

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB3 6EA

t: 08450 450 500
f: 01954 713149
dx: DX 729500 Cambridge 15
minicom: 01480 376743
www.scambs.gov.uk



22 February 2005

To: Chairman – Councillor Dr JPR Orme
Vice-Chairman – Councillor NIC Wright
All Members of the Development and Conservation Control Committee

Dear Councillor

You are invited to attend the next meeting of **DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION CONTROL COMMITTEE**, which will be held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **WEDNESDAY, 2 MARCH 2005** at **10.00 a.m.**

Yours faithfully
GJ HARLOCK
Finance and Resources Director

AGENDA

Members should declare any interests immediately prior to the relevant item on the agenda.

Should Members wish to declare an interest in an item discussed after they have left the meeting, and wish also that that declaration be recorded in the Minutes, they should make their declarations clear to the Committee. (Members need only declare an interest in circumstances where there is an item on the agenda that may cause a conflict of interest.)

	PAGES
PROCEDURAL ITEMS	
1. APOLOGIES	
TRAVELLERS ISSUES	
2. PLANNING FOR GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES This report is attached to the paper version of the agenda as a separate document.	
PLANNING APPLICATIONS	
3. S/0082/05/F - GRAVELEY	1 - 4
4. S/1964/04/RM - SAWSTON	5 - 8
5. S/2080/04/F - SAWSTON	9 - 12
6. S/0076/05/F - TEVERSHAM	13 - 16
7. S/2316/04/F - SHINGAY-CUM-WENDY	17 - 20

8.	S/0019/05/F - BASSINGBOURN	21 - 24
9.	S/0209/04/F - STEEPLE MORDEN	25 - 32
10.	S/0134/05/F - WATERBEACH	33 - 36
11.	S/2490/04/F - WATERBEACH	37 - 42
12.	S/0042/05/F - THRIFLOW	43 - 46
13.	S/0011/05/F - BABRAHAM	47 - 50
14.	S/2582/04/F - SHEPRETH	51 - 60
15.	S/2517/04/F - MELDRETH	61 - 66
16.	S/2595/04/F - CROXTON	67 - 72
17.	S/1164/04/F - COMBERTON	73 - 76
18.	S/2611/04/F - MADINGLEY	77 - 82
19.	S/1299/03/F - BOXWORTH	83 - 86
20.	S/2570/04/LB & S/2571/04/F - ICKLETON	87 - 94
21.	S/2554/04/F - LITTLE SHELFORD	95 - 100
22.	S/0559/04/F - GREAT EVERS DEN	101 - 104
23.	S/0651/04/F - GREAT EVERS DEN	105 - 108
APPEALS AND STATISTICS		
24.	APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION	109 - 116
TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS		
25.	TO CONSIDER MAKING AN ORDER IN GAMLINGAY	117 - 122
26.	TO CONSIDER THE CONFIRMATION OF ORDERS IN FEN DITTON, FOWLMERE AND PAPWORTH EVERARD	123 - 132

PLEASE NOTE

Some development control matters in this Agenda where the periods of consultation and representation may not have quite expired are reported to Committee to save time in the decision making process. Decisions on these applications will only be made at the end of the consultation periods after taking into account all material representations made within the full consultation period. The final decisions may be delegated to the Planning Director.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0082/05/F - Graveley
Extension at 18 Fieldings Place for Mr and Mrs Peck

Recommendation: Refusal
Date for Determination: 14th March 2005

Site and Proposal

1. No 18 is a two-storey semi-detached brick and slate dwelling situated on the eastern side of Fieldings Place, opposite St. Botolph's Church, adjacent to (but within) the eastern village framework boundary for Graveley. The dwelling has been extended to the front and side with a single storey flat-roof porch and garage. To the north of the pair of semi-detached dwellings is a public footpath.
2. The full application, received on 17 January 2005 proposes the conversion and extension of the existing garage, and erection of a first floor extension above the existing garage and porch, in addition to a front dormer window. The extension measures up to 6.3m in width and 6.2m in length.

Planning History

3. Planning permission was given for an extension to the dwelling to form a garage and porch in 1977 (Ref: **S/0082/05/F**). A rear extension has been added to the dwelling under permitted development rights.

Planning Policy

4. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("The County Structure Plan") requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment.
5. **Policy HG12** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ("The Local Plan") sets out the requirements that must be met in order for proposals to extend or alter dwellings within village frameworks to be considered for approval. This policy states that proposals which would seriously harm the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of light or privacy, being unduly overbearing in terms of its mass, or would adversely affect surrounding properties by virtue of its design, layout, location or materials will not be permitted.
6. **Policy SE9** of the Local Plan states that development on the village edges should be designed and landscaped to minimise the impact of development on the countryside.

Consultation

7. **Graveley Parish Council** - Recommendation of Approval. No additional comments made.

8. **Cambridgeshire County Council**, Public Rights of Way Officer - comments to be verbally reported

Representations

9. None received at the time of writing report.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

10. The key issues in the assessment of this application are whether the design is in keeping with local characteristics and impact on neighbour amenity.

Design and Appearance

11. I am of the view that the proposed design of the extension is out of character with both the existing design and appearance of the dwelling to be extended and the adjacent semi-detached dwelling. The proposed cat-slide roof with supporting pillars and front dormer window are considered to create an alien and incongruous feature in the streetscene that does not relate well to the relatively plain frontages of adjacent dwellings. The eaves and window-sill height along the front elevation are at odds with the existing position of these features on the pair of semi-detached dwellings (Nos. 18 and 20) and the proposed windows along the front elevation are not considered compatible with the original windows on the dwelling in size or design.
12. The proposed extension by virtue of its size, design and position would also have an unbalancing effect on the symmetrical frontage of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, which would lead to an unacceptable visual impact upon the streetscene.

Impact on Residential Amenity

13. I am of the view that the proposal does not seriously harm the residential amenities of adjacent properties. It is noted that proposed first floor windows along the southern elevation are high level.

Recommendation

14. Refuse

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposal by virtue of its design, scale and position to the front of the original front elevations of Nos. 18 and 20 Fieldings Place, creates an alien and incongruous feature in the streetscene, that does not relate well to the local character of the built environment and has an unacceptable visual impact upon the streetscene. The proposed forward projection, roof design, eaves height, window sill height, forward position of dormer window and use of supporting columns along the front elevation are incompatible with the design features of the existing and adjacent dwelling and would create an unduly dominating frontage feature in the streetscene. The proposal by virtue of its design, scale and positioning would also have an unbalancing effect upon the symmetrical frontage of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and be out of character with pattern of plain frontages on adjacent dwellings.

For the above reasons, the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 which states that extensions and

alterations to dwellings will not be permitted where there would be an unacceptable visual impact upon the streetscene. The proposal is also contrary to Policy 1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 which states that a high standard of design is required for all development that responds to the local character of the built environment.

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

- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003;
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004; and
- Planning File Ref: S/2595/04/F

Contact Officer: Allison Tindale - Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713159

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/1964/04/RM - Sawston
Erection of Medical Centre and Paramedic Garage Together with Car Park and
Associated Works at Allotment Site, London Road for Primary Asset Management

Recommendation: Approval
Date for Determination: 17th November 2004

Background

1. Members may recall that this application was considered at the January Committee meeting. Officers were granted delegated powers to approve the application subject to:
 - Further discussions taking place with the Local Highways Authority and Local Members (District and County) regarding the possibility of additional off-site highway works;
 - Confirmation from this Authority's Legal Director as to whether the paramedic garage can be considered as a reserved matter in view of a condition of the outline consent which refers to the erection of a **building** (singular).
2. A copy of the Committee report is attached as an appendix.

Update

3. Since the Committee meeting, I have sought the views of the Local Highways Authority (LHA) again. The LHA has advised that the development is satisfactory from a highway safety point of view and that it would therefore be unreasonable to require the developer to fund traffic calming in London Road. In addition, to link the traffic calming to the planning permission would be extremely difficult due to the necessity for public consultation and third party decision. The provision of a pedestrian crossing is not considered by the LHA to be absolutely necessary.
4. Whilst I understand and am sympathetic to the concerns of the Parish Council and Local Members about the highway safety implications of the development, given that the LHA has advised that off-site highway works are not necessary for highway safety reasons, adding a condition to the consent requiring such works to be carried out could not be justified. This is because all conditions attached to planning consents must pass a number of tests, including the need to be both reasonable and necessary.
5. My view is that Officers can only **encourage** (rather than require) the developers to liaise further with the Parish Council, Local Members and local residents (subsequent to the granting of planning permission) with a view to providing some form of traffic improvements. Such improvements would also need to be agreed with the County Council's Traffic Engineers and Safety Audit.

6. The Legal Director has advised that the paramedic garage (and covered stores) can be considered as a reserved matter given that these are ancillary to the principal building/use on the site.
7. Finally, the Local Highways Authority has requested a further amended plan clearly showing that there would be no difference in level between the widened footway and the vehicular access. The requested amendment has been submitted.

Recommendation

8. The recommendation remains one of approval of reserved matters of siting, design, external appearance and means of access in accordance with application dated 22nd September 2004, as amended by plans date stamped 1st December 2004 and 1st February and 14th February 2005, and in accordance with outline planning permission dated 2nd June 2004, reference S/2392/02/O subject to the following conditions:
 1. Standard Condition 5a - Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Reason 5a(ii));
 2. Sc5 - Details of the solar thermal collectors (Rc5a(ii));
 3. Sc56 - Protection of trees during construction (Rc56);
 4. Sc57 - Landscaping (protection of existing trees) (Rc57);
 5. Sc58 - Retention of hedges along the eastern and western boundaries of the site (Rc58);
 6. Sc60 - Details of boundary treatment, including details of the type of boundary fencing to be erected (Rc60);
 7. Para B10 (Rc10).

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3** (Sustainable design in built development);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: SE10** (Protected Village Amenity Areas) and Policy Sawston 2
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including noise disturbance and overlooking issues
 - Highway safety
 - Visual impact on the locality
 - Impact upon setting of adjacent Conservation Area

General

1. The applicant's attention is drawn to the conditions of the outline planning permission which continue to apply. Details required by Conditions 3 (footpath widening), 4 and 5 (landscaping of the site), 6 and 7 (surface and foul water drainage details) and 8 (details of power driven plant and equipment) still remain to be submitted and to be approved.
2. Should driven pile foundations be proposed, then before works commence, a statement of the method for construction of these foundations shall be submitted and agreed by the District Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.
3. During demolition and construction there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site except with the prior permission of the Environmental Health Officer in accordance with best practice and existing waste management legislation.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Refs: S/1964/04/RM and S/2392/02/O

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/2080/04/F - Sawston
7 Houses and Garages – Land r/o 16/20 Cambridge Road for Park Hill Homes Ltd

Recommendation: Approval
Date for Determination: 7th December 2004

Background

1. Members may recall that this application was considered at the January Committee meeting. Officers were granted delegated powers to approve the application providing:
 - The access road is brought up to adoptable standards;
 - The road layout allows refuse vehicles to turn within the proposed turning head;
 - Explore with the applicants the possibility of some of the units being key worker units.
2. A copy of the Committee report is attached as an appendix.

Update

3. Since the Committee meeting, the applicant's agent has confirmed in writing that the size and geometry of the extended road will be designed and laid out in accordance with the County Council's highways standards even though it will not be proposed for adoption. The existing stretch of road that has been laid out to serve the police station and 8 dwellings has not been adopted as the lack of surface water infrastructure in the area required the developers to use soakaways. Due to the ground conditions encountered it was not possible to include the large volume of soakaways within the adoptable area and it was therefore decided not to offer the road for adoption. This Authority confirmed in writing at the time that the planning permission did not require adoption of the road but that it be laid out in accordance with the approved drawings prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings.
4. I have been advised by Mr Barnes at the Local Highways Authority that part of the reason why the existing stretch of road has not been adopted is that its construction (ie – materials used, structure and depth) does not comply with the standards necessary for adoption. However, the Local Highways Authority has advised that the geometry and layout of the existing and proposed stretches of road are to adoptable standards. As such, if the drainage and construction of the road were acceptable, the Local Highways Authority would be happy to adopt the road.
5. The term 'adoptable standards' covers the dimensions and geometry of a road as well as its construction and drainage. It is clear from the above comments that the design of the roadway does not present any highway safety problems. In addition, a condition can be attached to any consent requiring satisfactory details

of the drainage of the road in order to ensure that run-off from the road does not present a flood risk to surrounding properties as well as to dwellings on the site itself.

6. The remaining issue relates to the construction of the road. The main harm that could arise from the fact that the road has not been built to adoptable standards is that it may deteriorate quickly and require significant ongoing maintenance. However, this is not a material planning issue and to withhold permission on this basis would not be justifiable.
7. The applicant's agent has advised that the maintenance of the road will be dealt with by means of positive covenants applied to the contract of sale for the new units. Each purchaser of the properties would be required to pay their fair contribution to the maintenance of the road and the ownership of the road will remain with the developer so that he can administer maintenance charges on an annual basis to the homeowners.
8. The Council's Recycling and Waste Minimisation Officer has been consulted in respect of whether the layout allows sufficient space for refuse vehicles to turn. His comments will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.
9. With regards to the issue of key worker units, the applicant's agent states that the scheme is only financially viable using open market values. Cambridge County Council funding for key-worker accommodation is not directed at proposed developments and is only available directly to individuals who apply for grants to assist in shared ownership purchases of properties on the open market. The size of the development puts it beneath the threshold for compulsory provision of low-cost housing and it is hoped that the issue of providing key-worker units is also not a compulsory requirement.
10. There are no planning policies in this Authority's Local Plan requiring key-worker housing to be provided on new residential sites. Whilst such provision would be desirable, it cannot justifiably be required as part of any planning permission.

Recommendation

11. The recommendation remains one of approval, (subject to no objections from the Recycling and Waste Minimisation Officer) as amended by drawings date stamped 26th November 2004, subject to the following conditions:
 1. Standard Condition A (Reason - A);
 2. Sc5a – Details and samples of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5aii);
 3. No development shall take place until a 1.8 metre high close boarded fence has been erected on the northern site boundary. (Reason – To protect the privacy of adjoining residents);
 4. Sc23 – First floor window in north elevation of Plot 15 to be obscure glazed (Rc23);
 5. Sc5b – Details of surface water drainage, including of the drainage of the access road, (Rc5b);
 6. Rc5c – Details of foul water drainage (Rc5c);
 7. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);

8. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
9. Sc60 – Boundary treatment details (Rc60);
10. Sc66 – Archaeological investigation (Rc66);
11. During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions (Rc26).

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:** P1/3 (Sustainable design in built development);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:** SE2 (Development in Rural Growth Settlements) and HG11 (Backland Development).
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity;
 - Visual impact on the locality
 - Highway safety/parking issues.
 - Impact on trees.

General

1. Should driven pile foundations be proposed, before works commence a statement of the method for construction of these foundations shall be submitted and agreed by the District Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.
2. During construction there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site except with the prior permission of the Environmental Health Officer in accordance with best practice and existing waste management legislation.

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

- Local Plan
- Structure Plan
- File Refs: S/2080/04/F and S/0014/03/F.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/0076/05/F - Teversham
Extension at 29 Marshall's Close, Teversham**

**Recommendation: Refusal
Date for Determination: 11th March 2005**

Site and Proposal

1. No.29 forms an extended semi-detached property located towards the end of the close on a bend of the circular access which encloses a central grassed area. The dwelling faces east with the main garden doglegged to the south rising in ground level towards the rear boundary which forms the edge of the village framework, beyond which is Green Belt land. The site is southwest of the attached semi, No31, both of which overlook the garden of No.33.
2. This application received on 14th January 2005 seeks full planning permission for a 1st floor rear extension above an approved (currently being constructed) ground floor extension. The proposal would be 6.5m wide and project 3.5m in depth matching the ground floor footprint. The roof would project from the main roof as a gable with a matching ridge height 6.8m above ground level. The proposal would accommodate a new bedroom and relocation of the bathroom and linen closet.

Planning History

3. **S/0432/02/F** – Two storey side extension to provide two new 1st floor bedrooms and an extended kitchen and utility room at ground floor. Approved 15th April 2002
4. **S/2034/03/F** – Single storey rear extension to provide new kitchen. Approved 28th October 2003.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy P1/3 'Sustainable Design in Built Development'** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that a high standard of design and sustainability should be adopted for all new forms of development.
6. **Policy HG12 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 sets out the requirements that must be met in order for proposals to extend or alter dwellings within village frameworks to be considered for approval.

Consultation

7. **Teversham Parish Council** recommends approval. Councillors thought that this was a retrospective application. However it has no objections.

Representations

8. No representations were received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

9. The key issues to consider in respect of this application are the scale of the proposed extension and its impact on the amenities of the attached property No.31 in terms of access to light and whether the two-storey element would be overbearing in terms of its mass.
10. Policy HG12 of South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 specifically states that planning permission for the extension and alteration of dwellings will not be permitted where, amongst others, the proposal would harm seriously the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of light and through being overbearing in terms of its mass.
11. The garden of the attached semi, No.31, is shallow, approximately 6.5m to the rear boundary and so the first floor addition has the potential to appear overbearing from this perspective. It is acknowledged that the proposal would not breach a 45-degree line of sight taken from the nearest window at No.31; however, the extension is of matching height to the existing ridge and is not considered to be of subordinate nature. This factor, coupled with the southwest orientation to No.31, would result a reduction to the level of afternoon sunlight to the immediate garden space and those rooms, ground floor and first floor, at the rear of No.31.
12. The level of residential development already approved at the site has resulted in a property with 4 modest sized bedrooms. To date this has not compromised the neighbouring dwellings however I consider that the application before me is not sympathetic to the amenity of those residents at No.31. A scheme on a reduced scale is achievable without compromising the amenity of the attached semi if so desired, however the applicant is not willing to amend the plans. In its current form I take the view that the scheme would reduce the amenity to the residents at No.31 in terms of sunlight and by being overbearing in terms of its first floor mass and height.

Recommendation

13. Refusal

1. The proposed 1st floor rear extension, by reason of its positioning, mass and height would result in a reduction in the level of sunlight to those residents at No.31 Marshall's Close beyond a level that they may reasonably expect to receive. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy HG12 of South Cambridgeshire Plan 2004 which states that planning permission for the extension and alteration of dwellings will not be permitted where, amongst others, the proposal would harm seriously the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of light.
2. The rear garden of both the proposal site and the attached semi is limited in depth. The proposed 1st floor rear extension, by reason of its positioning, mass and height would result in a bulky addition that would be overbearing when viewed from the rear of No.31. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy HG12 of South Cambridgeshire Plan 2004 which states that planning permission for the extension and alteration of dwellings will not be permitted where, amongst others, being unduly overbearing in terms of its mass.

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

- Application file Ref S//0076/05/F and Ref S/2034/03/F
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

Contact Officer: Matthew Carpen – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713393

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/2316/04/F - Shingay-cum-Wendy
Alteration and Conversion of Buildings to Live/Work Dwellings
(Mixed Use Classes C3 & B1) at Manor Farm Business Park for CMA Ltd.**

**Recommendation: Refusal
Determination Date 11th January 2005**

Site and Proposal

1. The site lies approximately 1.4km south west of the village of Wendy heading towards Guilden Morden and forms part of a group of buildings with mixed uses of light industrial, offices, children's day nursery and dwelling.
2. Within the site are two connected buildings forming an 'L'. One is a light brick and slate roof pitched structure and the other a black stained timber framed barn with an asymmetrically pitched corrugated tin roof.
3. The full planning application, received 16th November 2004, proposes to convert the L-shaped building from business Class B1 to a mixed use of residential and business in order to create a live/work dwelling. The timber framed part of the structure would become the dwelling, linked internally to the workspace in the brick structure. New openings are proposed in the walls and roof of the timber framed building to accommodate the conversion and the creation of a new first floor.
4. A garden is to be created to the north of the building with walls and post and rail fencing. Parking for two cars and turning space is to be provided within the site.

Planning History

5. In November 1986 planning permission was granted for the conversion of barns for light industrial use and one dwelling.
6. In November 1987 planning permission was granted for Business use (Class B1).
7. In September 1988 planning permission was granted for 2 barns for light industrial use together with car parking and septic tank.
8. In July 2003 planning permission was granted for change of use from office (Class B1(a)) to children's day nursery (Class D1).

Planning Policy

Policy EM9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (the Local Plan) - Teleworking.

9. This Policy states that the District Council will support proposals for teleworking schemes which bring home and workplace physically together on sites within village

frameworks or by conversion or adaptation of rural buildings outside village frameworks provided that there would be no adverse impact on residential amenity, traffic, character and the environment generally.

10. **Policy TP1** of the Local Plan states (in part):
The Council will seek, through its decisions on planning applications, to promote more sustainable transport choices, to improve access to major trip generators by non-car modes, and to reduce the need to travel, especially by car.
11. To give effect to these aims, planning permission will not be granted for developments likely to give rise to more than a small-scale increase in travel demands unless the site has (or will attain) a sufficient standard of accessibility to offer an appropriate choice of travel by public transport or other non-car travel mode(s).

Policy P2/6 - Rural Economy of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("The County Structure Plan") states (in part):

12. "Sensitive small-scale employment development in rural areas will be facilitated where it contributes to one or more of the following objectives:
 - Helping to achieve a balance of employment with the type and quantity of local housing;
 - Supporting new and existing business and research and technology clusters (see Policy P2/4);
 - Providing opportunities for home working, or making good use of new information and communication technologies;
 - Enabling farm or rural diversification where appropriate to the local area, including appropriate rural tourism (see Policies P4/1 and P4/2);
 - Enabling the re-use of existing buildings;
 - Helping to maintain or renew the vitality of rural areas.
13. **Policy P1/1** of the County Structure Plan - Approach to Development states (in part):
In all cases development should be located where travel distances by car can be minimised, walking and cycling encouraged and where good public transport accessibility exists or can be provided.
14. **Policy P1/3** of the County Structure Plan - Sustainable Design in Built Developments states (in part):
A high standard of design and sustainability for all new development will be required which: minimises the need to travel and reduces car dependency.

Consultation

Shingay-cum-Wendy Parish Council

15. "Discussed" at meeting 14th December 2004 No objections and general favour of application."

Chief Environmental Health Officer

16. No objections

Environment Agency

17. No objections subject to safeguarding measures

Ecology Officer

18. Comments are awaited

Representations

19. None

Further Representations of the applicant

20. These are attached as Appendix 1.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

21. The key issues are: sustainability and impact on the surrounding countryside.

Sustainability

22. The site lies well outside any defined settlement framework and is only realistically accessible by car. Cycling on the main road would not be safe, there is no bus service and no footpaths. This is not a site that would be considered acceptable for conversion to housing for these reasons.
23. The proposal aims to bring home and work place together which should reduce the need to travel. However, this site is almost 1.5km away from the small village of Wendy. Journeys to schools, shops, doctors etc in surrounding villages will of course be necessary by car. The mixed use will be, however, more sustainable than a pure residential conversion alone provided the mix could be maintained in perpetuity.
24. The proposal will not meet the needs of benefiting the rural economy by the reuse of buildings because the buildings already have a use that ensures a benefit to the economy.

Countryside

25. The new openings to the timber frame building will have an acceptable impact in my opinion, particularly as they are mostly in the north eastern elevation that faces inwards towards the existing buildings and not towards open countryside. However the erection of walls and fences, a more formal garden layout (which would be beyond control) and the inevitable residential paraphernalia will change the character of this site, particularly as the land to the north for the proposed garden is currently green and open with little natural screening.

26. ***Ecology Officer***

I am of the opinion that no obvious signs of bat usage are apparent and do not feel it reasonable to request any further surveys. I would encourage, in line with Policy EN14, (put as an informative) the erection of bat boxes or even a barn owl box upon the new conversion. I can give further advice to the applicant if required.

The pond at the front of the site is not in the application site and as such I am not considering it with this application.

Recommendation

Refusal

1. The proposed development would result in significant additional traffic generation to and from this remote and rural site. Such additional vehicle movements would be unsustainable in this location and contrary to the aim of reducing the need to travel, especially by car. Consequently the proposal would be contrary to Policies TP1 and EM9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 and Policies P1/1 and P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003.
2. The proposed use would result in the loss of the simple rural character of this site. It would change the character of the site by the introduction of walls, fences, a garden and residential paraphernalia which will formalise and harm the visual quality of the rural surroundings. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy EM9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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

- Working planning file reference S/2316/04/F
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

Contact Officer: Nigel Blazeby - Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713256

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/0019/05/F - Bassingbourn
Extension, 125 The Causeway for Mr and Mrs Davey**

**Recommendation: Refusal
Date for determination 2nd March 2005**

Site and Proposal

1. The Causeway is part of the main road running east-west through the village of Bassingbourn. On either side of the Causeway are a mix of detached, semi detached and terraced dwellings which are mainly well spaced.
2. The proposal site forms a pair of semi-detached 1970's, brick and pan tile, 2-storey houses with No. 123 The Causeway. It is situated to the north-east of the latter property. It has an existing garage to the side and a conservatory to the rear; a shed and a gazebo are situated on the rear boundary of the site. No. 59 and 61 Tower Close, which are also 2 storey houses are situated to the northwest. An access road to an industrial estate runs along the eastern boundary of the site.
3. The full planning application received, 5th January 2005, proposes the removal of the existing conservatory, bathroom and garage and the erection of a single storey rear extension and new garage.

Planning History

4. **S/2260/03** – Two storey and single storey rear extension. This application was refused on loss of neighbour amenity by being unduly overbearing in terms of its mass, therefore causing loss of light and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. The application was later dismissed at appeal.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy P1/3 'Sustainable Design in Built Development'** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment and details aspects of design to be considered.
6. **HG12 'Extensions and Alterations to dwellings within Frameworks'** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states in part that applications will not be permitted where the proposal would seriously harm the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of light or privacy, being unduly overbearing in terms of its mass, or would adversely affect surrounding properties by virtue of its design, layout, location or materials.

Consultation

7. **Bassingbourn Parish Council** recommends approval.

Representations

8. One letter was received from the occupiers of 123 The Causeway supporting the application. They have also mentioned in their letter received 5th February 2005, that they intend to re erect the conservatory that is currently on the rear of No. 125 The Causeway onto their own rear elevation.
9. Whilst I am aware the current neighbours do not object to the proposals and have taken the letter of support into account I have to deal with the proposals on their merits having regard to the fact that the extension is likely to remain long after the present occupiers have left the properties.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

10. The key issues are the impact of the development the occupiers of No. 123 The Causeway.

Neighbour Amenity

11. The new proposal is similar to that of the previous application but the two-storey element has been reduced to a single storey. The footprint of the proposed development has altered slightly. The depth of the rear extension closest to the occupiers of 123 The Causeway stays the same at 6 metres. It has been moved to 200 mm from the 2-metre boundary fence that separates 123 and 125, the height to the proposed eaves line measures 2.5 metres and the new ridgeline has been reduced from 7 metres to 4 metres.
12. The new proposed scheme has been reduced significantly in height. The main issue is with the 6 metres depth of the single storey rear extension located 200mm from the occupiers of 123 The Causeway. 123 The Causeway forms the other half of the dwelling and lies west of the site. It has a set of French doors and a window in its rear elevation at ground floor. I have assessed the impact of the proposed extension on the view from the French doors using the 45⁰ site line rule, I am still of the view that there is an adverse impact on the occupiers of 123 by means of being overbearing.
13. I have discussed with the agent and the applicant the scope to reduce the depth of the proposal and/or to move the development away from the boundary. Having reduced the scale of the extension significantly already I was informed they did want to reduce it any further and would achieve less internal space than they required by doing so.

Recommendation

14. Refusal

The property is a semi-detached house with no first floor rear windows. The attached property is identical to the application site. The proposed single storey rear extension would extend 6 metres at the rear, 0.2 metres from the northeast boundary of No. 123 The Causeway.

The proposed extension would harm the amenities of the neighbours of No. 123 The Causeway by being unduly overbearing in terms of mass and therefore causing an adverse impact on the occupiers of this dwelling. As such the proposal is contrary to

the requirements of Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, which aims to resist extensions of dwellings where the amenities of neighbours would be seriously harmed.

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

- Planning application S/2260/03/F
- Planning Application S/0019/05/F
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

Contact Officer: Saffron Garner – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713162

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/0209/04/F - Steeple Morden
Demolition of Existing Workshops and Redevelopment of Site to Provide 6 Dwellings
15 Ashwell Road, for Marchfield Developments

Recommendation: Delegated Approval
Date for Determination: 31st March 2004

Members will visit this site on 28th February 2005.

Site and Proposal

1. This full application, as amended by drawings received on 6th January 2005, proposes the erection of six dwellings on a 0.38ha site off Ashwell Road, Steeple Morden. The site currently contains approximately 800m² of industrial buildings which are in a poor state of repair.
2. The site is served by a narrow access roadway approximately 70m in length, which is a little over 4m in width for most of its length. The roadway is bounded on either side by the side and long rear gardens of semi-detached houses in Ashwell Road. The boundaries comprise wire fencing or hedging. The main part of the site adjoins the rear gardens of two pairs of semi-detached houses in Ashwell Road and to the west a side garden of a detached house in Ashwell Road. To the rear the site adjoins a house in Station Road, which is set well back from the road and abuts the site. To the east the site adjoins the rear gardens of properties in Plough Close, a modern development off Station Road. The boundary with Plough Close comprises a row of tall conifer and Poplar trees.
3. The proposal involves the erection of four detached houses and a pair of two bedroom houses groups around a turning head. The pair of two bedroom dwellings provides the affordable housing element of the scheme.
4. A landscaping scheme is submitted as part of the proposals. It is proposed to remove the existing conifer and Poplar planting on the east boundary of the site and replace with new planting.
5. The site is within the village framework. The density of the scheme is 17 dph.

Planning History

6. The site has been used for industrial purposes since the 1970's.

Planning Policy

7. **Policy SE4** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ("The Local Plan") identifies Steeple Morden as a group village where residential development and

redevelopment up to a maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings will be permitted within the village framework provided that:

- (a) The retention of the site in its present form is not essential to the character of the village;
- (b) The development would be sensitive to the character of the village, local features of landscape or ecological importance, and the amenities of neighbours;
- (c) The village has the necessary infrastructure capacity; and
- (d) Residential development would not conflict with another policy of the Plan, particularly **Policy EM8**.

Development may exceptionally consist of up to 15 dwelling, if this would make the best use of a brownfield site.

All development should provide an appropriate mix of dwelling size, type and affordability.

- 8. **Policy HG7** of the Local Plan sets out the District Councils policy in respect of affordable housing on sites within village frameworks. In villages such as Steeple Morden, where the population is below 3000, such provision should represent up to 50% of the total number of dwellings for which planning permission may be given, dependant upon the level of clearly identified local need, although higher or lower percentages may be agreed in the light of such factors as proximity to local services; access to public transport; the particular costs associated with the development; and whether or not the provision of affordable housing would prejudice other planning objectives warranting greater priority in the particular case.
- 9. **Policy HG10** of the Local Plan states that residential developments will be required to contain a mix of units providing accommodation in a range of types, sizes and affordability, making the best use of the site and promoting a sense of community which reflects local needs.
- 10. **Policy EM8** of the Local Plan states that the conversion, change of use or redevelopment of existing employment sites to non-employment uses within village frameworks will be resisted unless the existing use is generating environmental problems such as noise, pollution or unacceptable levels of traffic or where it demonstrated that the site is inappropriate for any employment use to continue having regard to market demand.
- 11. **Policy P5/5** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("The County Structure Plan") permits small scale housing developments in villages taking into account: the need for affordable rural housing; character of the village and its setting; and the level of jobs, services, infrastructure and passenger transport provision in the immediate area

Consultations

- 12. **Steeple Morden Parish Council** recommends refusal of the application as amended. It states:

"The Parish Council regrets the loss of any local employment opportunities and consequently fully supports Policy EM8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, covering change of use of such a site to a non-employment use. We therefore trust that, in line with paragraph 5.43 of this Policy, the Planning Officers have received

documentary evidence that the site has been adequately marketed over the past 12 months to confirm its non-viability for such a purpose.

Should this be the case, we would still oppose the application on the following grounds:

We have serious concerns over the viability of the narrow access to the site, bearing in mind that it would have to carry both pedestrians and vehicular traffic, is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass and has limited sightlines at its junction with Ashwell Road. We note that the applicant has indicated that previous usage of the site involved 40 vehicle movements a day and would ask for this claim to be substantiated, as we understand that several of the workshops were jointly used by a single tenant and a covenant restricted their use at the weekends and after 6pm on weekdays. Bearing in mind these limitations, we regard the claimed previous level of vehicular movements to be unlikely and note the happy coincidence of the given figure with the standard reckoning for those likely to be generated by five dwellings.

In our response to the previous application, the Parish Council suggested that the need for 5-bedroom houses had already been met in other, more sustainable locations than Steeple Morden. Whilst noting that, in line with our previous request, the amended version has at least replaced one of the large dwellings with two affordable dwellings, we would concur with the Highways Department that 5 dwellings would be the absolute maximum for this site, due to its access problems, and would therefore ask for 2 of the 5 dwellings to be affordable dwellings (or alternatively, for a commuted payment towards the provision of affordable housing in the village.)

In addition, we would ask for the Highways Department to make a site visit, to confirm that the access road, its sightlines and its suitability for use by delivery and utility vehicles conforms to with their requirements. We would also ask for Anglian Water to confirm that the local (and overloaded) sewage system has the capacity to cope with the contributions of the five extra dwellings.

We note the concerns of neighbouring residents in Plough Close over the likely impact on their property if adjacent mature trees are removed, and the need for some after-care provision for the maintenance of the screening on the site boundaries. We also understand that there will be a need to decontaminate some areas of the site before any building commences and would wish to see proposals for this.

We see no mention of any street lighting for the proposed development and would wish to see proposals for this, particularly with a view to enhancing pedestrian safety on the access road without intruding into the amenity of adjacent dwellings.

Without prejudice to these objections, we would ask, that should Committee decide to approve the application, any Section 106 Agreement attached to the permission should require any education contribution from the development mainly to benefit Steeple Morden Primary School.

Finally. Given the likely impact of the proposed development on its immediate surroundings, we would be very grateful if members of the Committee could make a site visit to assess any problems, before reaching their decision.

13. The **Local Highway Authority** comments in respect of the amended plans. "Whilst I appreciate that some 801m² of light industrial units *could* be anticipated to generate in the region of 64 - 96 vehicle movements a day (TRICS), the actual daily

movements associated with these run down buildings has not been established. On this basis I was prepared to accept the redevelopment of the site for five dwellings, which is likely to generate some 40-vehicle movements a day.

A further dwelling unit will not only exceed the recommended number of dwellings served by a private drive, but has the potential to add another eight vehicle movements per day along this very narrow track.

Clearly, the more traffic likely to be generated, the greater the likelihood of conflict within the track - particularly at the junction, resulting in vehicles manoeuvring/waiting within Ashwell Road.

I recommend that the number of residential units remain as five as originally proposed.”

14. The **Environment Agency** requests conditions requiring the submission of schemes in respect of ground contamination and foul and surface water drainage as well as setting out informatives
15. The **Chief Environmental Health Officer** requests conditions restricting the hours of operation of power driven machinery during the period of demolition and construction, and a scheme for the investigation of any contamination of the site. Informatives should be attached concerning the use of driven pile foundations, burning of waste and the need for a Demolition Notice.
16. The **Chief Financial Planning Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council**, is concerned that adequate secondary school capacity is not available at Bassingbourn Village College, where additional pupils generated by the development could be expected to go and a seeks a contribution to cover the cost of providing an additional space in the sum of £9000.

The **Development Manager** supports the scheme.

17. The comments of the **Trees and Landscapes Officer, Environment Operations Manager, and Building Control Manager** on the amended scheme will be reported at the meeting,

Representations

18. The occupier of 17 Ashwell Road, adjacent the access, expresses strong concerns, particularly about the access to the site. Does the proposal accord with the requirements of the Fire Safety Officer, Building Inspector in respect of width of access roadway and turning provision? Can refuse vehicles turn within the site or will owners of the new properties have to leave bins on Ashwell Road to be collected? There is already problems with damage to fences either side of the access roadway due to its limited width, and there are children that play outside the houses. The access roadway is unsafe. If the plans are approved who will be responsible for the fences? Visibility for cars is obstructed at the entrance by cars parked in the parking bay to the right and an electrical pole and parked cars to the left. The old buildings contain a lot of asbestos - will this be dealt with properly? As factory units there is little noise from vehicles, normally less than 10 a day and n there was no movement in the evenings or weekends. The proposed development will lead to an increase in car noise.

19. The occupiers of 1 Plough Close expresses concerns that the upstairs window of the semi-detached house on Plot 1 will over look their property causing a loss of privacy. Could this window be obscure glazed or a bungalow built there? The remaining dwellings are too large for the needs of the village. There is concern at the safety of the narrow access and the existence of asbestos in the existing buildings.
20. The occupiers of 4 Plough Close, whilst having no fundamental objections to the proposed development are concerned at the impact that the removal of the existing conifer and poplar trees on the east boundary of the site on nearby buildings. Assurance is sought that any asbestos in the existing buildings will be properly dealt with and that the site will be properly decontaminated.

Applicant's Representations

21. A detailed planning statement has been submitted by the applicant which is available as part of the background papers and will be displayed at the meeting

Planning Comments - Key Issues

22. The key issues to be considered are whether the site complies with Policy EM8 of the Local Plan in respect of the loss of an existing employment site; whether the development would be sensitive to the character of the village and the amenities of neighbours; highway safety and; affordable housing.
23. The existing industrial buildings on the site are in a run down condition. In my view any long term use of the buildings for employment purposes is likely to result in pressure for replacement buildings. Although it would not necessarily be appropriate to allow replacement on a similar scale (800m²) it is likely that any redevelopment would lead to potential levels of traffic generation above that which would be appropriate for the narrow access road. The existing buildings have not been used intensively for the past few years but have the potential to generate additional traffic movements. To the west of the site is Wyndmere Farm, which benefits from planning consent for conversion of buildings to employment use. In my view the long term use of this site has the potential to be incompatible with adjacent residential properties and given the existence if a significant area of employment floorspace at Wyndmere Farm I do not consider it essential that the application site remains in employment use.
24. As amended I do not consider that the proposed dwellings will have an unreasonable impact on the amenity of adjacent residents in terms of overlooking or being overbearing.
25. The Parish Council and local residents have expressed concern about the suitability of the narrow access to cater for the traffic likely to be generated by six dwellings. This concern is supported by the Local Highway Authority which has previously indicated that five dwellings should be the maximum allowed. In my view this is the key issue in determining this application and there is a balance to be struck between making best use of the site and the constraints imposed by the access.
26. As originally submitted the application proposed five detached dwellings. Although an additional unit has now been included one of the larger detached dwellings has been replaced by two smaller two bedroom dwellings. There has therefore been no increase in the number of bedspaces proposed.

27. Given that there is 800m² of industrial floorspace on the site which has the potential to generate a significant volume of traffic, although this has not been the case in recent years I am of the view that it would be difficult to resist the additional dwelling now proposed. I will report the views of the Building Control Manager in respect of emergency access.
28. The Development Manager supports the provision of two affordable dwellings as proposed. Although this represents only a 33% provision, development costs associated with the site preclude additional affordable units.
29. The Environment Agency has not raised any concerns in respect of foul water drainage although requested a condition.
30. The applicant will be asked to provide evidence to address the concerns expressed by residents in Plough Close regarding impact on existing buildings as a result of the loss of the existing trees.
31. Details of street lighting can be required by condition.

Recommendation

32. That subject to the views of outstanding consultees the applicant be invited to enter into a Section 106 Agreement securing the provision of two affordable dwellings. Subject to the prior signing of the Agreement delegated powers be given to approve the application subject to safeguarding conditions.

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:**
P5/5 (Homes in Rural Areas)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
SE4 (Dwellings in Group Villages)
HG7 (Affordable Housing on Sites within Village Frameworks)
HG10 (Housing Mix and Design) and
EM6 (New Employment at Rural Growth and Limited Growth Settlements)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including noise disturbance and overlooking issues
 - Highway safety
 - Visual impact on the locality
 - Loss of employment use
 - Drainage

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

- Planning file Ref.S/0209/04/F

Contact Officer: Paul Sexton - Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713255

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0134/05/F - Waterbeach
Extension at No.2 Josiah Court, Waterbeach for Mr and Mrs Cormack

Date for Determination: 22nd March 2005
Recommendation: Approval

The site will be visited by members on Monday 28th February 2005.

Site and Proposal

1. Josiah Court is located towards to the eastern end of Bannold Road on the northern edge of Waterbeach. No.2 forms one of 4 mansard style semis set as two pairs at right angles to each other with an area of parking and allocated garaging positioned to the front. The rear of No.2 backs onto the garden of No.1 Park Crescent, a rented property owned by the MOD. The garden of No.3 extends along the side boundary of the proposal site.
2. This application received on 25th January 2005 seeks full planning permission for a two storey side and rear extension. The dwelling already benefits from an original flat roof side projection to the west; this section would form part of the ground floor element with a new first floor above and extending two storeys' by 5.3 metres beyond the rear of the existing dwelling. Viewed from the front the roof would appear as a continuation of the mansard design. At the rear the same design would be echoed in the two storey rear projection with a lower ridge height by 0.7m.
3. Internally the ground floor would only be extended at the rear with a new summer room. Double doors would face east with new windows facing south and west. At first floor there would a new study, bathroom and bedroom with en-suite. The scheme includes various high-level windows, roof lights and obscure glazed windows to south, east and west elevations.

Planning History

4. **S/2291/04/F** - Two storey side and rear extension. Refused on 5th January 2005 on grounds of loss of privacy to residents south, east and west of the proposal site.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy P1/3 'Sustainable Design in Built Development'** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that a high standard of design and sustainability should be adopted for all new forms of development.
6. **Policy HG12 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 sets out the requirements that must be met in order for proposals to extend or alter dwellings within village frameworks to be considered for approval.

Consultation

Waterbeach Parish Council approves the application subject to neighbours. Concerns re loss of neighbours privacy as stated in their letters to SCDC.

Representations

7. Local Member Councillor Williamson has commented noting the planned extension does seem to take up a lot of the garden and the new set of French windows could be intrusive for the neighbours at No.1. No.1 and No. 3 will have their gardens in shadow for considerably more of the day than at present (number 1 in the afternoon and number 3 in the morning). Although there is a precedent at No.3 it has very little effect on the neighbouring houses because of its orientation with respect to them. In the case of an extension of the proposed size at No.2 I feel it could be quite seriously overbearing.
8. Two letters of objection have been received from the residents at No.1 and No.3 Josiah Court. The objections are summarised below.
 - The extension as proposed is too large altering the whole aspect of the Josiah Court development. It increases the size of No.2 Josiah Court by 53% half as much again from the current size.
 - The proposed 2-storey extension will have the effect of significantly reducing the hours of afternoon sunlight in the garden of No.1, impairing our ability to utilise the north/south (all day sunlight) that we currently enjoy.
 - The windows both first floor and second storey of the proposed extension will overlook the garden and living quarters at No.1 leading to an intolerable reduction of privacy inside and outside the house. We have serious concerns with the proposed windows /doors on the ground floor 'summer room' directly facing our garden.
 - There will be a significant loss of privacy to the garden and living quarters of No.1 Park Crescent from the windows of the proposed extension. The size of the extension would not be far from the boundary between the two properties.
 - In the proposed extension two new windows are shown upstairs in the front (north) elevation. Their replacement and proximity would adversely affect our property. The second landing window would look directly into the main (east facing) bedroom window of No.3.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

9. The key issue to consider in respect of this application is the impact of the new extension on the amenities of occupiers of the adjacent dwellings.
10. Policy HG12 of South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 specifically states that planning permission for the extension and alteration of dwellings will not be permitted where, amongst others, the proposal would harm seriously the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of light or privacy and through being overbearing in terms of its mass, or would adversely affect surrounding properties by virtue of its design, layout, location and materials.

Impact on No. 1

11. No.1 is the attached dwelling to the east; the boundary is currently screened by 2.5m high shrubs increasing to a 3m hedge adjacent to the back of the building. The bulk of the two-storey extension would be approximately 8m away from the shared boundary, a reasonable gap to avoid it being unduly overbearing. Given these two

properties benefit from south facing gardens I still consider No.1 will receive a reasonable amount of light. With regard to the issue of privacy there is adequate ground floor screening and at first floor the proposed roof lights and obscure glazing would restrict direct views.

Impact on No.3

12. No.3 has already been extended in a similar style (Ref: S/2079/91) to that proposed, albeit marginally shorter in depth and width. The garden of No.3 extends along the boundary of the proposal site that comprises a low open wire fence allowing views from the existing kitchen window at No.2 into the garden space of No.3.
13. On visiting the site the main private space would appear to be the patio area screened by No.3's own two-storey rear extension. Direct views to the garden of No.3 from the proposed west elevation are restricted by the proposed roof lights and obscure glazing of the bathroom. The bulk of the new addition would clearly be a noticeable feature when viewed from this garden with some early morning sunlight being lost. The new rear addition would have a marginally lower roof height and would be set between 4 - 6m from the shared boundary with No.3 due to the angled boundary between the two curtilages.
14. I take the view that the loss of light is not significant enough to warrant a refusal and its presence would not be significantly overbearing from this mainly secondary garden space. Given the existing extension at No.3 and the layout of dwellings with south facing gardens giving good access to sunlight most times of the day I feel we would struggle to justify a refusal on this basis.
15. I have requested the omission of the first floor landing window to the north elevation to avoid direct views into the bedroom of No.3, all other windows do not result in overlooking given they are either obscure glazed or within the roof.

Impact on No.1 Park Crescent

16. There would remain a distance of approximately 6m to the rear boundary, beyond which is the garden of No.1 Park Crescent. The extension would not be of bulky appearance from this perspective and there would be no significant level of overlooking given the high level window proposed. This can be secured by condition.

General

17. The scheme was previously refused under reference S/2291/04/F on the grounds of overlooking to the adjacent dwellings. The size and massing of this application remains the same and it is considered that subject to either the deletion of the first floor landing window or imposing a condition on this window to be obscure glazed and fixed shut it is recommended that the application be approved.

Recommendation

18. Approve subject to the following conditions:
 1. Standard Condition A - Time limited permission (Reason A)
 2. Sc5a - Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5a(ii))
 3. Sc60 - Details of boundary treatment, insert 'west' (Rc60)
 4. The new first floor window serving the landing in the north elevation of the existing building, hereby approved, shall not be glazed or re-glazed other than with obscure glass. This window shall be permanently fixed shut. (RC22)

5. The new first floor window to the east elevation of the rear extension, hereby approved, shall be side hung to the right and shall not be glazed or re-glazed other than with obscure glass. (RC22)
6. The new first floor high-level window serving the bedroom to the south elevation of the rear extension, hereby approved, shall have a cill height no lower than 1.7m above first floor level. (RC22)
7. The new first floor window serving the bathroom to the west elevation of the side extension shall not be glazed or re-glazed other than with obscure glass. The small high-level casement will be the only openable element of this window, the rest shall be fixed shut. (RC22)
4. Sc22 - No further windows other than those hereby approved shall be inserted at first floor level in the north, south, east or west elevation of the development (Rc22)

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:**
P1/3 (Sustainable design in built development)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
HG12 (Extensions and alterations to dwellings within frameworks)
2. The development approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including the overbearing aspect of the new extension and issues of privacy.

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

- Planning files reference S/2079/91/F, S/2291/04/F and S/0134/05/F
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

Contact Officer: Matthew Carpen - Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713393

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd March 2005

AUTHOR: Director of Development Services

S/2490/04/F - Waterbeach

**Erection of Double Garage with Studio Over, Revised Design and Siting,
(Retrospective application), Threeways, 2 Denny End Road for Mr and Mrs Walker**

Recommendation: Refusal

Date for Determination: 18th March 2005

Site and Proposal

1. Threeways is a semi detached property sited within the village framework of Waterbeach, located adjacent to the junction of Denny End Road and Bannold Road. Bannold Court, a small residential development of three properties is sited to the north.
2. This full application submitted on the 8th December 2004, (re-dated on the 21st January 2005 following the submission of corrected plans) seeks consent for the erection of a double garage with studio above. The garage measures 6.3 metres in length, 6 metres in width and measures 5.9 metres in height. Four roof lights and a gable end window provide light into the studio.
3. The garage has been erected on land to the east of the main dwelling in an area of the application site fenced off from the main garden. Whilst a path links the garage to the dwelling, vehicular access is provided via a shared drive accessed off Bannold Road. No 1A Bannold Road, the attached neighbour, is sited approximately 15 metres to the south of the garage. No 3 Bannold Court is sited approximately 4.75 metres due north of the structure.

Planning History

4. Planning permission was granted in 1998 for the erection of an extension including an annex and erection of garage, reference **S/1600/98/F**. While the extension and annex were attached to the main dwelling, the double garage with pitched roof was sited in a similar location to the garage under consideration in this application.
5. Planning application **S/1335/03/F** gave consent for the erection of a double garage with studio above. This garage was sited approximately 1 metre further away from the site boundary shared with No 3 Bannold Court while the eaves and ridge height of the structure were 600mm lower.

Planning Policy

6. **Policy HG12 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks'** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 sets out the requirements that must be met in order for proposals to extend or alter dwellings within village frameworks to be considered for approval.

7. **Policy P1/3 'Sustainable Design in Built Development'** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment and details aspects of design to be considered.

Consultations

8. **Waterbeach Parish Council** – Approves subject to neighbours and occupation of garage being ancillary to the dwelling.
9. **Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board** – No comment

Representations

10. **Councillor Williamson** requested that this application be presented at Committee. Concerns were raised regarding the potential conflict of interests.
11. Letters of objection have been received from both adjacent properties, 1A Bannold Road and 3 Bannold Court. The concerns raised include:
- Overshadowing;
 - Overbearing
 - Overlooking
 - Intensity of use of studio
 - Over provision of car parking spaces
12. The applicant has, by letter, raised the following points:
- Prior to the garage being erected, the boundary to 3 Bannold Court was lined by a 10 metre high Leylandii hedge
 - Following the removal of this hedge, existing trees still overshadow the adjacent properties
 - The boundary line is not accurately shown on site or on the plans and an additional 150mm separation is provided to the true boundary line.
 - If the height of the garage were reduced, the overlooking potential out of the roof lights would be increased due to the reduced cill height of these openings.
13. **Planning Comments – Key Issues**
This application is a retrospective application. The garage detailed in this application was erected following consent being granted on the site for a garage with studio above, (reference S/1335/03/F). The structure which was erected was however higher and built in a different location. This previous consent had therefore not been implemented and a revised application was requested, in accordance with the Council's protocol on enforcement action.
14. The key issues to consider in this application are the overshadowing/overbearing affect of the garage and studio, the overlooking potential and impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
15. ***Overshadowing/overbearing***

No 3 Bannold Court is sited to the north of the garage and has a number of ground floor and first floor windows, which face directly towards the application site. These windows serve a lounge, study and bedroom and are located approximately 9 metres away from the flank wall of the garage.

16. Despite No 3 Bannold Court being sited to the north, in considering application S/1335/03/F it was decided that the overshadowing/overbearing affect of a 5.4 metre high structure would be insufficient to justify a refusal of permission. A typical 2 metre high boundary fence would screen the majority of the flank wall from view while the roof sloped away from the No 3 Bannold Court with the ridge set 4.9 metres away from the boundary.
17. Given the revised siting of the garage, (850mm – 1000mm closer to No 3 Bannold Court) and the increased eaves and ridge height (600mm or approximately 9 brick courses higher) the garage feels oppressive when viewed from within the rear garden of No 3 Bannold Court and overshadows the south facing windows of this property. Whilst the applicant has made reference to the overshadowing affect of leylandii trees previously sited along the boundary, these can, and in this case have, been removed. A structure like this is permanent, as is the overshadowing/overbearing affect.
18. With regards to the adjacent property, No 1A Bannold Road, it is considered that sufficient separation is provided to ensure the 600mm increase in height will not adversely affect the amenities of this property.
19. **Overlooking**
The earlier consent for a garage with studio above was of similar design. In this approved application the studio area was lit by 2 gable end windows and three roof lights, (1 south facing, 2 north facing). Whilst just 1 additional south facing roof light has been inserted and a gable end window omitted, increasing the eaves and ridge height of the garage has provided a more useable first floor area. Sufficient headroom is now provided within the first floor area to allow an adult to walk freely within the roof and stand up adjacent to the cill of each roof light.
20. Having looked out of these openings myself, views are provided into the first floor bedroom and study windows of No 3 Bannold Court. These openings are at a similar height to the roof lights and are sited just 10 metres away, (approximately). Whilst views provided towards 1A Bannold Road are at present partially obscured by a tall tree clearer views would be provided towards the first floor openings of this property if this tree were to be removed or cut back. These openings are sited slightly further away however a window to window distance of 15 metres still gives rise to a certain degree of overlooking.
21. Given the cill height of the roof lights, views from within the studio are not provided down into the private rear gardens of either adjacent property.
22. I disagree with the applicant's claim that greater views would be provided out of these windows if the garage had been built in accordance with the plans approved in application S/1335/03/F. While the cill height of these windows would be lower, an adult would be unable to stand up and look directly out of these windows. The only views provided would be when standing in the centre of the room beneath the ridge of the roof, some distance back from the window.
23. Very limited useable floor space is provided within the roof space of a traditional double garage. In increasing the ridge and eaves height of this structure a kitchenette and small bathroom and have been able to be provided, in addition to a

well-proportioned room. Whilst the use of this space may remain ancillary to the main dwelling, the greater headroom will undoubtedly allow this space to be used more intensely, thus further increasing the potential overlooking affect.

24. ***Character and appearance of area***

Only very limited public views of the garage are provided and despite measuring almost 6 metres in height, the garage will not affect the character and appearance of the area.

25. Whilst concerns have been raised about the overprovision of car parking spaces, the provision of three spaces (2 within the garage 1 adjacent) is considered acceptable.

26. As this is a retrospective application, if Members are minded to refuse the application I would request authorisation to seek enforcement action to reduce the height of the garage so as to accord with the details approved in application S/1335/03/F. If the eaves and ridge height of the garage are reduced it is considered that the revised location, sited closer to No 3 Bannold Court, would be acceptable.

Recommendation

Refuse

1. The adjacent property, No 3 Bannold Court is sited to the north of the application site and has several ground floor and first floor, south facing openings sited approximately 10 metres away from the flank wall of the garage. The 5.9 metre high structure sited just 850mm away from the common boundary of the site overshadows the garden area and south facing bedroom, study and lounge windows of the adjacent property, No 3 Bannold Court. The garage also by reason of its height, bulk and proximity to the boundary appears overbearing when viewed from within the adjacent property, to the detriment of the residential amenity of No 3 Bannold Court.

Whilst this site does benefit from a previous approval for a double garage and studio, the approved structure was sited an additional metre away from the common boundary of the site and the eaves and ridge height of the structure were 600mm lower.

2. Given the increase in eaves and ridge height of the garage, the first floor studio is now a useable area where adults can move freely without restricted headroom and stand up against the cill of each roof light. Given the close proximity of the garage to the adjacent property, No 3 Bannold Court clear views are provided out of the two north facing roof lights into the first floor bedroom and study window of this adjacent property.

Whilst currently screened from view by a mature tree, if this tree were to be removed or cut back clear views would also be provided towards the first floor rear facing openings of No 1A Bannold Court out of the 2 south facing roof lights. A window-to-window distance of just 15 metres will still give rise to significant degree of overlooking.

The double garage with store above is, for the reason listed above, considered to have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of both adjacent properties, No 1A Bannold Road and 3 Bannold Court. The details of this application are therefore considered contrary to Policy P1/3 of the

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policy HG12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning files Ref S/2490/04/F and S/1335/03/F

Contact Officer: Paul Belton – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713 253

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0042/05/F - Thriplow
Garage, Outbuilding, Boundary Walls and New Vehicular Access at 5 Middle Street for
Mr & Mrs T Holmes

Recommendation: Approval
Date of Determination: 7th March 2005

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is occupied by a 2 storey (6.1 metre high) render and slate dwelling with a single storey brick and flint element on its north-western side and single storey additions to the rear. The property is located along a bend in the road within a large open site that backs onto paddocks to the rear.
2. The full application, submitted on 10th January 2005, seeks to erect a garage within the garden area on the north-west side of the dwelling, to erect a 2 metre high flint wall along the roadside boundary of this side garden area and to create a new point of vehicular access to replace the existing access on the south-east side of the property.

Planning History

3. **S/2460/03/F** – Members may recall that an application for a large 2 storey, 4 bedroom extension to the rear of the dwelling was approved at Committee in February 2004, contrary to Officer recommendation, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement to ensure there is no further development on the site and to ensure the extension is only occupied as an annexe to the existing dwelling. The legal agreement has not been signed to date.

Planning Policy

4. **Policy P7/6** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 requires development to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
5. **Policy P1/3** of the County Structure Plan requires a high standard of design that responds to the local character of the built environment.
6. **Policy EN30** of the Local Plan requires development in a Conservation Area to either preserve or enhance the character of the area.
7. **Policy HG12** of the Local Plan states (in part) that permission for extensions to dwellings will not be permitted where the design and use of materials would not be in keeping with local characteristics and where there would be an unacceptable visual impact upon the street scene.

8. The land on the north-west side of the dwelling, on which it is presently proposed to site the access, wall and garage, has no specific policy designation. However, within the 1999 Deposit Local Plan, this Authority proposed its designation as a Protected Village Amenity Area (PVAA) in order to maintain views across the site into open countryside. However, the Local Plan Inspector suggested that this designation be deleted from the Local Plan on the basis that the site does not have the character or appearance of a PVAA or serve any purpose meriting such a designation.

Consultation

9. **Thriplow Parish Council** raises no objections to the application.
10. The comments of the **Conservation Manager** are awaited and will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.
11. The **Trees and Landscape Officer** has advised that the ash on the site frontage is an old semi-pollard with severe decay and that the other trees affected within the site are of mediocre quality. The proposed garage would impact on the adjacent young ash trees.
12. The comments of the **Chief Environmental Health Officer** are awaited and will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.

Representations

13. 3 letters have been received to date. No. 7 Middle Street supports the application, stating that the garden store on the south side of the dwelling is preferable to the previously proposed cart shed. In addition, the proposed flint and brick wall would be very attractive. No. 4 Middle Street also supports the application.
14. No.2 School Lane raises no objections to the proposal itself but does query the accuracy of the plans in respect of the boundary of the site with No. 2 School Lane and the position of trees.

Representation by the Local Member

15. **Councillor Quinlan** supports the application stating:

"I have now seen the amendments proposed to this scheme and consider the latest scheme a significant improvement on the previous scheme. It is also preferred by the neighbours. I believe the scheme will enhance the conservation area and has very positive townscape benefits."

Representation by the applicant's agent

16. A covering letter has been submitted in support of the application. This states that application seeks to relocate a cart shed, previously approved on the east side of the house by this Authority under planning ref: S/2460/03/F, to the village hall boundary along the western side. The replacement of the approved garage with a reduced garden store will afford enhanced glimpses of the Thriplow Church Spire and field beyond. The proposed revised access location would have benefits as there would be the ability to bring all visitor cars off the road and mitigate the possibility of car parking on the verge or road that would occur with the currently approved access. The boundary along Middle Street is best served by a traditional brick and flint wall which is common in Thriplow.

The views from Middle Street will be maintained as the wall will be no higher than any hedge or fencing that would have been provided within the original application.

17. The applicants have offered to provide a Section 106 Agreement over the area of land where the cart shed would be located in order to give the Council comfort that they have no intention of building a separate dwelling on that part of the plot. The legal agreement would be finalised after consideration of the current application.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

18. The key issue to consider in the determination of this application relates to the impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
19. Although the Conservation Manager's comments have not been received to date, Planning and Conservation Officers have advised, in pre-application discussions, that Officer support would not be given for the proposed scheme. The area on the north-west side of the dwelling has an informal, rural character and is considered to be an important open space within the Conservation Area. The Section 106 Agreement that Members have approved for the site was intended to prevent any development occurring on this land, thereby retaining its open character, rather than to specifically prevent the erection of a dwelling on this part of the site. The access, flint wall and garage would formalise the setting of the cottage and detract from the rural character of this part of the site. As the development would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the proposal would contravene the aforementioned planning policies.

Recommendation

20. Refusal

The proposed development would detract from the informal, open, rural character of the land to the north-west side of the existing dwelling to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: Policies P1/3 which requires a high standard of design that responds to the local character of the built environment, and P7/6 which requires development to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: Policies EN30 which states that permission will be refused for schemes which adversely affect the setting of Conservation Areas and HG12 which states that permission will be refused for additions to dwellings that would have an unacceptable visual impact on the street scene.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Application Refs: S/0042/05/F and S/2460/03/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/0011/05/F - Babraham
Conversion of 2 Houses into 4 Flats for The Babraham Institute

Recommendation: Approval
Date for Determination: 1st March 2005

Departure Application**Site and Proposal**

1. Nos. 33 and 34 The Close form a pair of semi-detached houses that are situated at the end of a group of semi-detached properties at The Close. To the southwest and northeast of the site are amenity grass areas. Neighbouring properties to the northeast, Nos. 32, 32A and 31 and 31A are 4 flats previously converted from 2 semi-detached houses. To the west of The Close is The Babraham Institute.
2. The application, received on 4th January 2005, proposes the conversion of 2 semi-detached houses into 4 flats with the addition of two staircases at the side elevations and 4 off-street parking spaces and 2 drop kerbs within the residential curtilage.

Planning History

3. S/1035/91/F - Planning permission was granted in 1991 for conversion of semi-detached pair of houses into 4 self-contained flats at Nos. 31 and 32 The Close
4. S/0149/92/F - Planning permission was granted in 1992 for conversion of semi-detached pair of houses into 4 self-contained flats at Nos. 33 and 34 The Close

Planning Policy

5. The existing dwellings and the curtilage are within the countryside and the Green Belt, and adjacent to the Babraham Conservation Area.
6. **Policy P1/2** of the **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure 2003** states that development in the countryside will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
7. **Policy P9/2a** of the **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure 2003** states that new development within the Green Belt will be limited to uses appropriate to a rural area.
8. **Policy SE8** of the **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004** states that residential development outside village frameworks will not be permitted.
9. **Policy GB2** of the **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004** defines development which is not inappropriate in the Green Belt and states that planning permission will

not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.

10. **Policy HG13** of the **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004** states in part that extensions to dwellings in the countryside will only be permitted where:
1. The proposed development would not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling;
 2. The extension does not exceed the height of the original dwelling;
 3. The extension does not lead to a 50% increase or more in volume or gross internal gross floor area of the original dwelling; and
 4. The proposed extension is in scale and character with the existing dwelling and would not materially change the impact of the dwelling on its surrounding.

The aim of this policy is to minimise the impact of development upon the landscape and to prevent the gradual reduction in the stock of small and medium sized dwellings in the countryside.

11. **Policy EN30** of the **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004** states that proposals will be expected to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the Conservation Areas.
12. **Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (Green Belts)** outlines the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Paragraph 3.4 implies that extensions that result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building are classed as inappropriate and by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.

Consultation

13. **Babraham Parish Council** approves the application
14. **Conservation Manager** raises no objection

Representations

15. Supporting information submitted by the applicant:
- Nos. 33 and 34 are not up to the Babraham Institute's current letting standard and No. 33 has had to stand unlet for nearly 2 years;
 - The 'family' houses at The Babraham Institute are usually all let and there is a waiting list for flats. Flats are attractive to more junior and lower-paid staff;
 - The accommodation in the Institute is useful for recruiting and retaining staff. The properties on The Close are for the use of staff or students at the Institute and it contributes to Green Transport objectives to allow staff to walk to work. Sub-letting is not permitted and there is no intention to sell any of the properties on The Close;
 - The proposal would supplement the existing accommodation for rent with a greater capacity for staff and their spouses/partners both work at the Institute especially benefiting lower-paid staff.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

16. The key issues in relation to this application are:
 - Impact upon character and appearance of the countryside and the Green Belt;
 - Whether the proposal, which is sited outside the village framework, would protect the countryside from gradual encroachment on the edges of the village and to help guard against an incremental growth in the number of dwellings in unsustainable location; and
 - Whether there are any material considerations which outweigh the presumption against residential development in the countryside
17. National and development plan policies confirm that development in the Green Belt is not necessarily inappropriate as long as the development would not materially increase the impact of the site on the surrounding countryside and there are very special circumstances can be demonstrated. In view of the applicant's supporting information that the proposed flats are exclusively for the use of staff and students working at the adjacent Babraham Institute, the impact upon the countryside and the Green Belt, and the issue on sustainability are considered below.
18. I have no objection in principle to the external alterations at the rear and to the front, and extensions to the original dwellings with the additions of the staircases at the side elevations. I do not consider that the proposal will have an adverse impact upon the openness of the Green Belt given that the alterations are in scale and character with the existing dwellings and would not materially change the impact of the dwellings upon the countryside and the Green Belt. The proposal generally meets the aim of Policy HG13 of the Local Plan 2004 to minimise the impact of development upon the landscape and to prevent the gradual reduction in the stock of small and medium sized dwellings in the countryside.
19. Policy P1/2 of the Structure Plan 2003 and SE8 of the Local Plan 2004 require residential development to be sited within village frameworks in order to protect the countryside from gradual encroachment on the edges of villages and to help guard against incremental growth in unsustainable locations.
20. It is confirmed by the agent that the flats will be used to accommodate staff and student at the Babarham Institute. It is considered that the proposal to convert 2 houses into 4 flats could reduce the need to travel, particularly by car; therefore, it would not materially increase the impact of the site on the surrounding countryside. The proposal contributes to sustainability in this rural location with little public transport.
21. Given that it is confirmed by the applicant that the future occupiers of the proposed flats will be the staff and students at the Institute and I consider that it is a special circumstance in this instance to outweigh the presumption against inappropriate development in the countryside and the Green Belt. I support the proposal as a Departure from the Development Plan and my recommendation is one of approval.
22. The development would not significantly prejudice the implementation of the development plan's policies and proposals. If Members are minded to support the application, it would not therefore be necessary to refer it to the Secretary of State.

Recommendation

23. Approval subject to conditions:

1. Standard Condition A - Time limited permission (Reason A)
2. Prior to the occupation of the flats, hereby permitted, the parking shall be provided in accordance with layout shown within the 1: 200 scale site plan and thereafter maintained (Reason - In the interest of highway safety)

Reasons for Approval

1. Although the development is not in accordance with South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policy SE8, it is considered to be acceptable as a departure from the development plan having regard to representation received in support of the special circumstances that the future occupiers of the proposed flats will be the staff and students at the Institute, it is at in this instance to outweigh the presumption against inappropriateness in the countryside.
2. The approved development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:**
Policy P1/2 (Environmental Restrictions on Development in Countryside);
Policy 9/2a (Green Belt)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
Policy GB2 (General Principles in the Green Belt);
Policy HG13 (Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside);
Policy EN30 (Development in/adjacent Conservation Areas)

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

- PPG2 –Green Belt
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- File references S/1035/91/F, S/0149/92/F and S/0011/05/F

Contact Officer: Emily Ip - Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713250

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/2582/04/F - Shepreth**Three Dwellings (Revised Scheme) at 20 High Street, Shepreth for
David Reed Homes****Date of Determination: 16th February 2005****Recommendation: Approval****Conservation Area****Site and Proposal**

1. This 0.16ha site lies on the west side of the High Street. There is currently a single dwelling positioned approximately in the centre of the site which has been extended with a flat roof forward projection. A number of outbuildings lie to the side and rear. To the south is no. 22 High Street, a two storey dwelling with mature trees on the boundary with the application site. To the north is no. 18 High Street, a white painted cottage with single storey rear elements and a separate single flat roof garage to the side. To the rear of this property, and attached to it, is a barn (Grade II Listed) that forms part of no. 14/16 High Street (house de-listed in December 1987), to the north of no. 18. To the west is open countryside.
2. The site lies within the village framework for Shepreth.
3. The full planning application, received on 22nd December 2004, proposes the erection of an affordable cottage style house at the front of the site with a ridge height of approximately 8m and the erection of two dwellings to the rear with ridge heights of approximately 8.5m and with a barn like appearance following demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings.

Planning History

4. In November 2002 Conservation Area consent was granted for the total demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings.
5. On 11th March 2004 planning permission was granted for three dwellings, including one affordable. A Section 106 agreement is in place to ensure that the affordable dwelling is occupied only by qualifying persons and secured in perpetuity for that purpose.

Planning Policy**Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (the Structure Plan)
Policy P1/3 - Sustainable Design in Built Development.**

6. This policy stresses the need for a high standard of design and a sense of place which responds to the local character of the built environment, amongst a whole host of other sustainability considerations.

Structure Plan Policy P7/6 - Historic Built Environment

7. Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (the Local Plan) Policy SE5 - List of Infill Villages

8. Shepreth is listed as an Infill village.

Residential developments within the village frameworks of these villages will be restricted to not more than two dwellings comprising:

1. A gap in an otherwise built-up frontage to an existing road, provided that it is not sufficiently large to accommodate more than two dwellings on similar curtilages to those adjoining; or
 2. The redevelopment or sub-division of an existing residential curtilage; or
 3. The sub-division of an existing dwelling; or
 4. Subject to the provisions of Policy EM8, the conversion or redevelopment of a non-residential building where this would not result in a loss of local employment.
9. Provided the site in its present form does not form an essential part of village character, and development is sympathetic to the historic interests, character, and amenities of the locality.
10. In very exceptional cases a slightly larger development may be permitted if this would lead to the sustainable recycling of a brownfield site bringing positive overall benefit to the village.

Local Plan Policy HG10 - Housing Mix and Design

11. Residential developments will be required to contain a mix of units providing accommodation in a range of types, sizes (including 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings) and affordability, making the best use of the site and promoting a sense of community which reflects local needs.
12. The design and layout of schemes should be informed by the wider character and context of the local townscape and landscape. Schemes should also achieve high quality design and distinctiveness, avoiding inflexible standards and promoting energy efficiency. The District Council will support the preparation of Village Design Statements to secure these aims.

Local Plan Policy EN30 - Development in Conservation Areas

13. The District Council will require that applications for planning permission for development in Conservation Areas or affecting their setting, be accompanied by sufficient details to allow the impact of the proposals to be assessed. This must include drawings or other pictorial material which illustrates the proposed buildings in their context, and in most cases outline applications will not be acceptable. Proposals will be expected to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of Conservation Areas especially in terms of their scale, massing, roof

materials and wall materials. The District Council will refuse permission for schemes which do not specify traditional local materials and details and which do not fit comfortably into their context.

Consultation

Parish Council

14. Recommends refusal. It states:

“The Parish Council strongly objects to the height of the proposed dwellings and feels that any new development should be in keeping with the rest of the village.”

Conservation Manager

“Site:

The site is in the grounds of a small cottage set back from the High Street and running up to the boundary of the conservation area. To the west is a collection of scrub and mature trees with open countryside beyond. The character of this part of the village retains its historic appearance of a loose collection of vernacular properties, with hedgerows tightly enclosing the street frontage and agricultural buildings in the background.

Policy: EN30

Proposal:

The proposal is to demolish the existing site buildings and erect 3 residential properties. The foreground property is proposed as a detached cottage. Its architectural style is of a modest, 19th century brick house, with symmetrical elevations and using locally appropriate materials. To the rear there are two much larger detached properties designed to reflect the scale and visual character of agricultural buildings.

Considerations:

This is an amended version of a scheme which has previously received consent and which I supported. Conservation Area Consent was granted in tandem to the previously approved scheme for the demolition of the existing property on the site and the various outbuildings. Both this current scheme and the earlier (approved) version were subject to considerable negotiation to try to achieve a high quality scheme.

The design principle established in the earlier version is to reflect the agricultural character of the settlement. Hence the vernacular style cottage and the barn-like building to the background. I am the opinion that in general the proposed development has been successful in retaining the visual character of the site.

The foreground cottage is relatively modest, unassuming and visually well balanced. However, the eventual quality of the development will depend to a significant degree on the construction details. I would, therefore, suggest that conditions are applied to ensure that (as implied by the drawings) the windows have real brick arches, and that they are painted timber, set into appropriate reveals to ensure that there is a depth and texture to the elevation. Similarly, the main materials (brick & slate) will need to be conditioned to provide samples.

With regard to the larger barn-like buildings, these will be viewed across the site with the vista constrained by the foreground cottage. The approach has, therefore, been

to try to focus on achieving a general appearance, scale, and form which is a convincing attempt to suggest agricultural buildings. I am of the opinion that the proposed scheme has been generally successful in creating a collection of simple forms, such that the views of the building will be uncluttered ridge-lines and the expanse of roof. Where details are evident they are generally of the form that would be appropriate in a barn conversion, including open cart sheds and punched irregular openings on the main elevations. I would prefer to see a further simplified projecting gable to plot 2, (by reducing the first floor windows) but do not have any substantive objection to the proposal.

With regards to the access, I am of the opinion that the loss of the hedge, by reason of the imposed visibility splay is unfortunate, but understand this is a highway requirement and that the hedgerow will be replanted and strengthened. The surface material for the access drive should be conditioned to give a bound natural gravel finish, reflecting the informality of an agricultural access road.

I would also suggest that planting, both within the site and on the boundary is strengthened, particularly at the rear such that mass of the group is broken and the more domestic form of the rear elevation is screened to enable the focus of the site to remain on the roofscape.

Conclusion:

I am of the opinion, that this development makes a reasonable attempt to address the concern to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. I therefore support the proposal, as amended subject to the imposition of detailed conditions to control materials and architectural details."

Chief Environmental Health Officer

12. No objections subject to safeguarding measures during construction.

Representations

13. One letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of No. 14/16 High Street, Shepreth.

"The proposal will over develop the site because the houses at the rear are too big for the space. The new footprint of these houses appears to be bigger [than] the previous scheme which was also too big.

The houses at the rear are too tall. The drawings are not very exact but it appears that the height has increased to 9 metres. Permission was given for two houses at 8.3 metres after objections and even these were 1.5 metres higher than the adjacent old barn upon which they were supposed to be styled. The houses in this revised proposal are 1.7 metres higher than the tallest house in the High Street".

Planning Comments - Key Issues

14. The key issues are: The impact of the proposal of the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties, the impact on the visual quality of the street scene and the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Street scene and Conservation Area

15. Members may recall resolving to grant planning permission for a previous scheme, similar to the current proposal, in November 2003 (approved March 2004). The

affordable cottage style dwelling remains unchanged apart from a minor revision to the layout of the parking area to its rear.

16. The principal changes are to the other two dwellings. The simple barn like design of those previously approved has been replaced with a more complex approach. Whilst this loses the simplicity of the earlier designs the approach using high quality materials and more innovative design will enhance the appearance of the Conservation Area in my view. The revised dwellings are similar in scale and height - plot 1 is approximately 8.5m high and plot 2 8.3m high as opposed to the approved scheme where both dwellings were approximately 8.3m high.
17. Through negotiation prior to the submission of the application the southern most element of the house on plot 2 has been reduced in height and bulk following officers concerns that this dwelling will be seen at the end of the driveway and should not appear too bulky. The detail on the gable end facing the High Street has also been simplified from that originally proposed. The footprints and orientation have changed somewhat from the earlier scheme but overall the dwellings are in the same positions on the site. I take the view that these dwellings will be seen set well back within the site - their apparent heights and impact will therefore be reduced and will not have any materially greater impact on the street scene and Conservation Area than those already approved. I welcome the use of good quality materials and the design approach.

Amenity

18. Plot 1
There are no windows at first floor in the north elevation. A bedroom window at first floor above the garage in the east elevation is a concern as views into the garden of the adjacent property, No. 18 would be possible. However, I see no reason why this window cannot be obscure glazed as there are further windows shown in the south (front) elevation of the garage to serve this bedroom which will not create any overlooking of any existing dwelling or either of the other two proposed dwellings. Other windows in the south elevation serve a link and an ensuite and will not cause any overlooking (provided the ensuite window is obscure glazed). Windows in the west elevation look out towards fields and will not cause any overlooking.
19. Plot 2
Windows in the first floor of the south and east elevations will afford oblique views into the rear garden of No. 22 High Street but there is good planting to prevent any material overlooking and further planting can be required. Windows in the west elevation look out onto fields and those in the north are to be obscure glazed.
20. The driveway is a good distance off the boundary with No. 22 and separated by planting, its use should not cause any material loss of amenity to the occupiers of this property.
21. Windows in the northern gable end of the cottage at the front of the site will have views into a window in the side of No. 18 but these will be very oblique and in my view will not cause any material loss of privacy. (The window position has not changed from the approved scheme).

Car parking

22. There is sufficient space on site for two cars to park and turn for each dwelling so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear.

Hedge on frontage

23. It will be necessary to replant the hedge in order to achieve satisfactory visibility splays.

Recommendation

- A. A Section 106 Agreement be negotiated to ensure that the affordable dwelling is occupied only by qualifying persons and secured in perpetuity for that purpose; and
- B. Following the completion of the Section 106 agreement approval subject to the following conditions:
1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 5 years from the date of this permission.
(Reason - To ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development which have not been acted upon.)
 2. No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason - To ensure that visually the development accords with neighbouring buildings and to ensure that the development is not incongruous and does not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Policies SE5, HG10, EN30 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)
 3. No development shall commence until details of the surface water drainage and foul sewage disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason - To ensure satisfactory drainage of the site and to ensure the satisfactory disposal of foul sewage from the site in accordance with Policies CS2 and CS3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)
 4. No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used for hard surfaced areas within the site including roads, driveways and car parking areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason - To ensure that the development enhances the character of the area in accordance with Policies HG10, EN30 and EN31 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)
 5. No further windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted in the first floor of the north or south elevations of 'Plot 1'. The north, east or south elevations of 'Plot 2' or in the north or south elevations of the 'Cottage', hereby permitted, unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf.
(Reason - To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of adjoining properties in accordance with Policies SE5 and HG10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)
 6. No development shall commence until details of finished floor levels of the buildings in relation to ground levels have been submitted to and approved in

writing by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To ensure that the height of the buildings is well related to ground levels and is not obtrusive in accordance with the requirements of Policies SE5, HG10, EN30 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)

7. Details of the treatment of all site boundaries, including internal site boundaries, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the work completed in accordance with the approved details before the buildings are occupied or the development is completed, whichever is the sooner.
(Reason - To protect the amenities of the adjoining properties and to ensure that the appearance of the site does not detract from the character of the area, in accordance with the requirements of Policies SE5, EN31 and HG10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)
8. No development shall commence until details of the proposed windows and doors have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the windows and doors shall be of timber construction and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason - To ensure that the development enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.)
9. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development.
(Reason - To enhance the quality of the development and to assimilate it within the area in accordance with the requirements of Policies SE5, EN5, EN31 and HG10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)
10. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.
(Reason - To enhance the quality of the development and to assimilate it within the area in accordance with the requirements of Policies SE5, EN5, EN31 and HG10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)
11. No development shall take place within the site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority. (Developers will wish to ensure that in drawing up a scheme, the timetable for the investigation is included within the details of the agreed scheme.)
(Reason - To secure the provision of archaeological excavation and the subsequent recording of the remains in accordance with Policy EN15 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)
12. The use shall not commence until space has been laid out within the site (in accordance with plan No. 04013-03RevA) for the parking and turning of cars and

that area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking and turning of vehicles.

(Reason - To ensure adequate space is provided and thereafter maintained on site for the parking of vehicles and in accordance with Policy TP1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)

13. Prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings, hereby permitted, a 1.8m wide footway shall be provided along the entire frontage of the site.
(Reason - In the interest of highway safety.)
14. Visibility splays shall be provided on either side of the junction of the proposed access road with the public highway. The minimum dimensions to provide the required splay lines shall be 2.4m measured along the centre line of the proposed access road from its junction with the channel line of the public highway, and 43.0m. to the north and 70.0m to the south measured along the channel line of the public highway from the centre line of the proposed access road.
(Reason - In the interest of highway safety.)
15. Visibility splays shall be provided on both sides of the access and shall be maintained free from any obstruction over a height of 600mm within an area of 2.0m x 2.0m measured from and along respectively the back of the footway.
(Reason - In the interests of highway safety.)
16. No development shall take place until details of measures for bat mitigation and conservation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These measures should include:
 - a) Survey of the immediate grounds specifically for bats in order to ascertain information on any bats species present (surveys should be undertaken at an appropriate time of year and by a suitably experienced professional.)
 - b) Inspection of existing buildings on site within one month prior to their demolition or alteration to determine presence or absence of roosting or hibernating bats;
 - c) No building containing bats shall be demolished until the bats have been safely excluded using such measures as have been previously submitted to and approved by the Council; and
 - d) Provision prior to demolition or alteration of existing buildings and the commencement of development, of a new bat roost/Hibernacula constructed to a design and in a location previously approved by the Council.

(Reason - In the interests of the protection of protected species in accordance with the requirements of Policy EN13 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)

Informatives

EA Standing advice.

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:

- **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3** (Sustainable design in built development) and P7/6 (Historic Built Environment);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: SE5** (List of Infill Villages),
 - **HG10** (Housing Mix and Design) and EN30 (Development in Conservation Areas)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
- Overdevelopment of the site.
 - Visual impact.

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

- Planning application files reference S/2582/04/F and S/1824/02/F
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

Contact Officer: Nigel Blazeby - Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713256

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/2517/04/F - Meldreth

Erection of House and Garage Following Part Demolition of Existing Dwelling, Land at 94-96 North End, Meldreth for Mr and Mrs Prove

Recommendation: Approval
Date for Determination: 7th February 2005

Site and Proposal

1. 94-96 North End is within the village framework and is outside of the Conservation Area, the site is located in the most northeasterly corner of Meldreth. The plot is approximately 0.16 ha in size and the majority of its garden curtilage sits outside of the village framework. Part of the new build of the proposed dwelling is located outside of the village framework; the new location of the proposed dwelling is marginally closer to the road and deeper in depth than that of the existing house.
2. The garden, of which all is laid to lawn, except the small vegetable patch next to the southeast boundary is well screened. The views onto the countryside are hidden by tall leylandii on the southeast boundary.
3. The full planning application received 13th December 2004, proposes the erection of a house and garage following part demolition of the existing dwelling.

Planning History

4. **S/2152/04** – Part demolition, alteration and extension. This proposal has been approved and proposes a separate dwelling consisting of 2 double bedrooms, open plan kitchen and living accommodation with 2 off road parking spaces.
5. **S/0074/90** – Extension. Approved.
6. **S/1832/81** – Extension. Approved
7. **S/0021/77** – Alterations, Extension and conversion of Chapel to dwelling house. Approved.

Planning Policy

8. **Local Plan Policy HG10 – Housing mix and design.**
Residential developments will be required to contain a mix of units providing accommodation in a range of types, sizes (including 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings) and affordability, making the best use of the site and promoting a sense of community which reflects local needs.

The design and layout of schemes should be informed by the wider character and context of the local townscape and landscape. Schemes should also achieve high quality design and distinctiveness, avoiding inflexible standards and promoting

energy efficiency. The District Council will support the preparation of Village Design Statements to secure these aims.

8. **SE4 “Group Villages”** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) states in part that redevelopment will be permitted within the village frameworks of Group Villages provided that the retention of the site in its present form is not essential to the character of the village.
9. **SE8 “Village Frameworks”** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states in part, there will be a general presumption in favour of residential development within village frameworks
10. **Policy P1/3 “Sustainable Design in Built Development”** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment and details aspects of design to be considered.

Consultation

11. **Meldreth Parish Council** recommends refusal.
“Meldreth Parish Council is not in favour of this application as the proposed building is not in character with the village street scape. Anglian Water owns the piped ditch along side the property and they should be kept informed of any application”
12. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** raises no objections in principle although does express concerns about potential noise disturbance to residents during the construction period. As such, it is recommended that a condition restricting hours of use of power-operated machinery be applied to any planning consent. As an informative it has been requested that the applicant is aware that a Demolition Notice is required before the existing property is demolished.
13. **Anglian Water** has been notified on the request of the Parish Council. Nothing has been received to date and the application was not requested by it for comment.

Representation

14. None received

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The key issues are the impact of the development on its surroundings in terms of design and character and its affect on the street scene.

16. **Street Scene**

The existing dwelling house is currently a mixture of brick, concrete, timber, tile and slate. There are various different styles of window ranging from bay, dormer, high level and roof lights. The house has had numerous additions and the conversion of the chapel into living accommodation has meant that roof ridges are also largely varied. The existing house does not have one definite “style” to it but an array of different designs that make the house look like three different properties combined.

17. The existing street scene has various different property designs. The surrounding properties that are in line with that of No. 94-96, those to the northeast and south west of the site vary from brick to render, tiled, slate and thatched. There are some

newly built properties northeast of the site on the opposite side of North Road; these are smooth rendered and slate roofed. Opposite the proposal site, there have been numerous properties built behind the existing building lines of North End. These materials and designs are also very varied, the use of materials range from light coloured brick, red tiled roofing, dormer windows and a mixture of chalet style housing, bungalows and two storey dwellings. There is no definite uniform within the street scene.

18. The proposed dwelling house is a 7.2 metre property combining brick, timber cladding and a mock Tudor wood and render element to the gable ends. The materials are to be agreed on the planning application but these can be conditioned accordingly. The proposal introduces dormer windows prominent in the street scene.
19. Surrounding properties with dormer windows are set back from the road, although not unfamiliar in the vicinity. It has been discussed at delegation that the dormer windows over the garage on the northeast facing elevation could be reduced from two to one, lessening the number of dormers in the street scene. When discussed with the agent I was informed that this minor amendment to the proposal would adversely affect the symmetry of the most easterly facing elevation, although willing to make adjustments if necessary.
20. Approaching the site from the southwest has minimal changes. The existing converted chapel is in line with the proposed building line for the garage and remains mostly unseen.
21. I am of the view that the proposed dwelling house would not adversely harm the street scene; the materials would be similar to that of the existing house. The use of tile, wood and render is already apparent in the existing property and that of the neighbouring properties.
22. The new dwelling would replace a dwelling of no particular architectural merit and would not adversely affect the street scene

Recommendation

23. Approve
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 5 years from the date of this permission.
(Reason - To ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development which have not been acted upon.)
 2. Sc5a – No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used for the external walls and roof have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason – To ensure that visually the development accords with neighbouring buildings and is in accordance with the requirements of Policy HG10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004)
 3. Sc60 – Details of the treatment of all site boundaries shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the work completed in accordance with the approved details before the building is occupied or the development is completed, whichever is the sooner.

(Reason – To ensure that the appearance of the site does not detract from the character of the area and is in accordance with the requirements of Policy HG10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004)

4. Sc5f – No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used for hard surfaced areas within the site including roads, driveways and car parking areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason – To ensure that the development enhances the character of the area and is in accordance with the requirements of Policy HG10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004)
5. The first floor windows in the southwest elevation of the building, hereby permitted, shall be fitted and permanently maintained with obscured glass.
(Reason – To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of the adjoining property and is in accordance with the requirements of Policy HG10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004)
6. No development shall commence until details of the surface water drainage and foul sewage disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason – To ensure satisfactory drainage of the site and to ensure the satisfactory disposal of foul sewage from the site in accordance with Policies CS2 and CS3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)
7. The use shall not commence until space has been laid out within the site (in accordance with plan No.DW/P01 Rev A) for the parking and turning of cars and that area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking and turning of vehicles.
(Reason – To ensure adequate space is provided and thereafter maintained on site for the parking of vehicles and in accordance with Policy TP1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)

Informatives

1. Should driven pile foundations be proposed, then before works commence, a statement of the method for construction of these foundations shall be submitted and agreed by the District Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.
2. During demolition and construction there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site except with the prior permission of the Environmental Health Officer in accordance with best practice and existing waste management legislation.

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3**
(Sustainable design in built development)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**

- **SE4** (Group Villages)
 - **HG10** (Housing Mix and Design)
 - **SE8** (Village Frameworks)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
- Visual impact on the locality

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

- Planning Application S/2517/04/F
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

Contact Officer: Saffron Garner – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713162

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/2595/04/F - Croxton
Extension at 15 High Street for Mr and Mrs B. Sertic**

Recommendation: Approval

Members will visit this site on 28 February 2005.

Conservation Area

Site and Proposal

1. No. 15 High Street is a two-storey brick Victorian dwelling situated on the eastern side of High Street, Croxton within the Croxton Conservation Area. There are no previous extensions to the dwelling. To the east of the site is a garden of Special Historic Interest. The rear garden contains two large trees, with a 2.8m high hedge running along the northern and southern property boundary.
2. Along the rear elevation of the adjacent property to the north, Elmwood House, is a patio setback approximately 1.5m from the common property boundary with No. 15.
3. The full application, received on 23 December 2004, proposes the erection of a part two-storey and part single-storey rear extension with side dormer and velux roof lights and a single storey side extension. The roughly 'L' shaped extension measures up to 7.6m in length and 10.5m in width. The side extension is setback 6.5m from the front elevation of the dwelling. The extension is to be used as a porch, lobby/coats cupboard, TV room, dining area and lounge at ground level and a study area /sleeping gallery and bathroom at first-floor level.
4. The application was amended by plans franked 14 February 2005, which modified the design of the proposed rear extension, to delete the northernmost projection.

Planning History

5. No relevant planning history.

Planning Policy

6. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("The County Structure Plan") requires a high standard of design for all new development that responds to the local character of the built environment.
7. **Policy P7/6** of the County Structure Plan states that Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
8. **Policy HG12** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ("The Local Plan") sets out the requirements that must be met in order for proposals to extend or alter dwellings within village frameworks to be considered for approval. This policy states

that proposals which would seriously harm the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of light or privacy, being unduly overbearing in terms of its mass, or would adversely affect surrounding properties by virtue of its design, layout, location or materials will not be permitted.

9. **Policy EN30** of the Local Plan states that proposals in conservation areas will be expected to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the area, especially in terms of their scale, massing, roof materials and wall materials. Schemes which do not specify traditional local materials or details that do not fit comfortably into their context will not be permitted.
10. **Policy EN5** of the Local Plan states that the District Council will require trees, hedges and woodland and other natural features to be retained wherever possible in proposals for new development.
11. **Policy SE9** of the Local Plan states that development on the village edges should be designed and landscaped to minimise the impact of development on the countryside.

Consultation

12. **Parish Council** - In response to the original application, have recommended the refusal of the application. They have commented that the extension is:

“too large and out of character for a Victorian cottage within a conservation area. The proposal would harm seriously the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of privacy and light, particularly the dwelling to the north. Branches would need to be removed from a Hornbeam tree with a preservation order.”

Comments regarding the amended application will be verbally reported.
13. **Conservation Manager** - No objection to amended application, subject to the agreement of Council's Trees and Landscape Officer, and the imposition of several conditions of consent. The officer has provided the following comments to the original application:

“I had some pre-application discussions with the architect on this scheme. The scheme is for a relatively large extension, but the plot is relatively substantial and the extended dwelling will be proportionate to the site.

The design is of some interest, employing a contemporary solution with extensive glazing to the rear, but a more restrained, traditional approach on the elevations visible from High Street. The success or otherwise of this approach will be in the quality of the detailing, and in particular the treatment of the glass curtain wall. A similar approach to the extension in a conservation area was employed in Little Abington. That project was very successfully executed and received an RIBA award. I am satisfied that this scheme will not unduly impact on the setting of the Conservation Area and, if correctly detailed, the design could be of some merit..”
14. **Trees and Landscape Officer** - No objection to original application. The apex of the footprint nearest to the mature Hornbeam will be 6.5m. This is acceptable, as is the 6.5m clearance afforded to the poor quality Elm. Conditions for tree protection should be included in any planning permission.
15. **English Heritage** - No comment

Representations

16. Letter of concern received from adjacent property, Elmwood House, which has raised the following points of concern to the original and amended application:

- Loss of light and sunlight to rear patio/BBQ area;
- Loss of light to lounge and hall at rear of property;
- Overlooking of the patio and loss of privacy;
- Objection to the depth of the two-storey rear extension adjacent their property boundary; and
- Concern about noise and disruption during construction.

The occupants of this house have also commented that the amendment does not reduce the impact on the property and they are seeking some assurance and input into the removal and reduction of existing trees in the applicant's rear garden (including the pruning of the mature Hornbeam), to improve daylight/sunshine into their garden.

Representations by Agent

17. The agent has provided the following information in support of their application:

- The neighbours patio area is already partially shaded by the existing boundary hedge and trees in the rear garden of the applicant's property;
- The proposed extension will not significantly increase the overshadowing of the patio on the adjacent property, above that currently experienced for the majority of the year;
- The applicant is intending to request the removal of the poor specimen Elm tree on the site, to reduce the direct overshadowing of the adjoining property's patio area; and
- The footprint of the extension has been carefully calculated to minimise root disturbance.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

18. The key issues for consideration in the assessment of this application are impact on conservation area, impact on neighbour amenity and impact on trees.

Impact on Conservation Area

19. Council's Conservation Manager has expressed the view that the proposed extension will not unduly impact upon the character and appearance of the Croxton Conservation Area. The proposed design and materials for the extension are considered acceptable, subject to recommended conditions of consent. In that respect, consideration has been given to the statutory requirements in respect of conservation areas, required under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (c.9).

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

20. The proposed rear extension is setback a minimum of 1.2m from the side property boundary with Elmwood House and some 3.0m from the dwelling itself. Along the common property boundary is 2.8m high hedge situated in front of an approximately 1.8m close-boarded timber fence. To the rear of the adjacent property, Elmwood

House is an outdoor patio area measuring some 4m x 2.5m. At the southern edge of this patio is a visual screen some 1.8m in height.

21. I am of the view that the proposed extension will not result in an undue loss of sunlight or daylight to either rooms along the rear elevation of Elmwood House or the outdoor patio, due to its position and setback, the extent of existing overshadowing of the rear patio area for the majority of the year by the existing boundary features, visual screen on the patio and existing tall trees on the applicant's property; in addition to the lower ground levels of the proposed site.
22. The setback of the extension from Elmwood House, in addition to the rear gable design of the proposed extension with a relatively low eaves height of 3.5m, is considered to prevent the rear extension from appearing unduly dominant or overbearing when viewed from the rear patio area of the adjacent property. The proposed chimney breast will be largely screened from view, from rooms within the adjacent dwelling. The principle outlook of this dwelling is to the rear.
23. The proposed extension has been designed to prevent an undue loss of privacy to adjacent dwellings. The proposed dormer window on the northern elevation is to serve a bathroom and will face a blank side elevation of Elmwood House. The proposed velux windows on both the north and south elevations are positioned approximately 1.7m above the first floor ground level of the extension, and will prevent the overlooking of the adjacent rear gardens when standing up in the first floor study area/sleeping gallery. The approximately 2.8m high hedge along both side property boundaries will also protect the privacy of the rear gardens of adjacent properties.
24. It is noted that the insertion of two new windows and the enlargement of an existing window in the existing northern elevation of the dwelling does not require planning permission.

Impact on Trees

25. Council's Trees and Landscape Officer has confirmed that the proposal will not seriously harm the mature Hornbeam tree on the site. I am of the view that recommended conditions of consent, in addition to the protection afforded to this tree by virtue of its siting within a Conservation Area, will adequately protect this tree. The removal and/or pruning of existing trees on the site would be the subject of a separate application.

Recommendation

26. Approve as amended by Drawing Numbers Artek/Sertic/010A, Artek/Sertic/011A, Artek/Sertic/020A and Artek/Sertic/021A franked 14 February 2005.

Conditions of Consent

1. Standard Condition A - Time limited permission (Reason A).
2. Sc5a - Brick and slate samples to be used on the external elevations of the extension, hereby permitted, to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason: To ensure detailing appropriate to the Croxton Conservation Area.)

3. SC5a - Precise details of the dormer window on northern elevation (including materials) to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason: To ensure detailing appropriate to the Croxton Conservation Area.)
4. The window frame of the dormer window on the northern elevation, hereby permitted, shall be permanently maintained in timber.
(Reason: To ensuring detailing appropriate to the Croxton Conservation Area.)
5. SC5a - precise details of rooflights (including size and type) to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason: To ensure detailing appropriate to the Croxton Conservation Area.)
6. SC5a - Precise details of glazed curtain wall on east elevation and glazing on south elevation, including the submission of a sample of glass, to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason: To ensure detailing appropriate to the Croxton Conservation Area.)
7. SC22 - No windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted in the northern or southern elevation at first floor level in the extension, hereby permitted, unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf.
(Reason: To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of the adjoining properties.)
8. SC56 - No demolition, site clearance or building operations shall commence until chestnut pale fencing (or other type of fencing approved by the Local Planning Authority) of a height not less than 1.3m has been erected around the mature Hornbeam tree positioned adjacent the southern property boundary, at a radius from the trunk of not less than 3.6m (12 ft). Such fencing shall be maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority during the course of the development operations. In the event that this tree is removed without consent, is dying or has become severely damaged or seriously diseased during the period of development operations, it shall be replaced in the next planting season with a tree of such size and species as shall have been previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason: To protect the mature Hornbeam tree which is to retained on the site, in order to enhance the development and the visual amenities of the Croxton Conservation Area.)
9. SC26 - during the period of construction, no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays), unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions.
(Reason: To minimise noise disturbance to adjoining residents.)

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:**

P1/3 (Sustainable design in built development) and
P7/6 (Historic Built Environment)

- **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
HG12 (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks)
EN30 (Development in/adjacent to Conservation Areas)
SE9 (Village Edges) and
EN5 (Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows)

2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:

- Residential amenity including loss of light, overlooking and noise disturbance issues
- Impact upon character and appearance of Conservation Area
- Visual impact on the locality
- Impact upon trees

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

- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003;
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004; and
- Planning File Ref: S/2595/04/F

Contact Officer: Allison Tindale - Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713159

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/1164/04/F - Comberton
Erection of Dwelling and Garden/Summer House
at Land to the Rear of 4 and 8 West Street, for Mr B Obank**

**Recommendation: Approval
Date for determination: 30th July 2004**

Members will visit the site on Monday 28th February 2005.

Introduction

1. Members considered this application at the meeting of the D&CC Committee on 6th October 2004. My report is attached at **Appendix 1**. Members resolved to grant delegated powers to officers either to approve or refuse the application, in order to allow me to continue discussions with the applicant concerning means of access to the site.

Subsequent Developments

2. The Highway Authority has indicated that it has concerns about the use of the existing access onto the B1046 West Street by a third dwelling. The HA's concern would be addressed, however, if a visibility splay of 2.4m x 64m were to be provided in the westerly direction.
3. The applicant has provided drawings, received 4th and 31st January, to demonstrate the provision of a 2.4m x 64m visibility splay in a westerly direction from the junction. This will entail the removal of the existing hedgerow along the frontage of the adjoining dwelling at No.8 West Street (a property that is within the applicant's ownership/control) for the full length of 23 metres. The applicant has indicated that he intends to replant the hedge set 1.0m further back, so as to maintain the visibility splay area, and to retain existing trees.

Planning History

4. In respect of the adjoining dwelling at 8 West Street, planning permission for conversion of the former barn to a dwelling was granted 28th August 2001 - **S/0754/01/F**. Condition 6 required details of landscaping to be submitted for approval, and condition 7 required that any plants removed within five years of the completion of the development to be replaced with others of similar size and species. The landscaping scheme approved 31st October 2001, showed the existing frontage hedge to be retained.

Planning Policy

5. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:

P8/1 (Sustainable Transport - Links between Land Use and Transport) - LPA's should ensure that new development provides appropriate access from the highway network that does not compromise safety.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:

Policy EN5 (Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows): the District Council will require trees, hedges and woodland and other natural features to be retained wherever possible in proposals for new development.

Consultations

6. **Comberton Parish Council:** recommends refusal. The PC comments that the hedge is set back from the road and does not affect the driver's visibility if they approach the road with caution and stop to look - higher speed entrance and exit should not be encouraged or facilitated. The PC asks that if this supposed improvement to visibility is genuinely required would it not have been brought up during the first planning applications? The proposed replanting will upset the hedge line for surrounding properties and in any case the same effect can be achieved by simply trimming the hedge over an equivalent distance. This proposal appears to the PC to be yet another step towards the development of a mini-estate on this site by the back door.
7. **Highway Authority:** has commented that the existing access comprises very limited visibility with only approximately 44m to the west. Vehicle speed along West Street is subject to a 30 mph speed limit and may be travelling at around this speed at this point. Unless visibility is improved, the application should be refused. The provision of 64m visibility is acceptable so long that this is provided prior to the commencement of construction on the site.
8. **Council's Landscape Design Officer:** The LDO comments that the hedge is predominately thorn with ivy, with trees set back approximately 1m. Whilst not ideal, the hedge could be replanted along the tree line without long-term detriment to the street scene.

Representations

9. **The applicant:** has responded to the comments of the Parish Council. He disagrees that the proposed improvement to the visibility splay will encourage a higher speed entrance or exit, since this line of argument suggests that the further a driver is able to see along a road the greater is the potential for accidents. The new hedge will not "upset the hedge line". He points out that the revised hedge line is actually at a similar distance from the kerb line as the hedgerow fronting the adjoining dwelling at 2 West Street. Finally, he emphasises that his only reason for seeking to replace the hedge is as a consequence of the Highway Authority's requirements, and not to facilitate further development. The hedge will be planted in accordance with the Council's requirements and will be from stock that is between 1.0m and 1.5m high.
10. The occupier of an adjoining dwelling has indicated concern about the improvement to the visibility splay. Whilst he has no objection in principle to the construction of the proposed dwelling he is very concerned that the improved visibility splay may cause a precedent in allowing future development on the remaining site. He asks whether the Council can offer any assurance that further development will not be allowed.

Planning Comments

Removal of hedgerow

11. The existing hedge fronting 8 West Street is required to be retained by virtue of condition 7 of S/0754/01/F, unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority. The hedge falls within the conservation area and Policy EN5 encourages the retention of such features in new development. Set against the amenity considerations, the Highway Authority's requirements cannot be met without removing this length of hedgerow. The Landscape Design Officer has indicated that in the longer term there will be no loss of amenity to this frontage and for this reason I recommend that the application should be supported as amended by plans showing provision of the improved visibility splay to the west.

Recommendation

1. Approval as amended by drawings received 4th January and 31st January 2005, subject to the conditions, informatives and reasons as set out in my report of 6th October 2004 and the following additional condition:
2. Highway visibility splays to be provided prior to the commencement of development, and thereafter maintained clear of obstruction. (R. In the interests of highway safety)

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning files Ref. S/1164/04/F, S/0754/01/F

Contact Officer: Ray McMurray - Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713259

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

**S/2611/04/F - Madingley
Erection of Avian Laboratory, at
University of Cambridge Sub-Department of Animal Behaviour, High Street for
The Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.**

**Determination Date: 18th February 2005
Recommendation: Approval**

Conservation Area**Site and Proposal**

1. The site lies outside the village framework and in the countryside. The Cambridge Green Belt boundary cuts across the north eastern corner of the site - undefined on the ground.
2. The site is used by the University of Cambridge as a research establishment.
3. Mature trees surround the site on the northern, eastern and southern boundaries apart from a single gap on the northern boundary.
4. A cricket ground lies to the south of the site.
5. The full application, received on 24th December 2004, proposes the replacement of an existing primate house with a single storey building approximately 6.7m in height with floor area of approximately 270m² with, in addition, a further 350m² of attached aviaries.
6. The purpose of the building is to research in the field of avian evolutionary studies and follows the need to replace an existing avian research laboratory which is unsafe.
7. Amended plans have been received revising details of materials.

Planning History

8. In February 2004 planning permission was granted for the retention of the portakabin.
9. In November 2002 conservation area consent was granted for the total demolition of the existing primate building.
10. In August 2000 planning permission was granted for a controlled environment unit.
11. In July 1998 planning permission was granted for extensions to the research building.
12. In December 1995 planning permission was granted for a changing and shower unit close to the existing primate building.

13. In November 1993 conservation area consent was granted for the total demolition of eleven outbuildings.
14. In January 1990 planning permission was granted for the siting of a portakabin.
15. In January 1981 planning permission was granted for the erection of the primate building.
16. In October 1977 planning permission was granted for the erection of a building for the keeping of animals.

Planning Policy

17. Policy EM4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (the Local Plan) states: Proposals for the development of new research establishments (and for the expansion of existing research establishments) will normally be permitted if it can be demonstrated that:
 - (a) Such development is intended to provide accommodation for organisations whose primary purpose is to research or investigate ideas, theories and concepts and/or to design and develop instruments, processes or products, up to and including production for testing, but excluding manufacture; and
 - (b) That the organisations are required in the national interest to be located close to existing major establishments in related fields (such as the universities, the teaching hospital or private research establishments) in order to share staff, equipment or data, or to undertake joint collaborative working for the purposes specified in (a) above.

Where there is any conflict between such proposals and other policies and proposals in the development plan this must be outweighed by evidence of need in the national interest as referred to above.

Development under this policy will be regulated by way of a condition(s) or, where appropriate, a planning obligation, to restrict the future occupation and use of the premises for the purposes specified.

18. **Policy GB2 of the Local Plan** details the criteria attached to the protection of the Green Belt from inappropriate development.
19. Policy P1/2 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states (in part): "Development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location".
20. Planning Policy Statement No 7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas states (in part): New building development in the open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans, should be strictly controlled; the Government's overall aim is to protect the countryside for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and so it may be enjoyed by all... Priority should be given to the re-use of previously-developed ('brownfield') sites... All development in rural areas should be well-designed and inclusive, in keeping and scale with its location, and sensitive to the character of the countryside and local distinctiveness.

Consultation

21. **Madingley Parish Council**

The Parish Council has made no recommendation.

22. **Conservation Manager**

Observations:

The building will replace an existing single storey brick structure on the site (for which CAC has already been granted Ref: S/1983/02/CAC). This replacement structure has a significantly larger footprint than the building it replaces. In addition, although it is also single storey, it is significantly higher than the building it replaces.

The site is part of a complex of buildings and is well screened from the village and the adjacent fields by mature trees and hedgerows. However, it is my opinion that the gable of the new building will be visible from the footpath leading to the Cricket Ground to the south of the site.

The new building is a functional box with very little articulation. The exterior is to be clad in untreated sawn Red Cedar, which will weather down to a silver grey. The gables of the new building would appear to be clad in zinc, matching the standing seam roof. It would be preferable for the Cedar cladding to continue up into the gables, to avoid banding on the elevations and keep a clean, uncluttered form. The lower portion of the south gable appears to be clad in brickwork, in contrast to the rest of the building. Again there does not appear to be any functional reason for this change in materials and I would prefer to see the Cedar cladding continued down to the brick plinth as elsewhere on the building.

Recommendation:

No objection subject to revisions to the exterior materials outlined above.

23. **Conservation Manager (in response to the amended plan)**

"I now accept that the zinc cladding to the apex of the gables is an integral part of the design that will not impact unduly on the setting of the conservation area (the zinc colour will tend to blend with the roof/sky and help reduce the apparent bulk). However, I am keen to avoid the banding that would result from retaining the brick panel at low level on the south gable. The architect has agreed to revise the elevation to remove this brick panel, and on that basis I have no further objections to this application."

24. **Chief Environmental Health Officer**

No objections subject to a condition requiring details of the location and type of any power driven plant or equipment.

25. **Environment Agency**

No objections subject to conditions to address surface water and pollution control issues.

26. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service**

Additional water supplies for firefighting are not required.

27. **Representations**

None

Planning Comments - Key Issues

28. The key issues are the impact of the site on its surroundings, impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the justification for new build in the countryside.

Impact on surroundings and Conservation Area

29. The site is surrounded by tall mature trees and is not readily visible from the surrounding countryside. However the building would be approximately 6.7m high and views may be gained from the footpath leading to the Cricket Ground to the south of the site.
30. The Conservation Manager has requested changes to the detailing. The University has responded with a revised plan which has satisfied the concern regarding the impact on the Conservation Area. I therefore consider that the proposal will not have a negative impact on the surrounding countryside or the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Justification

31. The application, as submitted, contained no information to justify the proposal. On 10th February a letter was received that states the following:
- “1. A new building to house various species of birds in conditions that approximate to their natural conditions is proposed for the Department of Zoology’s Sub-Department of Animal Behaviour at Madingley. The existing avian research laboratories were declared unsafe by the University’s Health and Safety Division in 2002, due to land subsidence and structural insecurity of asbestos roofing, and surveys have demonstrated that a replacement building is the most cost-effective option. Research in the field of avian evolutionary studies has expanded in the Departments of Zoology and Experimental Psychology. The laboratory-based research at the Avian Laboratory is carried out under Home Office licence and comprises non-invasive investigations into how conflicts of interest within the family group are resolved. This research enhances the theoretical modelling and fieldwork studies of internationally recognized groups both in the Department of Zoology and in cognate disciplines in the School of Biological Sciences. The new facilities will enable and promote multidisciplinary collaborations between these complementary approaches to evolutionary biology, which is a core theme underlying the Department of Zoology’s research strategy. The integrative biology theme of this research is a strategic priority area of the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council.
2. The project has been approved by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), for support from the Science Research Investment Fund (SRIF) round 2 funding programme.
3. The scheme is consistent with the needs of the Department’s development plan and will be constructed in one phase, in the location shown in the plan below, after the demolition of a vacant and redundant building of total area 109 sq.m. The proposed new building will provide a total area of 251 sq.m.”
32. In addition to the above, the University has stated that it considers the site to be ‘brown field’ and it was not its intention to encroach into the Green Belt with the building but to construct it on that part of the site outside of the Green Belt.
33. It would appear that a small part of the structure will cross over the Green Belt boundary. However, the boundary is arbitrary here and the extent to which the building falls within the Green Belt is really dependent on the accuracy of the drawing

of the Green Belt boundary. I do not consider that this marginal incursion will affect the openness of the Green Belt or compromise any of the other Green Belt criteria.

34. In my opinion this is a brown field site and although it falls outside of the village framework it is well screened and clearly reads with the rest of this University research establishment and not with the surrounding open countryside. There is a building on site already and although the proposal is for a substantially larger building I do not consider it will harm the surrounding countryside and Green Belt or the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Recommendation

35. Subject to the application being referred to the Secretary of State for consideration approval as amended by letter dated 14th February 2005 and plan no. F65 03/01 A 015 Rev D subject to the following conditions:
1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 5 years from the date of this permission.
(Reason - To ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development which would not have been acted upon.)
 2. No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used for the external walls and roof have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason - To ensure that visually the development accords with neighbouring buildings and is not incongruous in accordance with the requirements of Policies EM4 and GB2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 and Policy P1/2 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003).
 3. Details of the location and type of any power driven plant or equipment, including equipment for heating, ventilation and for the control or extraction of any odour, dust or fumes from the building but excluding office equipment and vehicles and the location of the outlet from the building of such plant or equipment, shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority before such plant or equipment is installed; the said plant or equipment shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and with any agreed noise restrictions.
(Reason - To protect the amenities of occupiers of nearby residential properties in accordance with the requirements of Policies EM4 and GB2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 and Policy P1/2 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003.)
 4. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.
(Reason - To prevent the increased risk of flooding and/or pollution of the water environment.)
 5. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control to the water environment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The

works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.

(Reason - To prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment.)

Reasons for Approval

1. Although the proposal has been considered as a Departure from the Development Plan, and particularly in regard to policies aimed at protecting the countryside, the Local Planning Authority considers very special circumstances exist which outweigh the harm by being located in the countryside:
 - **The replacement building sits within an existing research development site is well screened from the surrounding countryside and not located in an open area rendering it visually acceptable within the countryside;**
 - **The building is required for research which is nationally significant.**
2. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

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

- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Planning Policy Statement 7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
- Planning File Ref. S/2611/04/F

Contact Officer: Nigel Blazeby - Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713256

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/1299/03/F - Boxworth
Amendment to Planning Permission for Erection of House and Garage
Land Between Seagraves and 8 Farm Close for Hurst Holdings Ltd

Recommendation: Approval
Date for determination: Not applicable

Members will visit the site on Monday 28th February 2005.

Site and Proposal

1. The site lies on the southern fringe of the village. To the west there are new and converted buildings comprising Seagraves, which are clad in stained timber. On the frontage of Seagraves there is a 19th century single storey range with an attractive wall containing a contrasting brick string courses and pantile roof.
2. The approved main house is nearing completion. Work has not yet commenced on the approved 3-bay cart shed that is proposed to be sited forward of the house, with access from Seagraves. Between the garage position and the main road there is a small group of trees within the application site that provides some screening to the development.
3. The approved cart shed is of brick construction and pantile roof, with coloured string courses to match the adjacent single storey range. The applicant, by drawings received 6th January 2005, requests an amendment to the application by constructing a modular Finn Forest timber-framed cart shed in the same position but with shallower foundations so as not to disturb the roots of the nearby trees. The approved cart shed measures 11.5m long x 5.5m deep x 5.2m to ridge. The proposed cart shed measures 5.2m deep x 5.2m to ridge x length of either 8.4m (3-bay) or 11.1m (4-bay), as required. The proposed materials are treated timber boarding and slate roofing to match the existing house.

Planning History

4. **S/1299/03** - Erection of house and garage. Full permission granted 17th July 2003.

Planning Policy

5. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/3** (Sustainable Design in Built Development) of the requires a high standard of design and sustainability for all new development will be required which:

Minimises the need to travel and reduces car dependency by providing:

- Managed access for the private car and other motor vehicles.

Provides a sense of place which:

- Responds to the local character of the built environment;
- Is integrated with adjoining landscapes;
- Conserves important environmental assets of the site;
- Pays attention to the detail of forms, massing, textures, colours and landscaping.

Policy P8/5 (Provision of Parking) - parking standards for all new development will be expressed as maximum standards. Lower levels may be required where means of travel other than the private car are available.

6. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

Policy SE5 (Infill-Only Villages) requires development to be sympathetic to the historic interests, character and amenity of the locality.

Policy EN5 (Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows): the District Council will require trees, hedges and woodland and other natural features to be retained wherever possible in proposals for new development.

Policy TP1 (Planning for More Sustainable Travel) - car parking requirements will be restricted to the maximum levels set out in Appendix 7/1. (For dwellings, Appendix 7/1 gives a level of an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling, up to a maximum of two per 3 or more bedrooms in poorly accessible areas).

Consultations

7. **Boxworth Parish Meeting:** "We reject this proposal because we feel the original design with banded brick courses and pantiles provided a sympathetic consistency with the existing long, low roadside Seagraves building, a point made by the applicant himself in his 2nd June 2003 letter... The Village Planning sub-committee feel that this banded brick and pantile detail ... formed an important part of our acceptance of this building proposal. It may indeed be 'expedient and beneficial' to the developer at this time to substitute a custom-made cart shed, but we are obliged to think of the long term future of our village environment, already noted by Conservation as having several important frontages".
8. **Trees and Landscape Officer:** comments to be reported verbally.

Representations

9. Applicant: In support of his proposal, the applicant states that the timber construction will match the detailing of the boarding on the house. This will be particularly helpful in alleviating any potential problems with foundations in close vicinity of the trees, which he is keen to protect, and will also ensure that the cart shed and house are more sympathetic to each other. For the majority of the year the cart shed will be well screened from the High Street by the trees and shrubs anyway. This solution would be 'expedient and beneficial' for him. He is willing to be guided as to which of the 3-bay and the 4-bay version is preferable to Members.
10. In a letter dated 2nd June 2003 accompanying application S/1299/03/F, the agent at that time (not the current applicant) stated, "Along the frontage the existing trees would be retained and garaging provided in the form of an open cart shed that will screen the vehicle parking from the High Street. This building incorporates the brick

banding which is a feature of the existing barn adjacent to the High Street. In our view, the proposal would complement the existing Seagraves development and complete the courtyard environment around the site entrance”.

11. A nearby resident considers the original materials for the cart shed to be far preferable to a pre-fabricated timber building, the colour of bricks helping to screen this house (nearing completion) from the highway.

Planning Comments

Appearance

12. The main issue concerns the appearance and design of the cart shed. I note that the site is significantly screened by trees on the High Street frontage, and that the external materials will match those on the main house. I consider that the revised design and appearance of the cart shed is acceptable in this locality, which does not lie within a conservation area, and that the building will comply with policies P1/3 and SE5. I consider that the smaller 3-bay cart shed would be more appropriate in the context of policies P8/5 and TP1.

Recommendation

13. Subject to no objection being received from the Trees and Landscape Officer, Members are recommended to APPROVE the amendment dated 6th January 2005 for the provision of a timber-framed three-bay cart shed on the site previously consented pursuant to planning permission S/1299/03/F.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file ref. S/1299/03/F

Contact Officer: Ray McMurray - Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713259

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/2570/04/LB - Ickleton

**Internal & External Alterations for Conversion of Barn to 5 Bedroomed Dwelling
Incorporating 2 Storey Reconstruction of Adjacent Ruinous Outbuilding. New Flint
Garden Wall & Timber Gate Attached to Barn Linked to Proposed Garage Block &
Close-boarded Boundary Fence**

S/2571/04/F - Ickleton

**Extension and Conversion of Barn Into Dwelling and Erection of Boundary Fences and
Garden Wall**

Barn at Priory Farm, Back Lane for B F Contracts Ltd

**Recommendation: Approval
Date of Determination: 14th February 2005**

Conservation Area and Listed Building**Site and Proposal**

1. The application site is located on the north-west side of Back Lane and is occupied by a Grade II Listed timber barn sited within the village Conservation Area. The barn was formerly an outbuilding to Priory Farmhouse (No. 49 Abbey Street) and used for domestic storage purposes. To the north of the site are the rear gardens of properties fronting onto Abbey Street whilst to the south are two storey detached dwellings located within Southfield. Directly to south-west of the site is a detached render dwelling.
2. The planning and listed building applications, submitted on 20th December 2004 and amended on 7th February 2005, seek to extend and convert the barn in order to create a 2 storey 5-bedroom dwelling. The dwelling would face north-westwards with its rear elevation onto Back Lane. Openings would be added to all elevations of the barn and a two storey extension added to its front/north-west elevation. Vehicular access to the site would be via Back Lane. In addition, a 1.95 metre high brick and flint wall would be constructed between the barn and a new garage. (The garage does not form part of this application having been approved as part of an earlier scheme).

Planning History

3. **S/1086/03/LB and S/1087/03/F** – Planning permission and listed building consent granted to extend and convert the barn to a dwelling and to erect a garage/store and garden wall.
4. **S/1382/00/F and S/1383/00/LB** – Planning permission and listed building consent granted on land to the south-west of the site (formerly part of Priory Farm) for the erection of two houses and the conversion of agricultural buildings into two dwellings.

Planning Policy

5. The site lies inside the Ickleton village framework. Ickleton is identified within **Policy SE5** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 as an Infill-Only village. In such locations, Policy SE5 states that residential development will be restricted to no more than two dwellings comprising (amongst others) the redevelopment of an existing residential curtilage providing the site does not form an essential part of village character, and development is sympathetic to the historic interests, character, and amenities of the locality.
6. **Policy P1/3** of the County Structure Plan 2003 stresses the need for a high standard of design and a sense of place which corresponds to the local character of the built environment.
7. The barn is a Listed Building and the site lies within the village Conservation Area. **Policy P7/6** of the County Structure Plan 2003 requires development to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment, whilst **Policy EN30** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 requires new development in a Conservation Area to either preserve or enhance the character of the area.
8. **Policy EN20** of the Local Plan states that permission will be refused for extensions to Listed Buildings which would detract from the building in scale, form, massing or appearance. **Policy EN26** of the Local Plan stresses that the impact of extensions and alterations upon the fabric, character and setting of a Listed Building will be considered in judging applications for the change of use of Listed Buildings.

Consultation

9. **Ickleton Parish Council** objects to the application stating:

“The first floor windows in the north east elevation of the two storey extension overlook two neighbouring gardens, including a swimming pool and are a considerable intrusion of privacy. The original plans (S/1087/03/F) show a sloping roof on the north-east elevation with only one significant window; the Parish Council found these plans acceptable. The first floor windows on the south west elevation also overlook another neighbouring garden. The Parish Council feels that the design of the two storey new extension is not in keeping with a conservation area. It is too much like a house rather than the barn of which it is part. The sloping barn-like roof on the original plans were more in keeping and acceptable.”
10. **The Conservation Manager** states:

“The barn dates from the late 16th or early 17th century. It is a six bay structure with a single aisle to the southern side (to Back Lane). It is listed in its own right. The use of the barn associated with a farm has ceased to exist and it has become necessary to find an alternative new use. Given its location in close proximity to a number of residential units its conversion to a dwelling is the most compatible use for the locality. A conversion scheme was approved in 2003 which was considered to retain the special character of the building

The basic principles established on this scheme were:

 - Replacement of the corrugated roofing with natural slates;
 - Retention of the two large openings as glazed elements to the front (northern) elevation;

- Restricting the new openings to the Back Lane elevation to one small window under the eaves;
- Retention of two full height voids behind the two large glazed opening;
- A new two storey extension replacing a structure in this location;
- Parking in a freestanding cartlodge.

The current application has been required as the new proposals differ from this approved scheme. Amendments have been sought to address the following Conservation concerns – in addition to those of the Parish:

- The design of the extension;
- The materials employed;
- Giving clearer definition between the old and new elements;
- Fenestration design

The amendments have addressed these concerns. The design of the proposed extension is now considered acceptable. The scheme is considered to address the following issues:

- It retains two full height voids in the building;
- It restricts the number of new openings to Back Lane to one;
- The extension is asymmetric similar to the roof profile of the main barn. Whilst the ridge matches that of the main barn the roof slope has been designed to drop the eaves to give a subservience to this element;
- The corner of the new extension has been set in to define the line of the old barn;
- The use of render contrasts with the weather boarding to the main barn;
- The design of the windows has a been rationalised so that whilst the window sizes may vary they generally follow a tripart style;
- The scheme does not include a new porch which the original scheme did which is welcomed.

The amended scheme is considered to respect the special character of the barn and is supported in Conservation terms. A recording condition is not proposed on the suggested conditions set out below as this has been undertaken – works have commenced on site to repair the frame under the provisions of the previous consent.”

11. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** recommends that conditions are attached to any approval relating to the times during the construction period when power operated machinery shall not be operated and requiring a site contamination investigation and details of any necessary remedial works.

12. **The County Footpaths Officer** raises no objections in principle to the conversion of the building but expresses concern about the use of Back Lane, which is a public right of way, to access the site. Vehicular access from Abbey Street would be preferable. To access the site from Back Lane, the applicants would need to establish that they have lawful authority to do so.
13. The comments of the **Ramblers Association** will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.

Representations

14. Letters of objection have been received from two local residents, No. 7 Back Lane and No. 43 Abbey Street (Harlequin House). The main points raised are:
 - Four upstairs windows on the north east side elevation overlook the garden area of No. 43 Abbey Street. In the approved application, there were two upstairs windows on this side elevation and this was acceptable;
 - The first floor windows in the south-west side of the 2 storey extension would overlook No. 7 Back Lane.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The key issues in relation to this application are:
 - The impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
 - The impact of the development upon the character of the Listed Building;
 - Residential amenity;
 - Impact on the public footpath.
16. Under planning and listed building consent refs: S/1086/03/LB and S/1087/03/F, permission has been given for the extension and conversion of the barn to a dwelling and works have already commenced on site. The principle of converting the barn to residential use has therefore previously been established and consideration of the current application should focus solely on the impact of the alterations/extension now proposed on the character of the building and on the amenities of neighbours.
17. The previously approved scheme had a 6.4 metre deep two storey extension on its north-western side designed with an asymmetrical roof that dropped down to a single storey height eaves on its north-eastern side (ie – towards No. 43 Abbey Street's garden) but had a full two storey height eaves on the opposite side. There were no windows or rooflights in the north-eastern side of the extension although there were a bedroom window and high-level bathroom window in the main part of the north-east elevation. The approved two-storey extension had two first floor bedroom windows in its south-west side elevation facing towards No. 7 Back Lane.
18. The current application initially proposed the erection of a full two storey extension on its north-west side but this was considered by the Conservation Manager and Parish Council to be overly domestic in appearance and to detract from the character of the building. Amended plans have been submitted and these have addressed the

concerns of the Conservation Manager. The proposals are considered to respect the special character of the Listed Building and the Conservation Area in which it is located.

19. The two first floor windows in the north-east side of the extension have been removed within the amended plans thereby overcoming concerns about overlooking of the private garden/swimming pool area of No. 43 Abbey Street. Two bedroom windows would remain in the north-eastern elevation of the barn itself and I consider this to be acceptable given that the approved scheme shows two openings in this elevation.
20. With regards to the impact upon No. 7 Back Lane, the previously approved two storey extension had two first floor bedroom windows in its south west elevation. The extension now proposed is approximately 1 metre closer to No.7 Back Lane than the previous scheme. However, there is a distance of 28 metres between this extension and the front elevation of No. 7 (within which there are no principal windows to habitable rooms) and around 35 metres to No. 7's private garden area. Given the distance between the extension to the barn and No. 7 Back Lane, I do not consider the impact of the development upon the amenities of the occupiers of this property to be unduly harmful.
21. Finally, the County Footpaths Officer has expressed concern about the use of Back Lane to access the site. This access already serves two dwellings and has previously been approved as the means of access to the site under the previous planning permission. As such, it would not be reasonable to withhold planning consent on this basis although the points raised by the Footpaths Officer (most notably the need for the applicant to have lawful authority to use the footpath to access the site) should be added as informatives to any planning permission.

Recommendation

22. Approval of both the planning and listed building applications, as amended by drawings date stamped 7th February 2005:
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5a...and preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area);
 3. Sc60 – All site boundaries (Rc60....."character and appearance of the Conservation Area);
 4. Sc22 – No further windows etc....."at first floor level in the north west and north east elevations.... (Rc22);
 5. Para C3a & b – Turning and parking (Rc10 – Highway safety);
 6. Sc21 – Withdrawal of permitted development rights – Part 1, Classes A, B and C (Reason – To protect the appearance and character of the building and to ensure that alterations, additions or extensions, which would not otherwise require planning permission, do not harm the appearance and character of the Conservation Area);
 7. During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any

time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions. (Reason – To minimise noise disturbance to nearby residents);

8. Prior to the commencement of any development, an investigation to establish the nature and extent of any contamination of the site and any remedial works necessary to deal with contamination shall be undertaken and submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any necessary remedial work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the dwelling is first occupied. The investigation shall initially consist of a desktop study, which shall include details of the site history, development of a site conceptual model and a preliminary qualitative risk assessment. If any likelihood of contamination is indicated by the initial study, then a further detailed site assessment shall be carried out which shall include intrusive investigations and which shall fully characterise the nature, extent and severity of contamination. Recommendations for a remediation strategy and post-remediation validation testing shall also be included. (Reason – To minimise the effects of the development to nearby residents and to occupiers of the development).

Listed Building Conditions:

1. LBC 1 – Time Limit;
2. LBC 2 – Definition of consent – Amended plans received 4 February 2005;
3. LBC 3 – Full working drawings to be submitted for approval;
4. Detailed drawings of all the proposed new windows to be installed to the building, at a scale of at least 1:20 shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The proposed windows shall be of timber construction and without trickle vents. The details shall include cill and glazing bar details and any measures necessary to ensure the windows meet the Building Regulation fire safety requirements. The external surface finish of the windows shall be agreed as part of these details:
Reason - To ensure fenestration appropriate to this Listed Building:
5. LBC 19 – Weather boarding to have black finish;
6. LBC 20 – Details of finish to hard surface areas;
7. LBC 21 – Means of enclosure;
8. LBC 23 – All new and matching materials to be agreed on site;
9. LBC 25 – sample panel of brickwork to be prepared on site;
9. LBC28 – Details to be agreed of:
 - a) The position and details of all soil vent pipes;
 - b) The position and details including external colour finish of any external flues vents or ducting;
 - c) Internal joinery details of the new staircase;

- d) Details of all new internal and external doors including pattern and materials.
11. LBC 29 – Use of lime based renders, mortars and plasters;
12. LBC 32 – Details of new rainwater goods;
13. Details of the rooflights to be installed to the building shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The rooflights shall be of a conservation format and inserted with flush detail.
Reason - To safeguard the appearance of this Listed Building;
14. LBC34 – use of natural slate: sample to be submitted;
15. No part of the timber frame shall be sandblasted. If any cleaning is to be undertaken details of the system to be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
Reason - To protect the fabric of the Listed Building;
16. Replacements of main timbers or part members shall be in green oak of a similar size and section to the existing timbers unless another type of timber/detail is agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority
Reason - To ensure such works are in keeping with the existing frame;
17. Prior to the following works being carried out the following details shall be submitted for the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority:
- a) Insulation details for the walls and roof areas;
- b) Timber treatment measures:
- c) Damp proofing measures;
- d) The heating system(s) for the building.
Reason - To secure an acceptable form of development.

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
- **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:** P1/3 (Sustainable design in built development) and P7/6 (Historic Built Environment);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:** SE5 (Development in Infill-Only Villages), EN20 (Extensions to Listed Buildings), EN26 (The Conversion of Listed Buildings to New Uses) and EN30 (Development in/adjacent to Conservation Areas)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
- Impact upon character of Listed Building;

- Impact upon character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
- Residential amenity;
- Use of the footpath as vehicular access

General

1. During construction there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site except with the prior permission of the Environmental Health Officer in accordance with best practice and existing waste management legislation.
2. Should driven pile foundations be proposed, then before works commence, a statement of the method for construction of these foundations shall be submitted and agreed by the District Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.
3. A guidance document on procedures for dealing with potential land contamination can be obtained from this Authority's Environmental Health Department.
4. Public Footpath Ickleton 8 runs along Back Lane and must remain open and unobstructed at all times.
5. No building materials may be stored on and no contractors' vehicles parked on the footpath (it is an offence both at common law and under s137 of Highways Act 1980 to obstruct a public footpath).
6. No alteration to the surface of the footpath is permitted without the consent of Cambridgeshire County Council (it is an offence under s.1 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971 to damage the surface of a public right of way without legal authority).
7. The footpath should not be used for vehicular access to the site unless the applicant is satisfied that they have lawful authority to do so (it is an offence under Section 34 of the Road Traffic Act 1988, as amended by Section 7 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 to drive on to a public footpath without lawful authority).
8. Under Circular 2/93 of Annex D, the granting of planning permission gives no entitlement to obstruct a public right of way.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Application Refs: S/2570/04/LB and S/2571/04/F

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

Charmain Hawkins – Historic Buildings Officer
Telephone (01954) 713178

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S:	Director of Development Services	

S/2554/04/F - Little Shelford
Erection of Dwelling & Garage Following Demolition of Existing Dwelling at
40 High Street For Mr & Mrs D Munro

Recommendation: Approval

Conservation Area

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is a 0.24 hectare (0.59 acre) plot of land occupied by a detached brick and tile bungalow. The dwelling is set approximately 13 metres back from the frontage of the site which is bounded by a low hawthorn hedge. There are a number of trees on the site including two well-established horse chestnuts, one within the front garden and the other adjacent to the south-east boundary of the property. The existing point of vehicular access is in the north-western corner of the site. Beyond the plot to the north-west is a render and tile two storey dwelling whilst to the south-east is a substantial red brick dwelling.
2. The full application, submitted on 16th December 2004, seeks to erect a two storey dwelling on the site following the demolition of the existing bungalow. The replacement dwelling would be a six-bedroom red brick and clay plain tile property sited approximately 21 metres back from the frontage of the site. The main element of the property would be sited some 8 metres behind the line of the existing bungalow. A single detached garage would be constructed at the front of the property and a detached building, to be used as a study, would be constructed in the rear garden area. The dwelling would comprise both two storey and single storey elements with the main part of the dwelling standing approximately 7.8 metres high (2.5 metres high to eaves). The existing vehicular access would be closed off and a new point of access created in a central position. The density of the development equates to approximately 4 dwellings/hectare.

Planning History

3. **S/1159/04/F** – Members may recall that an application for the erection of a detached dwelling on the site was refused at the September Committee meeting due to the scale and design of the dwelling and its subsequent impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
4. **S/1160/04/CAC** – An application for the demolition of the existing bungalow has been approved.

Planning Policy

5. Little Shelford is identified within **Policy SE5** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 as an Infill-Only village. In such locations, Policy SE5 states that residential development will be restricted to no more than two dwellings comprising (amongst

others) the redevelopment of an existing residential curtilage providing the site does not form an essential part of village character, and development is sympathetic to the historic interests, character, and amenities of the locality.

6. **Policy P1/3** of the County Structure Plan 2003 stresses the need for a high standard of design and a sense of place which corresponds to the local character of the built environment.
7. The site lies within the village Conservation Area. **Policy P7/6** of the County Structure Plan 2003 requires development to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment, whilst **Policy EN30** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 requires new development in a Conservation Area to either preserve or enhance the character of the area.

Consultation

8. **Little Shelford Parish Council** objects to the application stating:

“The Parish Council feel that the reasons for the refusal for the previous application dated 18.5.04 for a dwelling have not been adequately addressed. The Parish Council are concerned about the scale of the new dwelling and how this would sit on the plot. The design is still not of a high enough standard to respond to the local character of the buildings of this Conservation Area. The new positioning of the dwelling will have a direct effect on the neighbouring properties, in particular No.38. The front of this property overlooks No. 40. Consequently, their outlook and enjoyment will be directly impacted by the positioning, scale and design of the new dwelling.”
9. **The Conservation Manager** raises no objections, stating that the design of the dwelling is a significant improvement on the previous scheme. The footprint and massing of the building has been reduced and, though still much larger than the footprint of the existing dwelling, is proportionate to the site and not dissimilar to adjacent dwellings. The dwelling is set further back into the site which will allow more space for the existing tree retained in the front garden while some of the more ‘quirky’ aspects of the previous scheme (eg – buttressed walls and high level roof glazing) have been omitted. The south-west side of the High Street is made up of a series of large detached dwellings set back from the road (in contrast to the more traditional development on the east side of the road) and these revised proposals are in keeping with the overall pattern of development along this side of the High Street. The new dwelling will not adversely affect the setting of the Conservation Area. The new design incorporates a detached garage which is located so as to screen a parking courtyard. This will help remove cars from the streetscape and will be a positive enhancement to the setting of the Conservation Area.
10. **The Trees and Landscape Officer** was not specifically consulted in respect of the current application but raised no objections to the previous application subject to driveway construction being in accordance with Arboricultural Practice Note 1 and to tree protection condition.
11. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** raises no objections in principle although does express concerns about potential noise disturbance to residents during the construction period. As such, it is recommended that a condition restricting hours of use of power operated machinery be applied to any planning consent.

Representations

12. Letters of objection have been received from 2 local residents, Nos. 38 and 42 High Street. The main points raised are:
- The proposed dwelling would affect the outlook from and cut out sunlight to No.38 High Street. The main windows of this dwelling face south and overlook the side of the proposed new property;
 - The impact of the dwelling upon No.38 would be made worse by setting the property deeper into the site;
 - The new dwelling would be too large and too high for the site;
 - The two first floor oriel windows on the south east elevation of the house should be fitted with fixed obscure glass;
 - No.42 High Street is not hard against the boundary of the site as indicated on the site plan.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

13. The key issues in relation to this application are:
- The impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
 - Residential amenity;
 - Impact on trees
14. The site lies within the village framework where policies state that the principle of erecting a replacement dwelling is acceptable providing the site in its present form does not form an essential part of village character and providing development is sympathetic to the character and amenities of the surrounding area.
15. The plot is presently occupied by a brick bungalow and the Conservation Manager has raised no objections in principle to its demolition and subsequent replacement. The Parish Council has expressed concerns about the scale and design of the dwelling and its subsequent impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation. In particular, the Parish Council consider that this revised proposal does not overcome the reasons for refusal of the previous scheme.
16. The proposed dwelling is sited approximately 6 metres further back from the road than the previous scheme. When compared to the previous application, the height of the property has been reduced from 8.4 metres to 7.8 metres and its design has been simplified by removing elements such as high-level roof glazing and buttressed walls to the front gables. The Conservation Manager considers the revised proposals to be acceptable and in keeping with the form of development along this side of the High Street, which is characterised by a series of large detached dwellings set back from the road.
17. Concerns have been expressed in respect of the impact of the replacement dwelling upon the outlook from No.38 High Street whose principal windows face south-eastwards towards the site. The front of No.38 is approximately 25 metres away from the common boundary with the site and around 28 metres away from the north-west

side wall of the dwelling itself. I am satisfied that this distance is sufficient to avoid materially harming the outlook from No.38 and any undue loss of sunlight to this property. No first floor windows are proposed in the north-west elevation of the proposed house and, given that this elevation is just 3 metres away from the boundary with No.38, I would advise that any permission is subject to a condition preventing the insertion of first floor windows in this elevation at a later date.

18. With respect to the first floor oriel windows on the south-east side of the house, the drawings indicate that these would be boarded on the side facing towards No.42 High Street with the glazed elements facing towards the front of the site. Conditions requiring precise details of these windows and preventing further first floor windows in this elevation should be added to any planning consent
19. The application involves the replacement of the existing access with a new centralised access. Conditions should be applied to any consent requiring the closure of the existing access after the creation of the new access and also the provision/maintenance of on-site turning and parking. In addition, a landscaping condition should be applied to any consent to ensure that the existing opening is gapped up with a hedge to match the existing hedge along the frontage of the site.
20. Finally, I note the comments of No.42 High Street regarding the siting of their property between 0.5 metres and 1.5 metres off the boundary rather than hard on the boundary as shown. The impact of the proposal on this property has been fully considered on site and the slight misrepresentation of its position on the plan is not considered to be material in this instance.

Recommendation

21. Approval:
 - 1) Standard Condition A (Reason A);
 - 2) Sc5a – Details and samples of materials (Reason – To ensure that the development does not detract from the character of the Conservation Area);
 - 3) Sc5 – Precise details of the oriel windows at first floor level in the south-east side elevation of the dwelling, hereby permitted (Reason – To protect the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling to the south-east, No.42 High Street);
 - 4) Save for the first floor oriel windows in the south-east side elevation of the dwelling, no further windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted at first floor level in the south-east and north-west side elevations of the dwelling, hereby permitted, unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf (Reason – To protect the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling to the south-east, No.42 High Street, and to the north-west, No.38 High Street);
 - 5) Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 - 6) Sc52 – Implementation of Landscaping (Rc52);
 - 7) Sc60 – Boundary treatment (Rc60);
 - 8) Sc56 – Protection of trees during construction (Rc56);

- 9) Sc58 – Protection of front boundary hedge except at point of access (Rc58);
- 10) The driveway shall be constructed in accordance with the Method Statement for Non-Dig Construction in line with Arboricultural Practice Note 1 “Driveway Close to Trees” unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority (Reason – To safeguard the horse chestnut tree at the front of the dwelling);
- 11) During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions (Rc26);
- 12) Para C3a & b – Permanent turning and parking to be provided before the occupation of the dwelling (Rc10);
- 13) Para B6 – Closure of existing access (Rc10);
- 14) Para B10 – Before the occupation of the dwelling, hereby permitted, the new access from the existing highway shall be laid out and constructed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority after consultation with the Local Highway Authority (Rc10).

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3** (Sustainable design in built development) and P7/6 (Historic Built Environment);
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: SE5** (Development in Infill Villages) and EN30 (Development in/adjacent to Conservation Areas)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Neighbour impact including issues of loss of light, loss of outlook and overlooking;
 - Visual impact on the locality;
 - Impact upon the character of the Conservation Area.

General

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

2. Before the existing property is demolished, a Demolition Notice will be required from the Building Control Department establishing the way in which the property will be dismantled, including any asbestos present, the removal of waste, minimisation of dust, capping of drains and establishing hours of working operation.

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

- County Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- File Refs: S/2554/04/F and S/1159/04/F

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/0559/04/F - Great Eversden
Conversion of Farm Buildings into Four Dwellings
Holbeins Farm, High Street, for P & M Tebbit**

**Recommendation: Refusal
Date for Determination: 13th May 2005**

Departure Application

Members will visit this site on Monday 28th February 2004.

Site and Proposal

1. Holbeins Farm, Gt Eversden is located to the north of the main village. This full application, as amended by drawings received 18th August 2004, proposes the conversion of existing barns to four dwellings.
2. It is proposed to convert an existing timber barn, with corrugated roof, on the High Street frontage to a one bedroom unit and a larger linked barn to the south, of similar construction, gable end to the road, into 2 two bedroom units. An open timber framed barn to the rear of the roadside barn is to be converted into a 2-bedroom unit. The buildings are all single storey. A number of new openings are proposed along with the insertion of rooflights.
3. A further barn to the rear, original to be converted to a further dwelling, is now to be demolished. A total of eight car parking spaces are provided at the rear of the site. Behind the car parking spaces is a further agricultural building owned by the applicant.
4. Garden areas are provided to the west and south of the buildings, on the outside of the site, with Unit 1 being provided with a courtyard within the site.
5. Immediately to the north of the site are two bungalows. To the south is agricultural land. On the opposite side of the road, and a little to the north east is Fox Farm which is the subject of the following item.
6. A statement in support of the original application is attached as Appendix 1. It states that the aim is to convert the buildings to self catering units and visitors to the development would have the use of the brick pit fishing ponds and also have access to numerous walks, linking the farm to nearby villages, Wimpole Hall and Cambridge.
7. The applicants own Red House Farm on the opposite side of the road and to the south east of the site where there is an existing barn that has been converted to holiday accommodation

8. A structural survey submitted with the application states the existing structure of the buildings appear to be in a reasonable condition, and although some strengthening and repair will be required significant sections can be retained and incorporated into the new structures. Materials used for repairs will in general be complimentary to the existing structures.
9. The site is outside the village framework and in the Cambridge Green Belt

Planning History

10. There is no relevant planning history.

Planning Policy

11. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("The County Structure Plan") states that development in the countryside will be restricted to that which is demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
12. **Policy GB2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ("The Local Plan") states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Development is defined as inappropriate unless it comprises, amongst others, the re-use of buildings provided that a) the development does not result in a materially greater impact on the openness and purpose of the Green Belt; b) strict control is exercised over any proposed extensions and associated uses of surrounding land; c) the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction and capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction and; d) the form, bulk and general design of the buildings are in keeping with their surroundings.
13. **Policy RT10** of The Local Plan states that the District Council will support the conversion of buildings to holiday accommodation where a) the building is in sound condition and is capable of being reused without significant extensive rebuilding, extension, or alteration; b) the building itself and the proposal are of an appropriate scale, environmentally acceptable and in keeping with the character of the area and any surrounding buildings and; c) together with the cumulative effect of neighbouring proposals, development would have an acceptable impact on the character and amenity of the locality. Planning permission will be dependent on a Section 106 Agreement to limit the use of the accommodation to short-term holiday lets.

Consultations

14. **Great Eversden Parish Council** recommends approval. "This development is approved provided the dwellings are not to be used as permanent residences."
15. The **Environment Agency** request for conditions requiring the submission of schemes for foul and surface water drainage and adds safeguarding comments.
16. The **Chief Environmental Health Officer** requests conditions restricting the hours of operation of power driven machinery during the period of construction, and a scheme for the investigation of any contamination of the site. Informatives should be attached concerning the use of driven pile foundations, burning of waste.
17. The **Local Highway Authority** states that the existing access should be improved to provide a uniform width of minimum 5.0m for a minimum distance of 15.0m from the channel line of the High Street. Gates should be set back a minimum of 5.0m

18. The comments of the **Building Control Manager** will be reported at the meeting.

Representations

19. None received.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

20. The key issue to be considered are whether the proposed scheme complies with the aims of Policies GB2 and RT10 of the Local Plan.
21. The buildings are traditional in style and are important visually in the street scene. In my view it is appropriate to consider some form of re-use. Whilst the conversion of buildings to a general residential use in the Green Belt would be a departure the conversion to holiday lets would accord with Policy RT10.
22. I will report the comments of the Building Control Manager in respect of the structural survey. It is important to ensure that any scheme for conversion of buildings in the Green Belt can be achieved without major or complete reconstruction. I am particularly concerned about the open barn within the site where conversion results in a significant change to the appearance of the building.
23. It is important that the elevation of the buildings facing the High Street remains as unaltered as possible in order to minimise the impact of any conversion on the character of the area. In my view the scheme achieves this with the exception of the introduction of two rooflights. In general I would wish to see a reduction in the number of rooflights throughout the scheme and will discuss this further with the applicant
24. The proposal shows garden land being provided to the west and south of the group of buildings. In my view this element of the scheme has the potential to detract from the openness of the Green Belt. If the units are to be provided as holiday lets it is my view that the residential curtilages can be significantly reduced.
25. I am of the view that the scheme will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the bungalows to the north. The comments of the Local Highway Authority can be addressed by condition.

Recommendation

26. Subject to confirmation from the Building Control Manager that the proposed conversions can be carried out without requiring major or complete reconstruction and the receipt of further amended plans addressing the issues of the number of rooflights and extent of the residential curtilage, that the applicant be invited to enter into a Section 10 Agreement securing the units as holiday lets. Subject to the aforementioned delegated powers be given to officers to approve the application, subject to safeguarding conditions.

If the applicant is unwilling to enter into the Section 106 Agreement consent should be refused.

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:

GB2 (General Principles)

RT10 (Development for Holiday Accommodation)

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Ref. S/0559/04/F

Contact Officer: Paul Sexton - Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713255

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 2nd March 2005
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/0651/04/F - Great Eversden
Conversion and Extension of Barn into One Dwelling, Fox Farm, High Street
for P & M Tebbit**

**Recommendation: Refusal
Date for Determination: 21st May 2005**

Departure Application

Members will visit this site on Monday 28th February 2004.

Site and Proposal

1. Fox Farm, Gt Eversden is located to the north of the main village on the outside of a sharp bend. This full application, as amended by drawings received 18th August 2004, proposes the extension and conversion of an existing brick barn at Fox Farm, High Street, Gt Eversden into one dwelling.
2. Immediately to the north of the building is an existing dwelling. There is a mobile home and a collection of other low agricultural buildings within the site, which are to be removed as part of this application.
3. The existing brick building measures 11m x 6.5m with a ridge height of 4.7m. The proposed addition to the building will extend its length by a further 4.5m. The proposed dwelling will have two bedrooms and will be roofed in slate.
4. The application as originally submitted proposed a larger extension to the building to form two dwellings. However, although advised by the case officer that an objection would still be raised in principle, the proposal has been amended to one dwelling to be used specifically for disabled tourists.
5. A statement in support of the original application is attached as an appendix to the preceding item. It states that the aim is to convert the building to National Accessible Scheme guidelines for a facility specifically designed for disabled tourists and their carers. The building is adjacent to the farms old brick pits where guests would be able to enjoy the peaceful surroundings, or fish.
6. A structural survey submitted with the application states although the existing structure appears to be in a reasonable condition, some strengthening and repair will be required. Large sections can be retained and incorporated into the new structures with materials for the repair works being sympathetic to the original structures.
7. The site is outside the village framework and in the Cambridge Green Belt

Planning History

8. There is no relevant planning history.

Planning Policy

9. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("The County Structure Plan") states that development in the countryside will be restricted to that which is demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
10. **Policy GB2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ("The Local Plan") states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Development is defined as inappropriate unless it comprises, amongst others, the re-use of buildings provided that a) the development does not result in a materially greater impact on the openness and purpose of the Green Belt; b) strict control is exercised over any proposed extensions and associated uses of surrounding land; c) the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction and capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction and; d) the form, bulk and general design of the buildings are in keeping with their surroundings.
11. **Policy RT10** of The Local Plan states that the District Council will support the conversion of buildings to holiday accommodation where a) the building is in sound condition and is capable of being reused without significant extensive rebuilding, extension, or alteration; b) the building itself and the proposal are of an appropriate scale, environmentally acceptable and in keeping with the character of the area and any surrounding buildings and; c) together with the cumulative effect of neighbouring proposals, development would have an acceptable impact on the character and amenity of the locality. Planning permission will be dependent on a Section 106 Agreement to limit the use of the accommodation to short-term holiday lets.

Consultations

12. **Great Eversden Parish Council** recommends approval. "This application was strongly supported."
13. The **Environment Agency** request for conditions requiring the submission of schemes for foul and surface water drainage and adds safeguarding comments.
14. The **Chief Environmental Health Officer** requests conditions restricting the hours of operation of power driven machinery during the period of construction, and a scheme for the investigation of any contamination of the site. Informatives should be attached concerning the use of driven pile foundations, burning of waste.
15. The comments of the **Building Control Manager** will be reported at the meeting.

Representations

16. None received other than the comments from the applicant in the letter that is attached as an Appendix to S/0559/04/F.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

17. The key issue to be considered are whether the proposed scheme complies with the aims of Policies GB2 and RT10 of the Local Plan.

18. The existing small brick building is of limited visual merit. The proposed scheme includes a significant extension to the building, which in my view will materially change its character and impact on the area. From our discussions, the applicant has not been able to design a scheme that does not require a significant extension. Had they been able to do so, the scheme could have been acceptable as is the scheme submitted under S/0559/04/F.
19. Although the proposal involves the removal of a mobile home and other agricultural buildings from the site I do not consider that this can outweigh the above concern.
20. In my view the proposal conflicts with the aims of Policy GB2 and RT10 of the Local Plan.

Recommendation

21. That the application be refused on the grounds that it is contrary to the aims of Policy GB2 and RT10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Ref. S/0651/04/F

Contact Officer: Paul Sexton - Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713255

This page is intentionally left blank

APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

This item is intended to update Members on appeals against planning decisions and enforcement action. Information is provided on appeals lodged, proposed hearing and inquiry dates, appeal decisions and when appropriate, details of recent cases in interest.

1. Decisions Notified By The Secretary of State

Ref. No.	Details	Decision and Date
S/2474/03/F	Dr & Mrs Onudrah Adj 1 Stonehill Road Great Shelford House (Delegated Refusal)	Allowed 18/01/2005
S/0138/04/F	Mr & Mrs S Clemmow 6 Chapel Road Great Eversden Change garage roof from mono-pitch to pitched (Delegated Refusal)	Allowed 18/01/2005
S/0213/04/F	Mr J Heffernan 27 Hillside Orwell Extension to bungalow to form 2 storey dwelling (Delegated Refusal)	Allowed 19/01/2005
S/0297/04/F	J B Stiles & Partners Ltd Barn on Willow Grange Farm, Ely Road, Chittering Cottenham Conversion of barn into dwelling (Delegated Refusal)	Allowed 20/01/2005
S/2194/03/F	Mr C Taylor 45 Spring Lane Bassingbourn Construction of raised decked area, path and sunken patio/lawn (part retrospective) (Delegated Refusal)	Allowed 03/02/2005
E473A	Optima (Cambridge) Ltd The Bury, Newmarket Road Stow-cum-Quy Enforcement against erection of flat roofed extension to existing office building	Dismissed 03/02/2005
S/0740/04/F	Optima (Cambridge) Ltd. The Bury, Newmarket Road Stow-cum-Quy Retention and conversion of unauthorised office extension to garden machinery store (Delegated Refusal)	Dismissed 03/02/2005

2. Summaries of recent decisions of interest

J B Stiles & Partners – Conversion of barn to dwelling – Willow Grange farm, West Ely Road, Chittering, Waterbeach – Appeal allowed.

The main issues in this appeal were the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and whether the re-use of the barn for residential purposes was acceptable in policy terms. The appeal was heard by way of written representations.

The proposal was to demolish three barns, which are in poor condition and convert two others into a dwelling. The Council accepted that the barns were worthy of retention due to their local historic interest.

The inspector found that the group of buildings are well screened from public view and that those views that are possible are of the group of buildings as a whole. The appeal proposal would allow the historic barns to appear as a single entity, distinct and separate from those around them. Restoration of the fabric, while limiting the number of external openings and alterations would not materially change their original character. The extent of the domestic curtilage, access and parking areas would not be visually significant and any future extensions could be controlled through conditions. Thus the demolition of buildings that make no positive contribution to the landscape and the restoration of the two other barns would benefit the character and appearance of the Farm and beyond.

There are no policies in either the Structure or Local Plan that relate directly to the conversion of buildings for residential use. New housing is normally restricted to village frameworks. While the Council had relied upon this stance as part of its reasons for refusal, the inspector concluded this was inappropriate. PPS7 supports the sustainable re-use of buildings in the countryside while PPG15 seeks to preserve the historic environment. This proposal clearly embraces of sustainability in terms of retaining buildings of historic interest. No use, other than residential use would be likely to achieve this given the location and access to the site.

The appeal was therefore allowed subject to conditions requiring further details of the new works, materials, landscaping and a restriction on pd rights.

J Heffernan – Erection of two-storey side extension – 27 Hillside, Orwell - Appeal allowed

This application was refused under delegated powers because of the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the area and the privacy of neighbours. The appeal was heard by way of written representations.

27 and 29 Hillside form a pair of hipped-roof semi-detached bungalows with an attached garage/car port either side. The proposal would provide two bedrooms and store at first floor level by building over the garage and raising the roof-line by about a metre and including a flat-roofed dormer.

While the application had been refused on design grounds, the Committee subsequently granted permission for a near identical proposal in October 2004. The only difference was the attachment of two opaque side screens to the outer edge of the two new bedroom windows, intended to reduce overlooking.

The inspector noted “This permission is an important material consideration in the appeal ... were it not for the Council’s recent grant of permission for no.27, there would be a case for arguing that the proposal would, by its raised roof, raised side wall and extended main roof and side wing, create an unbalanced effect in relation to its conjoined neighbour ...” The

application would be contrary to Local Plan policy which seeks to limit the size of extensions in the countryside.

Given the Council's grant of planning permission, however, the inspector concluded "... it would be unreasonable of me to maintain an objection on the grounds of the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of this part of Hillside".

So far as privacy is concerned, the inspector concluded that "... the scheme would seriously harm the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of privacy, in comparison with the seclusion they currently enjoy in their rear gardens, and would be contrary to Local Plan Policy HG12. However, that privacy will be effectively lost as a result of the Council's recent planning permission, even with the side screens in place, and I do not believe that the appeal scheme would materially worsen the potential for overlooking. I therefore find that the Council's objections, following their grant of planning permission, are not sustainable on this ground either."

Planning permission was therefore granted subject to conditions regarding materials and finishes for the external walls, windows and roof of the extensions and the provision and retention of car parking spaces.

3. Appeals received

Ref. No.	Details	Date
S/2017/04/F	Mr R Turner Reed Cottage, 1 Rectory Farm Road Little Wilbraham Extension (Delegated Refusal)	19/01/2005
S/2019/04/LB	Mr R Turner Reed Cottage, 1 Rectory Farm Road Little Wilbraham Internal and external alterations and extension (Delegated Refusal)	19/01/2005
S/1819/04/F	Mr M W Southern Moat Farm, East Hatley Hatley Alterations to building 4 and change of use to manufacture of foiled products (class B2) Use of buildings 1,2,3 & 5 for associated storage. Use of building 6 & 7 for personal use. (Appeal against Non-Determination)	19/01/2005
S/2062/04/F	R W S Arnold Bennell Farm, West Street (Comberton) Toft Erection of B1 offices (Officer recommendation to refuse)	20/01/2005
S/1217/04/F	Mr C Crickmore Travellers Rest Caravan Park, Chittering Waterbeach Appeal against condition 3 of permission, limiting opening of the site to 8 months per year. (Officer Recommendation to Approve)	24/01/2005

S/6258/04/RM	MCA Developments Land South of Great Cambourne Cambourne Alterations in land form (dispersion of soil from building works.) (Delegated Refusal)	25/01/2005
S/1838/04/F	C Onslow Rhee Valley Works, Barrington Road Shepreth Temporary mobile home (Delegated Refusal)	25/01/2005
E 487	Mr Rahman R/o 23 Church Street Willingham Enforcement against change of use of premises from use class B1c (light industrial) to class A3 (sale of hot food for consumption On or off the premises) and delivery of hot food.	27/01/2005
S/1505/04/O	L R Satchell Land east of Dales Manor Business Park, north of Babraham Road (Sawston) Babraham Residential Development (Delegated Refusal)	27/01/2005
E 495A	J Gordon Clarke Water Lane, Smithy Fen Cottenham Enforcement against use of land as residential caravan site and removal of associated vehicles, sheds, steel containers, drains, electrical and water supplies, accesses and hardstandings.	28/01/2005
S/1861/04/F	Mr G Skinner 2 Church End Coton Replacement dwelling following demolition of existing dwelling and erection of additional dwelling. (Delegated Refusal)	07/02/2005
S/2240/04/O	Mr G Jennings Harlton Road Haslingfield Agricultural Bungalow (Delegated Refusal)	08/02/2005
4.	Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates scheduled before the next meeting on 6th April 2005	
Ref. No.	Details	Date/Time/Venue
S/1495/04/A	Miss J Garfitt Junction of A10 & Church Road Hauxton Sign (retrospective) (Informal Hearing)	02/03/2005 Swansley Room 10.00am

S/0019/04/F	Mr P Mansfield 29 Worcester Avenue Hardwick Change of use of land to garden land & extension to dwelling (Informal Hearing)	08/03/2005 Monkfield room 10.00am
-------------	--	---

S/0358/04/F	Dr & Mrs N Coleman Adj 33 Mill Hill Weston Colville Erection of house and garage and carport for existing dwelling (Informal Hearing)	09/03/2005 Monkfield room 10.00am
-------------	--	---

5. Appeals withdrawn or postponed

Ref. No.	Details	Reason and Date
S/6248/04/RM	MCA Developments Ltd. Plot GC13, Jeavons Lane Cambourne 54 Dwellings	Withdrawn by appellant 25/01/2005

6. Advance notification of future Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates (subject to postponement or cancellation)

Ref. No.	Details	Date
E 502	Mr H Price Adj Moor Drove, Cottenham Road Histon Operational Development (Local Inquiry)	14/04/2005 Confirmed
E 502A	Mr H Price Adj Moor Drove, Cottenham Road Histon Enforcement against material change of use to storage and residential use of caravans. (Local Inquiry)	14/04/2005 Confirmed
E502C	Mr H. Price Land at Moor Drove, Cottenham Road Histon Enforcement against installation of foul sewers & mains water & Electricity (Local Inquiry)	14/04/2005 Confirmed
S/0466/04/F	Mr & Mrs North Clopton Lodge, The Cinques Gamlingay Appeal against condition 2 of permission - personal occupancy condition and removal thereafter (Local Inquiry)	10/05/2005 Confirmed

S/0246/04/RM	Cofton Ltd., Peter Stroude, George Wimpey East Anglia, 19/07/2005 Kings Phase 2, Home Farm Longstanton Erection of 200 dwellings and ancillary works (Local Inquiry)	Confirmed
S/0629/04/F	Mr and Mrs Noyes 22 North Brook End Steeple Morden Extension (Informal Hearing)	04/10/2005 Confirmed
S/0628/04/LB	Mr and Mrs Noyes 22 North Brook End Steeple Morden Internal and external alterations including conversion of bathroom to utility room and two ground floor bedrooms (Informal Hearing)	04/10/2005 Confirmed
S/1109/04/F	Beaugrove Ltd. Crail, High Street Croydon Erection of two houses following demolition of existing house (Informal Hearing)	11/10/2005 Confirmed
S/0592/04/F	R W S Arnold Bennell Farm, West Street (Comberton) Toft Erection of B1 offices (Informal Hearing)	09/11/2005 Confirmed
S/2062/04/F	R W S Arnold Bennell Farm, West Street (Comberton) Toft Erection of B1 offices (Informal Hearing)	09/11/2005 Confirmed
S/0761/04/F	B Gemmil, A Sheridan, E Sheridan & K Sheridan Plots 1-11 Victoria View, off Orchard Drive Smithy Fen Cottenham Use of land for gypsy caravan site, (11 pitches) part retrospective (Local Inquiry to sit for 8 days)	10/01/2006 Offered/Accepted
S/1569/04/F	Mr M Hegerty land off Victoria View, Smithy Fen Cottenham Siting of 4 gypsy caravans (Local Inquiry to sit for 8 days)	10/01/2006 Offered/Accepted

S/1589/04/F

M Quilligan
Land off Water Lane, Smithy Fen
Cottenham
Siting of 2 gypsy caravans
(Local Inquiry to sit for 8 days)

10/01/2006
Offered/Accepted

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

AUTHOR/S: Finance and Resources Director

2nd March 2005**Tree Preservation Order – Gamlingay****Recommendation: To make an Order****Purpose**

1. To seek the Committee's authority to make and serve a Tree Preservation Order in respect of land at Little Heath, Gamlingay.

Effect on Corporate Objectives

1.	Quality, Accessible Services	Not applicable
	Village Life	The presence and protection of the natural environment enhances the quality of village life.
	Sustainability	The presence and protection of trees helps to control pollution levels, and therefore contributes to the Council's commitment to the climate change agenda. Trees provide an important micro habitat for both flora and fauna.
	Partnership	Not applicable

Background

3. Local planning authorities may make Tree Preservation Orders if it appears to them to be, "expedient in the interests of amenity to make provision for the preservation of trees or woodland in their area." (Town and Country Planning Act 1990, section 198(1)).
4. The Act does not define the word "amenity", nor does it set out the circumstances in which it is the interests of amenity to make a Tree Preservation Order. However, the Secretary of State takes the view that TPOs should be used to protect selected trees and woodlands if their removal would be likely to have a significant impact on the local environment and on the general public's enjoyment of that environment. Local authorities should be able to demonstrate a degree of public benefit before they make a Tree Preservation Order. For example, the tree should be visible from the Highway or some other public place.
5. Local planning authorities should be prepared to explain to landowners why their trees or woodlands have been made the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. Factors, which the LPA might take into account, include:
 - visibility from a public place
 - individual impact of the tree – its size, form, future potential, rarity and so on
 - wider impact of the tree, given its suitability in its particular location and the presence of other trees in the vicinity

6. Even if a Tree Preservation Order is desirable on amenity grounds, it may still not be expedient to make it if, for example, the tree or woodland, is under good arboricultural management. However, it may be expedient to make an Order if, say, it is likely that the tree would be cut down, or otherwise pruned in such a way as to have a significant impact on the amenity of the area.

Considerations

7. The land in question is at Little Heath in Gamlingay. A plan of the area is attached at **Appendix 1**.
8. A schedule of trees is attached at **Appendix 2**.
9. The Trees and Landscape Officer considers that the Council should make an Order in this case because the tree was identified, on a recent planning application, for retention as it was seen as an important feature of the area as a sky-line tree contributing significantly to the local landscape.

Options

10. The Development and Conservation Control Committee must determine whether or not to impose a Tree Preservation Order in this instance.

Financial Implications

11. The Council has made budget provision for Tree Preservation Orders.

Legal Implications

12. The landowners are Mr H Titmus, 5 Derwent Drive, Kearsley, Bolton, BL4 8PP and Mr D Titmus, 74 Bedford Road, Wootton, Beds, MK43 9JU. The District Council would serve an Order and Notice on the landowners and send copies to other "interested parties", including utilities.
- 13.. If made, the Order would take effect, provisionally, upon due service of it, and remain in force as such for six months or until confirmed, whichever is the sooner, Following service, those affected would have a period of not fewer than four weeks during which they could object to the Order. Such objections must be in writing and can be made for any reason, including:
 - to challenge the LPA's view that it is expedient in the interests of amenity to make the Order
 - to claim that a tree included in the Order is either dead, dying or dangerous
 - to claim that a tree is causing damage to property
 - to point out errors in, or uncertainties with, the Order
 - to claim procedural irregularities
14. If an objection is received within the stated period, the Council must carry out a site visit. Members must take into account all objections and other representations before deciding whether or not to confirm the Order. The Council can either:
 - confirm the Order, having not received any objections
 - confirm the Order, without modification, having considered objections but rejected them

- confirm the Order, subject to such modifications it deems expedient
- decide not to confirm the Order

- 15.. There is no right of appeal to the Secretary of State against the making or confirmation of a Tree Preservation Order. Once the Order has been confirmed though, an aggrieved, interested party may, within six weeks of the date of confirmation, apply to the High Court to have the decision reviewed

Staffing Implications

16. None.

Risk Management Implications

17. None.

Consultations

18. **Councillor Mrs A Elsby** and **Councillor SGM Kindersley** (local Members) support the making of this Tree Preservation Order.

Recommendations

19. It is **recommended** that the Committee authorise officers to make and serve a Tree Preservation Order in respect of trees at Little Heath, Gamlingay and, subject to there being no formal objection, which is not withdrawn and which therefore triggers a site visit, to confirm the Order in due course.

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

- Tree Preservation Orders – A Guide to the Law and Good Practice, Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions 2000
- Documentation relating to this proposed Tree Preservation Order on a file maintained by the Trees and Landscape Section

Contact Officer: Ian Senior – Democratic Services Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713028

This page is intentionally left blank

First Schedule

N° on Map

Description

Situation

Individual Trees

(Circled in black on the map)

T1

Oak

Located at the front of 4-5
Little Heath, Gamlingay
adjacent to the road.

Areas of Trees

(Within a dotted black line on the map)

NONE

Groups of Trees

(Within a broken black line on the map)

NONE

Woodland

(Within a solid black line on the map)

NONE

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

2nd March 2005

AUTHOR/S: Finance and Resources Director

Tree Preservation Orders – Fen Ditton, Fowlmere and Papworth Everard

Recommendation: To confirm without modification

Purpose

1. To review Tree Preservation Order nos.09, 10 and 11 of 2004.

Effect on Corporate Objectives

2. Quality, Accessible Services	Not applicable
Village Life	The presence and protection of the natural environment enhances the quality of village life
Sustainability	The presence and protection of trees helps to control pollution levels, and therefore contributes to the Council's commitment to the climate change agenda. Trees provide an important micro habitat for both flora and fauna.
Partnership	Not applicable

Background

3. Once made, Tree Preservation Orders remain in force for a provisional period of six months, but can be confirmed at any time.

Considerations

- **09/04/SC – Ermine House, Papworth Everard**

4. Tree Preservation Order 09/04/SC was made on 5th November 2004 under delegated powers. A plan and Schedule of trees are attached at **Appendix 1**.
5. The Council made the Tree Preservation Order to retain the trees, which comprise the significant woodland area, visually enhancing the area and local environment while providing a visual buffer to the property
6. The statutory period for the registering of objections to the Order ended on 10th December 2004.. There were no objections. Councillors MP Howell and NIC Wright (local Members) have been consulted and are both in favour of confirming this Tree Preservation Order.

- **10/04/SC - 2 Wrights Close, Fen Ditton**

7. Tree Preservation Order 10/04/SC was made on 25th November 2004 under delegated powers. A plan and Schedule of trees are attached at **Appendix 2**.

8. The Council made the Tree Preservation Order because the birch tree is considered an important feature of the local area and environment, and was also the reason for refusal of a recent planning application.
9. The statutory period for the registering of objections to the Order ended on 7th January 2005.. There were no objections. Councillor R Turner (local Member) has been consulted.

- **11/04/SC - Land at the Elms, Lynch Lane, Fowlmere**

10. Tree Preservation Order 11/04/SC was made on 25th November 2004 under delegated powers. A plan and Schedule of trees are attached at **Appendix 3**.
11. The Council made the Tree Preservation Order because the group of two Field Maple and one Walnut trees are relevant to a current planning application subject to negotiation and add intrinsic value to the street scene
12. The statutory period for the registering of objections to the Order ended on 7th January 2005.. There were no objections. Councillor Mrs DP Roberts (local Member) has been consulted and is in favour of confirming this Tree Preservation Order.

Options

13. Under the legislation, the Council can confirm a Tree Preservation Order, confirm it subject to modification, or decide not to confirm it.

Financial Implications

14. There are no financial implications.

Legal Implications

15. There are no legal implications.

Staffing Implications

16. There are no staffing implications.

Risk Management Implications

17. There are no risk management implications.

Conclusion

18. TPO number 09/94/SC remains provisionally in force until 4th May 2005.. TPO numbers 10/04/SC and 11/04/SC remain provisionally in force until 24th May 2005. By confirming them now, the Council will ensure that the Tree Preservation Orders remain in force beyond those dates.

Recommendations

19. It is **recommended** that Tree Preservation Orders 09/04/SC in Papworth Everard, 10/04/SC in Fen Ditton and 11/04/SC in Fowlmere be confirmed without modification..

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

- Tree Preservation Order nos. 09/04/SC In Papworth Everard, 10/04/SC in Fen Ditton and 11/04/SC in Fowlmere and the relevant files maintained by the Trees and Landscape Section

Contact Officer: Ian Senior – Democratic Services Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713028

This page is intentionally left blank

First Schedule

N° on Map	Description	Situation
<p>Woodland (Within a solid black line on the map)</p>		
W1	Ash, Holly, Hawthorn, Elder, Sycamore, Oak, Willow, Silver Birch, Scots Pine, Lime.	Situated around Ermine House, running east off Ermine Street South

Areas of Trees
(Within a dotted black line on the map)

NONE

Groups of Trees
(Within a broken black line on the map)

NONE

Individual Trees
(Circled in black on the map)

NONE

This page is intentionally left blank

First Schedule

<u>N° on Map</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Situation</u>
-------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------

Individual Trees

(Circled in black on the map)

T1	Birch	Located in the rear garden of N° 2 Wrights Close, Fen Ditton
----	-------	--

Areas of Trees

(Within a dotted black line on the map)

NONE

Groups of Trees

(Within a broken black line on the map)

NONE

Woodland

(Within a solid black line on the map)

NONE

This page is intentionally left blank

First Schedule

N° on Map

Description

Situation

Groups of Trees

(Within a broken black line on the map)

G1

2 Field Maple
1 Walnut

Situated on the boundary
of The Elms, Lynch Way,
Fowlmere

Areas of Trees

(Within a dotted black line on the map)

NONE

Individual Trees

(Circled in black on the map)

NONE

Woodland

(Within a solid black line on the map)

NONE

This page is intentionally left blank