

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

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



26 September 2006

To: Chairman – Councillor NIC Wright
Vice-Chairman – Councillor SGM Kindersley
All Members of the Planning Committee

Dear Councillor

You are invited to attend the next meeting of **PLANNING COMMITTEE**, which will be held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **WEDNESDAY, 4 OCTOBER 2006** at **10.00 a.m.**

Yours faithfully
GJ HARLOCK
Chief Executive

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	
2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING To authorise the Chairman to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2006 as a correct record. These Minutes are available on the Council's website .	
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND ASSOCIATED ISSUES	
3. S/1669/06/F - GIRTON	1 - 6
4. S/1416/06/F - HARDWICK	7 - 16
5. S/1158/06/F - SHEPRETH	17 - 22
6. S/1663/06/F - SHEPRETH	23 - 26
7. S/1642/06/F - FEN DRAYTON	27 - 32
8. S/1406/06/F - STEEPLE MORDEN	33 - 36

9.	S/1420/06/F - GREAT SHELFORD	37 - 42
10.	S/1615/06/F - STAPLEFORD	43 - 46
11.	S/1603/06/F - WATERBEACH	47 - 52
12.	S/0626/06/F - LANDBEACH	53 - 58
13.	S/1539/06/F AND S/1668/06/CAC - THRIFLOW	59 - 68
14.	S/1653/05/F - WILLINGHAM	69 - 74
15.	S/1654/05/F - WILLINGHAM	75 - 80
16.	S/1238/06/F - OVER (PARISH OF WILLINGHAM)	81 - 86
17.	S/0788/06/F - WILLINGHAM	87 - 92
18.	S/0264/06/F - OVER	93 - 96
19.	S/1308/06/F - CHILDERLEY	97 - 100
20.	S/1560/06/F - CALDECOTE	101 - 104
21.	S/1548/06/F AND S/1547/06/LB - FOWLMERE	105 - 110

INFORMATION ITEMS

The following items are included on the agenda for information and, in the main, are available in electronic format only (at www.scams.gov.uk/meetings and in the Weekly Bulletin dated 27 September 2006). Should Members have any comments or questions regarding issues raised by the reports, they should contact the appropriate officer.

22.	APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION	111 - 116
	Summaries of Decisions of interest attached.	
	Contact officers:	
	Gareth Jones, Head of Planning – Tel: 01954 713155	
	John Koch, Appeals Manager (Special Projects) – Tel: 01954 713268	

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR VISITORS TO SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE HALL

Whilst the District Council endeavours to ensure that you come to no harm when visiting South Cambridgeshire Hall you also have a responsibility to ensure that you do not risk your own or others' safety.

Security

Visitors should report to the main reception desk where they will be asked to sign a register. Visitors will be given a visitor's pass that must be worn at all times whilst in the building. Please remember to sign out and return your pass before you leave. The visitors' book is used as a register in cases of emergency and building evacuation.

Emergency and Evacuation

In the event of a fire you will hear a continuous alarm. Evacuate the building using the nearest escape route; from the Council Chamber or Mezzanine viewing gallery this would be via the staircase just outside the door. Go to the assembly point at the far side of the staff car park.

Do not use the lifts to exit the building. If you are unable to negotiate stairs by yourself, the emergency staircase landings are provided with fire refuge areas, which afford protection for a minimum of 1.5 hours. Press the alarm button and wait for assistance from the Council fire wardens or the fire brigade.

Do not re-enter the building until the officer in charge or the fire brigade confirms that it is safe to do so.

First Aid

If someone feels unwell or needs first aid, please alert a member of staff.

Access for People with Disabilities

All meeting rooms are accessible to wheelchair users. There are disabled toilet facilities on each floor of the building. Hearing loops and earphones are available from reception and can be used in all meeting rooms.

Toilets

Public toilets are available on each floor of the building next to the lift.

Recording of Business

Unless specifically authorised by resolution, no audio and / or visual or photographic recording in any format is allowed at any meeting of the Council, the executive (Cabinet), or any committee or sub-committee of the Council or the executive.

Banners / Placards / Etc.

No member of the public shall be allowed to bring into or display at any Council meeting any banner, placard, poster or other similar item. The Chairman may require any such item to be removed.

Disturbance by Public

If a member of the public interrupts proceedings, the Chairman will warn the person concerned. If they continue to interrupt, the Chairman will order their removal from the meeting room. If there is a general disturbance in any part of the meeting room open to the public, the Chairman may call for that part to be cleared.

Smoking

The Council operates a NO SMOKING policy.

Food and Drink

Vending machines and a water dispenser are available on the ground floor near the lifts. There shall be no food and drink in the Council Chamber.

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The following statement must be proposed, seconded and voted upon. The officer presenting to report will provide the paragraph number(s).

“I propose that the Press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following item number in accordance with Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that, if present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.”

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: Planning Committee

4th October 2006

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1669/06/F - Girton**Erection of Six Dwellings Following Demolition of Existing Dwelling (No. 2 High Street) at 2 High Street and Land Rear of 4 & 6 High Street****Recommendation: Delegated Approval****Date for Determination: 13th October 2006**Members will visit the site on Monday 2nd October 2006**Site and Proposal**

1. This site, measuring 0.26 hectares is formed from land that currently comprises the plot at 2 High Street, which has a detached bungalow on it, and parts of rear gardens to 4 and 6 High Street. The land rises approximately 2.5 metres eastwards from the road towards the rear of the site. It contains a number of trees and currently a hedge marks the frontage of no. 2. To the front of the site there is a grassed verge. There is no footpath on this side of the road. The site is adjoined by residential property at 20 Duck End and 50 High Street to the south and 5 Lawrence Close to the southeast; and gardens serving 8 High Street to the north and 66 – 68 Church Lane to the east. Mature hedges mark the southern and eastern boundaries.
2. This full planning application follows an earlier application (see planning history) and has been amended to address concerns raised. It proposes to demolish the existing 1920s bungalow on the site and to build six dwellings in the form of: a pair of semi-detached, three-bedroom houses to the frontage with garages to the rear; one two-bedroom bungalow; one four-bedroom bungalow with integral garage; and two chalet bungalows with ridge heights of 6.5 metres and integral garages. The proposals will result in development at a density of 23 dwellings per hectare (dph).
3. Plot four of the current proposals has been revised from a chalet bungalow to a bungalow to address overlooking and overbearing concerns. A beech hedge on the southern boundary is retained in its entirety. A garage to plot three has been omitted to free up space for visitor car parking and landscaping. 6m kerb radii to the street have been omitted.
4. A Design and Access Statement and a Flood Risk Assessment accompany the application.

Planning History

5. Planning application ref. **S/0616/64/O** for a bungalow to the rear of 4 High Street was refused. A subsequent appeal was dismissed.
6. Members may recall considering a previous application for six dwellings (ref. **S/0430/06/F**) on this site at the June 2006 meeting, which was refused on the following grounds:

1. The proposed form of development will result in the site having a cramped appearance when viewed within the context of the street scene and wider semi-rural character of the area. This is exacerbated by the lack of space within the scheme for significant soft landscaping. The proposals are therefore contrary to policies P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, adopted 2003, and SE3 and HG10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, adopted 2004, which require new developments to be designed to a high standard and provides a sense of place that responds to the local character of the built environment.
2. The size and height of the proposed dwellings will have a detrimental impact upon the amenities of neighbouring dwellings as, due to differences in ground levels across the site and neighbouring land, they will have an overbearing appearance. The proposals are therefore contrary to policies SE3 and HG10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2004, which require new housing developments to be sensitive to the amenities of neighbours.

Planning Policy

7. **Policy SE3** 'Limited Rural Growth Settlements' of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ('Local Plan') defines Girton as a Limited Rural Growth Settlement in which residential development will be permitted on unallocated land providing the development meets with the criteria of this and other policies included within the Local Plan. Development should provide an appropriate mix of dwellings and should achieve a minimum density of 30dph unless there are strong design grounds for not doing so.
8. **Policy HG10** 'Housing Mix and Design' of the Local Plan requires developments to include a mix of housing types and sizes, with the design and layout being informed by the wider area.
9. **Policy HG11** 'Backland Development' of the Local Plan states that development to the rear of existing properties will only be permitted where the development would not:
 - a. Result in overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing of existing residential properties;
 - b. Result in noise and disturbance to existing residential properties through the use of its access;
 - c. Result in highway dangers through the use of its access; or
 - d. Be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.
10. **Policy CS1** 'Planning Obligations' – The Council will seek to secure through section 106 agreements or Grampian conditions infrastructure or other forms of development that are necessary as a result of the development proposed.
11. Local Plan **Policy CS5** 'Flood Protection' restricts development where flood risk will be increased.
12. **Policy CS10** 'Education' of the Local Plan seeks financial contributions towards the provision of education where the development would cause the capacity of local schools to be exceeded.

13. **Policy TP1** 'Planning for More Sustainable Travel' of the Local Plan seeks to promote sustainable travel and as such planning permission will only be granted where small-scale increases in travel demands will result, unless satisfactory measures to increase accessibility are included. Standards for maximum car parking levels and requirements for cycle storage are found in Appendices 7/1 and 7/2.
14. **Policy EN5** 'The Landscaping of New Development' of the Local Plan requires trees, hedges and woodland wherever possible to be retained within proposals for new development and landscaping schemes will be secured through appropriate conditions.
15. Local Plan **Policy EN12** 'Nature Conservation: Unidentified Sites' seeks wherever possible to retain features and habitat types of nature conservation value where they occur. Where the need for development outweighs the need to retain such features appropriate mitigation measures will be required.
16. **Policy P1/3 'Sustainable Design in Built Development'** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ('Structure Plan') states that a high standard of design and sustainability should be adopted for all new forms of development.
17. **Policy P5/3** 'Density' of the Structure Plan requires developments to achieve a density appropriate to the area, with a minimum requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare.
18. Structure Plan **Policy P6/1** 'Development-related Provision' restricts development unless additional infrastructure and community requirements generated by the proposals can be secured.
19. Structure Plan **Policy P6/3** 'Flood Defence' requires measures and design features to be included to give sufficient protection against flooding on site or elsewhere locally.
20. **Policy P6/4** 'Drainage' of the Structure Plan states that all new development should avoid exacerbating flood risk locally by utilising water retention systems.
21. Structure Plan **Policy P7/2** 'Biodiversity' seeks to conserve and enhance biodiversity.
22. Structure Plan Policies **P8/1** 'Sustainable Development – Links Between Land Use and Transport', **P8/8** 'Encouraging Walking and Cycling' and **P8/9** 'Provision of Public Rights of Way' seek to ensure that new developments are located where they are highly accessible by public transport, cycle and on foot; reduce travel by car; cater for all users and; provide opportunities for travel choice; and do not compromise safety.
23. **Policy P8/5** 'Provision of Parking' of the Structure Plan requires car parking standards to be maximums, in accordance with PPG13.

Consultation

24. At the time of writing the consultation period had not expired. Responses are awaited from:
Girton Parish Council, Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue, Trees and Landscape Officer, Ecology Officer, Drainage Manager, General Works Manager, and the Local Highways Authority. A summary of responses will be provided to Members at Committee or earlier in the form of an appendix, if possible.

25. **Environment Agency** – The site is within flood zone 1 and is of less than 1 hectare in area, therefore as there are no other issues for the Agency, the Council is to assess the application on its behalf in line with standing advice on flood risk and surface water drainage.
26. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – no impact from an Environmental Health standpoint.
27. **Cambridgeshire County Council's Chief Financial Planning Officer** - Confirms that an educational contribution of £17,00 towards provision of secondary education is required.
28. Building Control Officer does not believe there will be drainage problems, although details of the Flood Risk Assessment are awaited.

Representations

29. The consultation period expires on 27th September 2006 and therefore further responses will be reported verbally to the Committee if received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

30. The occupier of No. 8 High Street objects to cars existing on to a narrow lane junction, causing noise pollution and loss of privacy to his back garden. If the development proceeds a 1.8m high solid wooden fence is required on the boundary to No. 6.
31. The occupiers of No. 68 Church Lane raise concerns in regard to the future maintenance of an underground drainage system beneath No. 2 High Street to prevent flooding of No. 68, increased traffic pressure along the narrow Church Lane and it would be undesirable to lose the natural habitat of trees and hedgerow between 66/68 Church Lane and 2/4/6 High Street.
32. In assessing this planning application the key issues are whether the previous two reasons for refusal have been adequately addressed through this new application. The two issues previously were the impact of the form and layout of the development on the street scene and wider area, and the overbearing impact of the dwellings on neighbouring properties.
33. One of the main concerns in relation to the previous scheme was the impact of plot four on the neighbouring properties. In the current scheme this has been revised from a chalet bungalow to a bungalow, with a reduction in ridge height of 900mm from 6.3 metres to 5.4 metres. In addition, the large beech hedge on the boundary is being retained. Although the site does rise, a bungalow on this plot with such a low ridge height will significantly lessen the visual impact upon 20 Duck End and 5 Lawrence Close, particularly as the hedge will screen views of the plot.
34. A garage to plot 3 has been omitted and replaced with two tandem car parking spaces adjacent to the garage serving plots one and two, reducing the built form visible when viewed from the neighbouring properties at 20 and 50 Duck End. This has the added advantage of freeing up space between plots three and four to provide two visitor car parking spaces and additional soft landscaping within the development.
35. 6 metre kerb radii to the street have been omitted. The implications of this for emergency and refuse vehicles to access the site must be considered, and balanced

a less in a less intrusive form of junction. The nature of consultants will influence the weight to be attached to these factors.

36. In summary, the applicants have done as much as possible to address the relationship of plots 3 and four, in particular on neighbouring properties, and therefore have overcome reason two of the previous refusal. Given that the density of the proposed scheme is just 23 dph, is not within a Conservation Area or setting of a Listed Building, and that the form and layout of the scheme has been improved to address concerns raised, a refusal along of the lines of the first reason for refusal on the previous application would in my opinion be difficult to substantiate. In terms of the character of the area, I do not believe a density greater than that proposed would be appropriate. The approximate density of development between High Street, Duck End and Church Lane south of a footpath link is 12 dph.

Recommendation

37. Subject to the responses of consultees, receipt of a revised FRA, section 106 requiring a contribution toward education provision delegated approval subject to appropriate planning conditions.

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: C/0616/64/O, S/0430/06/F and S/1669/06/F
- Documents referred to in the report including appendices on the website only and reports to previous meetings.

Contact Officer: Melissa Reynolds – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713237

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee4th October 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director/ Head of Planning Services

**S/1416/06/F - HARDWICK
Erection of 28 Affordable Houses, Land Rear of 124-158 Main Street
for Hundred Houses Society**

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Date for determination: 18th December 2006

Major Development

Members will visit this site on Monday 2nd October 2006.

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is at present agricultural land with a site area of 1.29ha. There is a fall in levels towards the south and west. Land to the north, west and south forms part of the same agricultural field. To the east, the site adjoins the service road at the rear of the houses at 124-158 Main Street, and to the north east, dwellings in The Pastures. Bridleway No. 5 passes the southern boundary of the site, which is marked by an avenue of semi-mature trees.
2. The full application, dated 7th July 2006, proposes the erection of 28 affordable dwellings with access taken from The Pastures. This represents a density of 22 dwellings per hectare. The site was enlarged to facilitate access from The Pastures and a revised ownership certificate provided on 18th September 2006.

Design statement

3. The application is accompanied by a design statement. This explains that Hundred Houses Society provides affordable housing in Cambridgeshire for people who cannot access open market housing owing to high prices. The scheme is designed to provide housing for local people who would not otherwise be able to live in the village and would have to move elsewhere. The application has been the subject of meetings between the developers, local residents and the Parish Council.
4. The design approach is of a traditional village green surrounded by buildings which fit comfortably with a rural situation. The layout includes a circulatory system for vehicles, with narrow roadways like a country lane, and a play area. An area of car parking for residents of The Pastures has been included in the scheme.

Design and appearance

5. In order to achieve significant cost savings, a major reduction in the length of time spent on site is intended, by taking advantage of techniques of off-site manufacture of components and volume production. This conforms with the Government's policy of Modern Methods of Production. There will be as much standardisation as possible.

There is to be a consistent use of forms and materials, with a variation in colours and detailing to provide individual identities. The houses and flats are to be built using render and stained timber weatherboards, with slate blue flat tiles. Each building has a projecting front annexe and porch containing service entry points and refuse storage. Ridge heights range from 5.7m for the chalets bungalows to 8.4 for the 4 bedroom /6 person houses. The two-storey blocks of flats have a ridge height of 6.6m.

6. Each building will be designed to be accessible to and be suitable for use by disabled persons. One three-bedroom house will be designed specifically for a wheelchair user.
7. Landscape hedging belts are proposed for the northern and western boundaries. The southern boundary is to be provided with hedgerow planting and additional trees to supplement the existing. The eastern boundary trees and hedgerow will be retained and reinforced. Within the site, trees will be planted on the green islands and in the play area, supplemented by areas of shrub planting. These will be mostly native species to enhance opportunities for bird and insect life.

Housing mix

8. The housing mix includes 8 single bedroom flats, 5 two-bedroom houses, 7 three-bedroom houses, 4 two-bedroom bungalows, 2 one-bedroom bungalows, 1 four-bedroom house and 1 five-bedroom house. It is expected that at least 8 of these homes will be offered for shared ownership purchase. This mix has been arrived at having regard to the Housing Needs Register.

Roadways

9. The majority of the new access road will be offered for adoption to the County Council. The secondary entrance to The Pastures is to become a 'Give Way' junction, with the road to the proposed housing becoming the priority route. No additional traffic calming is proposed on Main Street or The Pastures. The width of the roadway has been increased to 4.0m to facilitate access by refuse vehicles and fire appliances. A footpath link will be provided from the site to the bridleway at the south end of the site.
10. Parking provision will be to Local Planning Authority standards, showing 47 spaces for residents and 7 for visitors. Three disabled parking spaces have been included. 10 additional spaces have been included at the north of the site to meet the needs of residents of The Pastures.

Drainage

11. The application is accompanied by a flood risk assessment which concludes that the proposed development is not at risk from fluvial flooding and will not cause any future risk if the necessary attenuation measures are taken. Storm water run-off will be drained via a new piped system to outfall to the existing drain (awarded to SCDC) via a balancing facility and flow control device. This balancing pond is proposed at the south western corner of the field parcel, adjacent to the bridleway. This aspect will be the subject of a further planning application.
12. Foul drainage will be to Anglian Water Services fowls sewer in Main Street, reached using a new pumping station at the south east corner of the site.

Construction traffic

13. Construction traffic is to access the site via the bridleway at the south east of the site, utilising land to the rear of 158 Main Street. A 2m high fence will be erected on the boundary with neighbouring properties to provide screening. Contractors traffic will not be permitted to use The Pastures.

Planning History

14. **S/1812/03/F** - Erection of 20 affordable dwellings. Withdrawn prior to determination 16 October 2003.
15. **S/1060/02/F** - Children's Play Area. Approved subject to conditions 22 July 2002.

Planning Policy

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

16. **P1/1** (Approach to Development) For development on the periphery of settlements, previously developed land and buildings should be preferred over the use of land that has not been developed previously.
17. **P1/2** (Environmental Restrictions on Development) - development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
18. **P1/3** (Sustainable Design in Built Development) of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 requires compact forms of development through the promotion of higher densities that responds to the local character of the built environment.
19. **P5/5** (Homes in Rural Areas) – small scale housing developments will be permitted in villages only where appropriate, taking into account the need for affordable rural housing, the character of the village and its setting, and the level of jobs, services, infrastructure and passenger transport provision in the immediate area.
20. **P6/4** (Drainage) – development will be expected to avoid exacerbating flood risk by using sustainable drainage systems for the disposal of surface water run-off.
21. **P7/4** (Landscape) – Development must relate sensitively to the local environment and contribute to the sense of place, identity and diversity of the distinct landscape areas.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

22. **SE9** (Village Edges) - development on the edge of villages should be sympathetically designed and landscaped to minimise the impact of development on the countryside.
23. **HG8** (Exceptions Policy for Affordable Housing) - planning permission may be granted for schemes of 100% affordable housing on sites adjoining villages provided:
 - a) the scheme is limited to those in 'housing need';
 - b) the number, size, design, mix and tenure are appropriate to identified local need;

- c) the development does not damage the character of the village or the rural landscape.
24. **HG10** (Housing Mix and Design) requires residential developments to have a mix of units making the best use of the site. The design and layout of schemes should be informed by the wider character and context of the local townscape.
25. **CS1** (Planning Obligations) - the Council will seek to negotiate planning obligations to ensure the provision of any matters that are necessary and directly related to the proposed development, without which permission ought not otherwise to be granted. The obligation will be reasonably related to the proposed development in scale and kind.
26. **CS5** (Flood Protection) – planning permission will not be granted where the site is likely to increase flood risk unless it can be demonstrated that the effect can be overcome by appropriate alleviation and mitigation measures.
27. **EN3** (Landscaping and design standards for new development in the countryside) – where new development is permitted in the countryside the landscaping works shall be appropriate to the particular landscape character area and reinforce local distinctiveness wherever possible.
28. **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).
29. **RT2** (Public Open Space) requires the provision of public open space for new residential developments of 21 dwellings or more.

Local Development Framework Submission Draft (2006)

30. **SF/6** (Public Art and New Development) – in schemes of 10 or more dwellings, the District Council will encourage a contribution for the provision of publicly accessible art, craft and design works. Commuted maintenance sums for up to 10 years will be required.

Consultations

31. **Hardwick Parish Council** – Approval (no comments).
32. **Definitive Maps Officer**, Cambridgeshire County Council – no objection, subject to standard informatives. Consideration should be given to making the footway link to the bridleway also a bridleway, to facilitate access for bicyclists and horse riders.
33. **Environment Operations Manager** – As originally submitted, concerned that the road layout would not facilitate refuse collection, principally because of the dimensions of the carriageway and hammerhead radii. The comments of the EOM on the amended plans are awaited.
34. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – Comments awaited and will be reported verbally at Committee.

35. **Head of Housing Strategic Services** – No objection. The proposed units meet the housing needs for Hardwick and the Housing Corporation has allocated funding in 2006/2008 programme.
36. **Ecology Officer** – No objection. Recommends conditions regarding nest and bat box provision. Boundary screening should have gaps to allow for the movement of animals.
37. **Ramblers Association** – no response received.
38. **Anglian Water Services** - no response received.
39. **Police Architectural Liaison Officer** - There are a number of detailed concerns in respect of the layout plan as originally submitted. These include: the need for overlooking of the footpath link to the south, and of off-road car parking spaces. The roadways should be widened to allow two vehicles to pass. There are reduced opportunities for natural surveillance from the road of some of the proposed covered porches, especially to the single-storey dwellings on the southern edge of the development. Access to the rear and side of the flats should be reduced and provided with lockable gates.
40. **Environment Agency** – The site is proposed to be drained to a surface water balancing facility discharging to an Award Drain under the jurisdiction of SDCDC. The site surface water outfall pipe, and balancing pond, should be considered as part of this application. Adoption and maintenance in perpetuity must be agreed.
41. **The British Horse Society** – comments that the adjacent bridleway must not be used as an access road either during construction or as part of the development after completion.
42. **Trees and Landscape Officer** – Oaks in the service road to the rear of Main Street should be protected during development. The hedgerow on this boundary should be reinforced with new planting. The mature trees on the southern boundary are visually significant and should be protected during development. Additional planting should be placed on this boundary. More planting should be carried out within the development eg. in the play area and adjacent to parking bays. Amended plans received 18th September 2006 show these adjustments, which are to the satisfaction of the Trees and Landscape Officer.
43. **Local Highway Authority** – Several concerns regarding the scheme as originally submitted. These related to the access from The Pastures, the design of shared surface roads, and carriageway widths. The majority of concerns have been addressed, and the final comments on the amended plans are awaited.
44. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue** – response awaited.
45. **Building Control Manager** – acceptable provided that the road width maintains a minimum of 3.7m for fire appliances. The flood risk assessment is acceptable.
46. **Chief Financial Officer**, Cambridgeshire County Council – this type of development is exempt from the requirement to make a financial contribution towards local education provision.
47. **Arts Development Manager** – has confirmed that a public arts contribution will be required.

48. The **Land Drainage Manager** - The surface water flows are to be attenuated to greenfield levels and will therefore have minimal impact on the award drain. The development should provide evidence of an agreement to maintain the balancing pond and associated pipework in perpetuity.

Representations

The following representations have been received, summarised below:

49. 128 Main Street
There are already problems with parking on The Pastures close to the junction with Main Street. Cars have to wait on Main Street to let vehicles out of The Pastures. The new development will bring many new cars. The last application was turned down because of this problem – what has changed? The proposed car park at the rear of No. 128 will attract young adults with cars/mopeds; this will cause loss of privacy and overlooking day and night. Why don't Hundred Houses look at Burdens on St Neots Road?
50. 150 Main Street
Object because of loss of view of the wood. New housing will disturb the wildlife – munjacs, badgers and woodpeckers. Heavy lorries should not use the bridle path. This is a very dangerous corner and blind spot. Lorries should not use The Pastures either. The bus service is bad and there are no amenities at this end of the village. It is a mile to the shop and post office. Extra cars using the junction of The Pastures with Main Street would be dangerous. Children going to Comberton College all collect at Manor Crescent for their bus – if they were walking from the new development they would have to cross two roads, which would be dangerous. The last application was turned down for being dangerous for traffic.
51. 158 Main Street
The development will be clearly visible to anyone approaching from Toft. A thicker tree planting belt on the southern boundary would be far more appropriate especially in view of the height of these single-storey dwellings. This may require the six units along the southern boundary to be removed. The bridleway itself will become little more than a car park unless measures are taken to prevent vehicular access.

There is a proposal for a footpath link across the bottom No. 158 with only a fence being used for screening. This will cause loss of privacy and security. Could this not be positioned on the south west corner of the development?

Access during the construction period will be via the bridleway with the site office being positioned at the end of the garden. There is a low level fence to the rear and, as such, movement of construction traffic will cause noise, dirt, dust etc as well as security risk and loss of privacy. This impact should be avoided.

Planning Comments

Exception Housing Site

52. The site adjoins the village framework and is located at the southern end of the village where there are paved footpaths to the school, shop and post office. There is also a bus link to these central facilities. Subject to my further comments below, I consider that the development will not harm the rural setting of the village, will meet a housing need in terms of number, size, design and tenure and will comply with Policy HG8.

Design and appearance

53. The design uses a limited palette of form and external materials. This reflects the main objective of Modern Methods of Production, to limit build costs. However, there will be variety of colour to render panels and wood stain, and in the roof heights. The site will not be seen in close proximity to existing dwellings and will not be prominent when viewed from Main Street. The distinctive appearance and character of the development will not appear to be out of keeping with the character of this part of the village for these reasons and, in my opinion, the proposal complies with policies P1/3 (Structure Plan) and HG10 (Local Plan).

Landscaping

54. The landscape setting of the development has been considered in the layout. Substantial planting will be allowed for on the northern and western perimeters of the site, while the existing eastern boundary planting will be retained and enhanced. On the more prominent southern boundary, hedgerow and additional tree planting will be carried out as recommended by the Trees and Landscape Officer, to screen the rear elevation of the chalet bungalows on this boundary, adjacent to the bridleway. Subject to submission of final details, I consider this approach to be acceptable and in conformity with policies P7/4 (Structure Plan), SE9 and EN3 (Local Plan).

Highway aspects

55. The general approach to road layout and access has been accepted by the Local Highway Authority. Detailed aspects are being finalised at the time of compiling this report with the Highway Authority and the Environment Operation Manager. The accommodation of construction traffic is an issue that has been raised by the adjoining occupier at No.158, and the British Horse Society. Further discussions on this aspect are to take place with the County Council, and I recommend that a condition requiring final details of these matters be included if planning permission is issued.
56. The neighbour at No.158 has asked for the footpath link to be sited away from her boundary. The footpath is located some 15m from the rear boundary of her property. In this position it will facilitate access to Main Street and the bus stop. The applicant is reluctant to relocate it and I consider that there are no strong grounds for doing so.

Drainage

57. Surface water drainage of the site will require the provision of an off-site facility, for which a further planning permission will be required. I recommend that this requirement be the subject of a Section 106 Agreement.

Recommendation

58. The grant of planning permission should be dependent upon the prior signing of a S106 legal agreement for the affordable housing, maintenance of public open space, provision of off-site surface water drainage facilities, and provision of public art. Subject to no objections being received from the Local Highways Authority, Environment Operations Manager, Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue and Anglian Water Services, delegated powers are sought to approve the application, as completed by ownership certificate and amended by plans received 18 September 2006, 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);
3. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
4. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
5. SC56 – Protection of trees during construction (Rc54);
6. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment (Rc60);
7. Sc5f – Details of materials to be used for hard surfaced areas within the site including roads, driveways and car parking areas (Reason – To minimise disturbance to adjoining residents);
8. SC54 – Reservation of play area (Rc - To ensure the provision of a play area in accordance with Policy RT2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004);
9. Provision of bat and nesting boxes (Rc - In the interests of biodiversity);
10. Surface water drainage details (Rc - To ensure satisfactory drainage of the site);
11. Para C2 – Construction vehicle parking (Rc - In the interests of highway safety);
12. Withdrawal of permitted development rights for the formation of any pedestrian or vehicular access from rear garden areas adjoining Public Bridleway 114/5 (Rc - To discourage unauthorised use of the bridleway by vehicular traffic);
13. Restriction of hours of use of power operated machinery during the period of construction (Rc - To protect the amenities of adjoining residents.)

+ any conditions required by the Local Highways Authority

Informatives

The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments made by the Definitive Maps Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council in regard to public bridleway No. 5.

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)
 - P1/1 (Approach to Development)
 - P1/2 (Environmental Restrictions on Development)
 - P1/3 (Sustainable Design in Built Development)
 - P5/5 (Homes in Rural Areas)
 - P6/4 (Drainage)
 - P7/4 (Landscape)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
 - SE9 (Village Edges)
 - HG8 (Exceptions Policy for Affordable Housing)
 - HG10 (Housing Mix and Design)
 - CS1 (Planning Obligations)
 - CS5 (Flood Protection)
 - EN3 (Landscaping and design standards for new development in the countryside)
 - TP1 (Planning for More Sustainable Travel)
 - RT2 (Public Open Space)

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 countryside

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
- Local Development Framework Submission Draft (2006)
- Planning files Ref. S/1416/06/F, S/1812/03/F and S/1060/02/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee4th October 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

**S/1158/06/F - Shepreth
Construction of Walkway and Nocturnal House (Part Retrospective)
Shepreth Wildlife Park, Station Road for T Willers**

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 8th August 2006

Site and Proposal

1. Shepreth Wildlife Park is a private business and local tourist attraction on the edge of the village of Shepreth. Due to the nature of the animals housed at the park the site is enclosed by tall post and wire fencing, the northernmost section of which abuts the Kings Cross to Cambridge railway. To the south of the said section of fence there is an earth bund that visually screens the majority of the site from the open countryside to the north. Within the site itself there is a range of artificial habitats with associated built development that have been created to house the park's animals. There is also a dwelling within the site that is occupied by the applicant and his family.
2. The access to the Wildlife Park runs adjacent to a linear commercial/industrial estate that abuts the rail tracks to the north. To the southwest of the site the Park's parking area abuts village playing fields. The closest residential properties to the site of the proposed development are two pairs of semi-detached properties in Angle Lane (Edieham Cottages). A public footpath runs to the north past the eastern boundary of the site and the front elevations of Edieham Cottages and out into the open countryside.
3. The full planning application received on the 13th June 2006 proposes engineering works to create a walkway on top of the aforementioned earth bund and seeks to regularise the part construction of a nocturnal house that is located on the northern side of the bund. The application was amended on the 3rd August 2006 to shorten the route of the proposed walkway so that it would not come as near to the residential properties in Angle Lane as first proposed. The Nocturnal House, which has not been amended since the original submission, has a mono-pitch roof and measures 39.4 metres in length, 6 metres in width and is 3.7 metres above ground level at its highest point, which is 1.2 metres above the top of the bund. Externally the nocturnal house is proposed to be finished in black stained weatherboarding.

Planning History

4. The planning history of Shepreth Wildlife Park is a long and complicated one that consists of planning approvals and refusals, a considerable number of which were determined at appeal. Planning permission for a wild animal sanctuary on the site was approved in 1986 (**S/0113/86/F**). There are no applications that specifically relate to the proposed development or the area of the site that is the subject of this application.

Planning Policy

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

5. **Policy P1/2** 'Environmental Restrictions on Development' of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that developments in the countryside will be restricted unless demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
6. **Policy P4/1** 'Tourism, Recreation and Leisure Strategy' requires that new or improved tourism, recreation and leisure developments protect or improve the local environment, landscape and residential amenity.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

7. **Policy RT1** 'Recreation and Tourism Development' has regard to the scale, form, design and materials for recreation and tourist related developments. The policy also considers issues of screening and traffic generated by such developments.

Consultation

8. **Shepreth Parish Council** – Recommends that the application be refused as the raised walkway overlooks Edieham Cottages. The amendment is not considered to meet the original objections of overlooking and development without permission.
9. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – Has considered the application and the implications of the proposals in terms of noise and environmental pollution and has no objection.
10. **Network Rail** – Has not responded to the consultation.

Representations

11. Councillor Van de Ven objects to the application on the grounds that the development is retrospective and a business such as the Wildlife Park should not start building without first securing the relevant planning permission.
12. The owner/occupier of 2 Edieham Cottages objects to the application on the grounds that the nocturnal house is too close to the railway lines and the animals may be disturbed by passing trains. The walkway is not in keeping with the landscape area and it enables visitors to look in windows of this house. It is also felt that South Cambs should stop Mr Willers from putting up buildings and then applying for planning permission.
13. The owner/occupier of 12 Station Road, a nearby resident who enjoys walking down Angle Lane into the open countryside, has also objected to the application. The reason for the objection is that the site is outside the village framework and in the open countryside (as identified in at least two appeal cases). The bund forms a landscape screen ensuring that the view of the site from the open fields to Barrington is not obscured. Therefore it is felt that the nocturnal house should be located on the other side of the bund where there is space, and that the development does not constitute a necessary development within the countryside. Painting the structure black is strongly objected to and it is felt that a green roof design would be more appropriate, not simply painting the structure green. Similar concerns are expressed about the visual impact of the bund and its use as a walkway as it felt that it is important that the rural character of the villages is not eroded. It is considered that the

proposal is contrary to policy P7/4 – landscape, SE9 – village edges and EN1 – landscape of the South Cambs Local Plan.

14. A collectively signed letter has been received from the owner/occupiers of 2 and 3 Edieham Cottages who object to the application as the walkway will dramatically alter the view of the site from Barrington and visitors, especially children, will be close to the railway lines. The use of the walkway will increase noise levels and result in an overlooking of Edieham Cottages. Moreover the objectors are disturbed by the trend of building without gaining planning consent at the Park. There is also a fear that work on the walkway and nocturnal house will continue into the evening and cause a disturbance.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The long and varied history of planning applications and developments at Shepreth Wildlife Park has evidently caused concern amongst members of the local community. Moreover the fact that these latest developments are part retrospective has done little to allay those concerns expressed by nearby residents. Although the developments are retrospective Members should consider their acceptability on planning merits based on the two key issues that have come to light during the consultation process. These issues are the impact of the walkway on neighbour amenity and visually the impact of both the use of the walkway and the presence of the nocturnal house on the character of the surrounding countryside.

Impact upon neighbour amenity

16. Shepreth Wildlife Park is both a tourist attraction and animal sanctuary that is in the business of actively attracting visitors. It has been questioned whether the use of the bund constituted a change of use, which is not the case as the northern part of the site is included in the site area of the 1986 application for the wildlife sanctuary. A use of the northern part of the site by visitors is not a matter that would require express permission though the engineering works to construct the walkway would.
17. Originally the route of the walkway started at the nocturnal house and directed visitors, by way of the bund, towards the eastern boundary of the site where it dropped in height to join the part of the existing pathway network that runs alongside the eastern boundary fence. On the other side of the well-screened boundary fence there is a ditch and public footpath before one reaches the curtilages and front elevations of the Edieham Cottages in Angle Lane.
18. The distance between the closest point of the site boundary and the front elevation of the nearest Edieham Cottage is approximately 13.5 metres and the point where the original route of the walkway descended from the bank to the nearest Edieham Cottage was in excess of 20 metres. As a result of the Parish Council's comments an amendment to the route of the walkway was requested and received.
19. The amended end point of the walkway is now well in excess of 30 metres from the nearest Edieham Cottage, a distance which, given the well screened nature of the site boundary, is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact upon neighbour amenity by way of overlooking. Moreover the impact of noise from the walkway has been considered by the Chief Environmental Health Officer and is considered to be acceptable.
20. The enclosed nature of the nocturnal house and its distance from the nearest residential properties (approximately 55 metres) means that its impact upon

neighbour amenity is not considered to be an issue, though there have been local objections to its visual impact upon the countryside.

Visual impact upon the surrounding rural landscape

21. In terms of the use of the walkway it is inevitable that visitors will be visible from outside the site due to their elevated position. Though this visual impact should be considered no more unacceptable than seeing people using the nearby footpath from which views of the site has caused concern. If Members were minded to approve the application a condition requiring a scheme of landscaping would help to partially screen users of the walkway and any form of enclosure/fencing that might need to be erected. Given the concerns about the visual impact of development on the northern boundary of the site it is considered appropriate to attach a condition to any consent granted agreeing the details of any fencing or means of enclosure of the walkway.
22. Screening of the nocturnal house becomes more difficult to achieve given the fact that there is a functional need to maintain an area of land between the development and the boundary fence adjacent the railway tracks. Therefore in order to lessen the visual impact of the nocturnal house on the adjacent countryside an appropriate colour scheme would need to be considered. The proposed black weatherboarding would help give it the appearance of a rural outbuilding, though a condition would be used to agree the final finish and colour.
23. In one of the letters of objection a reference is made to the fact that the site is in the countryside and several Structure Plan and Local Plan policies are quoted. Policy SE9 in this case is not relevant as although the site is on the edge of the village it is not on the edge of the village framework, but it is accepted that the criteria do apply, as do those of the policies relating to landscape character areas (Structure Plan Policy P7/4 and Local Plan policy EN1).
24. It is recognised that no justification for either development has ever been given, except that the nocturnal house could be used to house the Park's wildfowl in case of an outbreak of bird flu. Although no justification has been put forward the developments are clearly proposed to diversify the experience of visitors to the site, and therefore securing its position in the local community as an employer and generator of visitors to the area, both of which will ultimately benefit the local economy.
25. When considering the character of the area it is necessary to look at how the rest of the northern boundary of Shepreth is presently defined and to understand that the wildlife park, although located in the countryside, is a brownfield site. The presence of the existing two-storey commercial/industrial units to the west of the site and the railway lines and associated development makes it difficult to argue that this part of the village has a rural appearance. Moreover the modest height of the nocturnal house means that, subject to an appropriate finish, the development should not appear as an incongruous feature along this already built up boundary of the village.
26. At this stage it has not been questioned as to whether there is a more appropriate site for the nocturnal house the other side of the bund, though after visiting the site it is clear that space within the confines of the Park is limited. It was first considered appropriate to ascertain whether the current location of the nocturnal house is acceptable or not before discussing other possible sites. It is my opinion that when seen in conjunction with the rest of the built development along the boundary with the railway tracks the nocturnal house and walkway are not unacceptable forms of development.

Recommendation

27. Approval as amended by letter dated 3rd August 2006 and amended drawing franked 15th August 2006.
1. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs of the nocturnal house (Rc - To ensure that the development is not an incongruous feature in the rural landscape);
 2. The walkway hereby permitted, shall be removed within 6 months of the date of this Decision Notice unless a means of enclosure for the walkway has been implemented in accordance with a scheme which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (Rc - To ensure that the development is not an incongruous feature in the rural landscape);-
 3. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 4. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52).

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:**
P1/2 (Environmental Restrictions on Development)
P4/1 (Tourism, Recreation and Leisure Strategy)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
RT1 (Recreation and Tourism 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 including noise disturbance and overlooking issues
 - Visual impact on the locality

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/0113/86/F and S/1158/06/F

Contact Officer: Edward Durrant – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713082

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee4th October 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1663/06/F - SHEPRETH**The Erection of a Dwelling and Garage at Land Adjacent 20 Angle Lane, Shepreth for David Reed Homes Limited****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 11th October 2006****Conservation Area****Site and Proposal**

1. The site, which is in the village framework and within the Conservation Area for Shepreth was once owned by the occupier of No.20 Angle Lane, comprising a detached two-storey dwelling. Following the sale of this land, the site has been subdivided and the application site now comprises 729m². The proposal sits to the northwest, set back slightly from the front building line of No.20 Angle Lane.
2. The site is bound by residential properties on three of its boundaries. To the front of the site, on the southwest boundary is Angle Lane, a road that is rural in appearance resembling a bridleway with very little vehicular movement. Opposite the front of the site is a small depot for Kenzies coaches. North of the site recent approval was granted for a pair of semi detached, two storey dwellings. To the east is the rear garden of No. 20 Angle Lane and to the west a bungalow, that is to be demolished once the new dwellings to the north are completed.
3. The full planning application received on the 16th August 2006 proposes the erection of a detached 4-bed dwelling house and an attached single garage. The highest part of the house measures 7.3 metres to the ridge and 4.5 metres to the eaves. The single storey element, located to the front of the property, measures 4.5 metres to the ridge and 2.5 metres to the eaves. The siting of the house is located approximately 1 metre from the south east boundary and 2 metres from the north west boundary, the closest part of the dwelling house is 10.5 metres from the front boundary. The rear garden is 25 metres in length.
4. The materials proposed include a mixture of plain and pan tiles with render, brick and timber boarding proposed for the fascias. The Design Statement that was included in this application comments on the vernacular design incorporating details and materials that are familiar in the surrounding properties in the village. It states that the varying height and materials are proposed to give the impression that the dwelling has evolved, much like number 20 Angle Lane.

Planning History

5. Planning permission was granted in 1995 for the erection of a house on the application site, of a different design and form to that now proposed. That consent expired in May 2002. Two applications for dwellings to the rear of 20 Angle Lane

were refused in 1996, the second of which was dismissed at appeal in 1997, on the grounds that it would neither preserve nor enhance the character of the Conservation Area. A revised application for a smaller dwelling at the rear was approved in 1998 after the then applicant entered into a Section 106 Agreement that meant that either scheme to the rear of 20 Angle Lane could be implemented but not both, to avoid what was considered at that time would be an over development of the site. An application submitted in 2002 proposed a detached house, again different to that of the proposed application in terms of layout and design. This was approved in 2003.

Planning Policy

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

6. **Policy P7/6** 'Historic Built Environment' of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
7. **P1/3** 'Sustainable Design in Built Development' of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 requires compact forms of development through the promotion of higher densities that responds to the local character of the built environment.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

8. **Policy HG10** 'Housing Mix and Design' sets out the requirements for residential developments to make the best use of sites in addition to be informed by the wider character and context of the surrounding area.
9. **Policy SE5** 'List of Infill Villages' sets out the requirements for new dwellings in infill village frameworks to consider issues of impact upon character and amenities of the locality.
10. **Policy EN30** 'Development in Conservation Areas' sets out the requirement for development within Conservation Areas to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of such areas.
11. **Policy EN12** seeks to retain features and habitats of nature conservation value.

Consultation

12. **Shepreth Parish Council** – Recommends that the application be refused. Concerns raised included sewers, the site being in a flood plain, too large for the plot, and a query regarding footpaths and the private access road.
13. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – Has considered the application and the implications of the proposals in terms of noise and environmental pollution and has no objection.
14. The **Conservation Manager** – Has no objections, all materials to be agreed.
15. The **Ecology Officer** requests condition/informatives to be attached to any consent.
16. The comments of the **Trees and Landscape Officer** will be reported at the meeting

Representations

17. One letter has been received from the occupier of 16 Angle Lane. The concerns relate to the intensification of vehicular movement that will use the lane, the adverse impact on the Conservation Area and the cluttered appearance of two drives side by side.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

18. The principle of development on this site has already been established through previous planning consents. The key issues relevant to this application are impact on neighbour amenity and the impact on the Conservation Area.

Impact upon neighbour amenity

19. The residents at No. 20 Angle Lane are not adversely affected by the development as the fenestration has been arranged so as not to infringe on the privacy and the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The siting of the dwelling is located further back than that of No. 20 and the impact of the building is predominately to the rear, away from that of No. 20. In relation to the neighbouring bungalow, this is to be demolished in the near future and is of an adequate distance from the new dwellings, which are located some distance behind the proposed scheme.

Impact upon the Conservation Area

20. Officers have had various dealings with this site since the original approval and discussions regarding the application site with the Agent have concluded that the current design approach is acceptable and a better approach to that of the originally approved scheme. Further negotiation, preliminary to this application, has achieved a design that is in accordance with the relevant policies and preserves the Conservation Area. I have no objections to the access arrangements.

Recommendations

21. Approval subject to safeguarding conditions
 1. SCA – RCA;
 2. SC5 – submission of details a, b, c, d, – RC5 a) i) ii), b), c), d);
 3. No power operated machinery shall be operated on the site, during the course of construction, 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;
 4. SC51 – Landscaping – RC51;
 5. SC52 – Implementation of Landscaping – RC52;
 6. SC56 – Protect Trees – RC56;
 7. SC60 – Boundary treatment – all boundaries – RC60;
 8. SC22 –No further windows (northwest and southeast elevation and roof slope) – RC22;
 9. SC23 – Obscured glass – northwest elevation – RC23;
 10. CS Para – C3 a) and b) – Permanent Turning and Parking – CS RC b – Safety;
 11. CS Para – C2 Temporary Parking – CS RC10 – Safety;

12. Control of vegetation during nesting period – for ecology purposes;
13. Provision of the scheme of nest and bat box provision. (Rc - To provide habitats in accordance with Policy EN12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.)

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)
P7/6 (Historic Built Environment)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
HG10 (Housing Mix and Design)
SE5 (Development in Infill Villages)
EN30 (Development in Conservation Areas)
EN12 (Nature Conservation)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations, which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Adverse impact on the Conservation Area
 - Increase in vehicular movement

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/1663/06/F, S/1143/06/F, S/1133/06/F

Contact Officer: Saffron Garner– Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713082

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee4th October 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director/ Head of Planning Services

S/1642/06/F - FEN DRAYTON**Erection of Reception/Office Building and Polytunnel (Amended Design) for Bannold.****Recommendation: Approval****Date for determination: 5th October 2006****Departure from the Development Plan****Site and Proposal**

1. The site comprises 2.3 hectares land in the rural area to the south-west of Fen Drayton, close to the slipway to the A14 eastbound. The land was formerly in use as a nursery, having a large single-storey agricultural building a number of glasshouses in poor condition. There are several storage bins with soils, sand and gravel, together with disused plant, equipment and vehicles on the site. A crop of Norwegian Spruce grows at the south eastern end of the site.
2. Access to the site is from Mill Road. The northwest boundary of the site adjoins the rear garden areas of a pair of dwellings, Nos 1 and 2 Mill Road. To the north east of the site, there are more nurseries. To the south west, the site is bounded by Huntingdon Road, where there is a mature hedgerow boundary. To the south east, the site adjoins a warehouse unit in use by Cambridge Produce Brokers.
3. This full application, dated 27th July 2006, proposes revised details for two buildings previously approved under planning permission S/1642/06/F. The office/reception building is amended to be a reclaimed oak-framed barn of aisled construction, known as Whidleys barn. This is a tall building – 9.5m to ridge – but single-storey with a small mezzanine level. It is to be clad in weatherboard and Tudor facing bricks, with a reclaimed pantile roof. The ground floor area of 220 sq m is similar to that previously approved. The proposed polyhouse is a single structure of approximately the same dimensions as the three greenhouses previously approved, and in the same location.

Planning History

4. Planning permission was granted on this site on 15th February 2006 with this description: 'Expansion of existing nursery facilities to retain tree plantation, provide 3 greenhouses, together with a change of use for 11 showgardens, area for storage and supply of hard and soft landscaping materials; erection of a reception/office building; retention of existing barn for ancillary storage and staff facilities; car parking and construction of a vehicular access to Huntingdon Road'. (S/2192/05/F).

Planning Policy

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

5. **P1/1** (Approach to Development)- development should be located where travel distances by car can be minimised, walking and cycling encouraged and where good transport accessibility exists or can be provided.
6. **P1/2** (Environmental Restrictions on Development)- development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
7. **P2/5** (Distribution, Warehousing and Manufacturing) – these uses will only be permitted on sites with good access to rail freight facilities, and to motorways, trunk or other primary routes.
8. **P2/6** (Rural Economy) – sensitive small-scale development in rural areas will be facilitated where it contributes, *inter alia*, to supporting new and existing businesses; to farm or rural diversification where appropriate to the rural area; to the re-use of existing buildings; towards helping to maintain or renew the vitality of rural areas.
9. **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

10. **EM10** (Conversion of Rural Buildings and Future Extensions) – outside village frameworks planning permission will be granted for the change of use and conversion of rural buildings to employment use subject to a number of provisions including:
 - (a) The buildings do not require major reconstruction;
 - (b) The conversion will not prejudice village vitality;
 - (c) The appearance after conversion is in keeping with the surroundings;
 - (d) The conversion does not materially change the material character of the building or the surrounding countryside;
 - (e) Safe access and satisfactory provision for parking and turning of vehicles can be achieved without detriment to the setting of the building or the surrounding landscape;
 - (f) Scale and frequency of traffic generated can be accommodated on the road system without undue effects.
11. **Paragraph 5.49** states: "Because most rural buildings in South Cambridgeshire are small the potential scale of activity of converted buildings will usually be similarly modest. Any elements of increased floorspace contained within conversion proposals will be strictly controlled and usually limited to that which may be necessary to achieve an enhanced design or integrate the scheme with its surroundings".
12. **Policy SH10** (Farm Shops and Nurseries) Sales from farms and nurseries of produce and/or craft goods will be permitted, subject to other policies in the Plan, provided they:
 - (a) Only sell goods of which the majority must be produced on the farm or in the locality;
 - (b) Do not generate a traffic problem;

- (c) Do not create a nuisance or create a visual intrusion;
 - (d) Do not adversely affect the setting or character of existing development.
13. The supporting text indicates “ The District Council is concerned about sporadic development in the open countryside but is aware of the special cases of nurseries and farm shops which can assist the viability of existing enterprises. Whilst nurseries and farmers may sell goods produced in the holding, there has been a trend for such outlets to include a wider range of goods including goods which are not produced locally. Operating with lower overheads, these sales could have adverse effect on the economic viability of existing shopping facilities in nearby villages. Nursery and farm sales should therefore be restricted to those goods which are primarily produced at the site.”
14. **Policy SH12** (Garden Centres): Garden centres will not be permitted unless they conform to the following criteria:
- (a) Convenience sales will not be permitted where it would have a significant adverse impact, either individually or cumulatively, on the viability and vitality of the existing the Rural and Limited Rural Growth Settlements in South Cambridgeshire, or other village centres;
 - (b) Not be located within the countryside or in such a location that the visual amenities of the countryside would be adversely affected;
 - (c) Be well related in scale and character to the settlement or surrounding development;
 - (d) Be conveniently located and well related to the primary road network and accessible by public transport, cyclists and pedestrians;
 - (e) Not create local traffic difficulties;
 - (f) Not prejudice the residential environment; and
 - (g) Not conflict with other policies and proposals in the Structure and Local Plans.
15. The supporting text states,” Garden centres are different from nurseries because the retail activity undertaken is not ancillary to the growing of stock on the site. Therefore, whilst they can be large users of land, garden centres do not need to be located in the countryside. A garden centre is wholly a retail activity and can be accommodated on retail warehouse parks or on the edge of existing urban areas. However, like petrol filling stations and farm shops, they can benefit from lower overheads and should not be permitted to sell convenience or other goods where it could undermine the viability of village shops which are better located to serve the entire population, not just those with ready access to motor car.”
16. **Policy EN3** (Landscaping and Design Standards for New Development in the Countryside) – new development in the countryside should reinforce local distinctiveness in terms of scale, design, layout, materials and landscaping.
17. **Policy Fen Drayton 1:** Within the area of the former Land Settlement Association Estate, planning permission will not be granted for housing or commercial development unless it is directly related to the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry or other uses appropriate to a rural area. The supporting text indicates that the former estate is the subject of a 1937 Planning Agreement which restricts the use of land, buildings and dwellings to those of agriculture and horticulture.

Consultations

18. **Fen Drayton Parish Council** – no objection to the development.

19. **Highways Agency** – The Highways Agency has reiterated its requirement that a travel plan should be provided to support the proposal.
20. **Environment Agency** – the Environment Agency has restated its recommendations for two conditions and informatives as for the previous planning approval.

Representations

21. Representations have been received from the present occupier of the site, and the occupier of the adjacent dwelling at 2, Mill Road, to confirm no objections to the proposal.

Planning Comments

22. The revised design to these two buildings do not raise any issue of principle. The appearance of the site will not be significantly affected, and there will be adverse impact on neighbouring amenity or the appearance of the countryside. The approved uses on the site will be unchanged.
23. The previous application was referred to the Secretary of State as a departure from the development plan, but was not called in for determination by her. In these circumstances I deem it unnecessary to refer the current application to her.

Recommendation

24. Approval of the application, dated 27th July 2006, subject to the following conditions:
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. All conditions and informatives attached to planning permission reference S/2192/05/F in respect of the site as a whole. (Reason - In the interests of the proper planning of the area).

Informatives

1. The development is considered generally to accord the following policies in the Development Plan:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P2/6** (Rural Economy)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: P2/5** (Distribution, Warehousing and Manufacturing); **EN3** (Landscaping and Design Standards for New Development in the Countryside)
2. The development is considered to be acceptable as an exception to other policies in the Development Plan, notably **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 P1/2** (Environmental Restrictions on Development), and **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 EM10** (Conversion of Rural Buildings and Future Extensions), **Policy SH10** (Farm Shops and Nurseries), **Policy SH12** (Garden Centres) and **Fen Drayton 1** because of the limited visual intrusion into the countryside, the proximity to the A14 which will afford safe vehicular access with minimal use of the rural road network, the retention of a significant element of a horticultural use, and the limited impact on the viability and vitality of village centres in South Cambridgeshire.

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/1642/06/F, S/2192/05/F.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee4th October 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1406/06/F – STEEPLE MORDEN
Change of Use of Agricultural Building to General Industry (Class B2),
Unit 3, Morden Grange Farm, Baldock Road

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 8th September 2006

Site and Proposal

1. Morden Grange Farm is located 1.3km north of the A505 in Steeple Morden parish. It is served by a long roadway that accesses direct to the dual carriageway section of the A505. It comprises a farmhouse and range of traditional and modern farm buildings to the north.
2. This full application, registered on 14th July 2006, proposes the change of use a section (105m²) of an existing brick and slate roofed building to B2 General Industrial use. Parking for 6 vehicles is provided, to be shared with another section of the building that already has consent for B2 use.
3. To the south of Morden Grange Farm itself are a pair of cottages owned by the applicant.

Planning History

4. Planning consent was granted in December 2005 for the conversion of 210m² of floorspace, in two buildings, to Class B2 use (**Ref: S/1942/05/F**). Conditions attached to that consent include restricting the occupation of the buildings to B2 uses only in order to restrict the number of vehicle movements from the site, and link the use of the buildings to Morden Grange Farm due to their proximity.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy EM10** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 ("The Local Plan") states that outside village frameworks planning permission will be granted for the change of use and conversion of rural buildings to employment use provided that, amongst other criteria:
 - (a) The buildings are of permanent and substantial construction and are capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction;
 - (b) The form, bulk and general design of the buildings both before and after conversion are in keeping with their surroundings;
 - (c) The buildings are capable of re-use without materially changing their existing character or impact upon the surrounding countryside;

- (d) Safe and satisfactory vehicular access can be provided together with adequate space within the curtilage to accommodate ancillary requirements such as car parking and lorry manoeuvring without significant detriment to the setting of the building and the landscape within which it is located;
 - (e) The scale and frequency of traffic generated by the proposal can be accommodated on the road system without undue adverse effects.
6. This policy reflects objectives of Policy P2/6 of the approved Structure Plan 2003, which encourages sensitive small scale employment development in rural areas through, amongst others, the re-use of existing buildings and Government advice in Planning Policy Statement 7: “Sustainable Development in Rural Areas”.

Consultation

7. **Steeple Morden Parish Council** recommends refusal. It states that in view of the response of Hertfordshire County Council to the earlier application for Units 1 and 2 “we feel obliged to recommend refusal, as we are not aware of any necessary upgrading of the access road in the intervening time.”
8. The **Local Highway Authority** (in this case Hertfordshire County Council) notes from the application that there is no increase in heavy goods vehicles using the existing access and there will be three additional light vehicles that would use the access road. This increase in the number of light vehicles is acceptable in highway terms. The visibility at the junction of the access road with the A505 is acceptable and the width of the access is capable of accommodating two-way traffic at the junction. It states that the final section of road to the junction of the A505 and the section leading to the new proposal because of its horizontal alignment, width and forward visibility would not be suitable to accommodate a significant higher level of traffic than that proposed. Parking provision is considered acceptable. It is of the view that the proposed increase in level of traffic has no significant implications for the safe and efficient operation of the adjoining highway network and therefore it does not wish to restrict the granting of planning permission on highway grounds.
9. The **Environment Agency** requests the imposition of conditions requiring schemes for foul and surface water drainage, and pollution control. In addition there are a number of informatives to be attached to any approval notice.
10. The **Chief Environmental Health Officer** states that the implications of the proposal in terms of noise and pollution control have been considered and it is concluded that there are no significant impacts from an Environmental Health standpoint.
11. The comments of the **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** are awaited.

Representations

12. None received

Planning Comments – Key Issues

13. The key issue to be considered with this application is whether the proposal complies with the various criteria set out under Policy EM10 of the Local Plan, and in particular the issue of highway safety.

14. The building is of traditional form. There are no external alterations proposed and adequate car parking can be provided on existing hardsurfaced areas within the site. The application shows the provision of 6 car parking spaces for the proposed unit and an existing unit, which have a total floor area of 285m². This provision meets the Councils' standards.
15. The roadway leading to Morden Grange Farm exits onto the dual carriageway section of the A505 and traffic can only turn east and enter from the west. Whilst visibility at the junction is good traffic is fast moving along the main road. In commenting on the previous application Hertfordshire County Council, as Local Highway Authority, stated that "any further development that generates additional levels of traffic that has an impact on the existing road would have to cater for the two-way traffic that ensues. This would involve widening and lengthening the stretch of road that can accommodate two-way traffic at the junction of the A505 in order to provide storage of queuing vehicles. The final section of road to the junction of the A505 and the section leading to the proposal because of its horizontal alignment, width and forward visibility would not be suitable to accommodate higher levels of traffic than that proposed. Any cumulative increase in traffic off the existing access road is likely to have an adverse impact on the operation and safety within the site and adjoining properties. A properly designed access road with the capacity to accept two way traffic that is anticipated to use the access road would have to be submitted to the Highway Authority demonstrating a suitable link between the A505 and the new development is achievable."
16. No improvement works to the access roadway and junction are proposed as part of this application and I have written to Hertfordshire County Council requesting clarification as to why it supports the proposal given its previous comments. I will report the response at the meeting.
17. If Hertfordshire County Council confirms its position of not wishing to object to this application I will recommend to Members that it is approved. If, after further consideration, it supports the wish of Steeple Morden Parish Council to see upgrading of the access I will contact the applicant to require the submission of a suitable scheme.

Recommendation

18. Subject to confirmation from Hertfordshire County Council as Local Highway Authority that it supports the application as submitted, consent be granted subject to the following conditions.
 1. SCA - 3 Years (RCA);
 2. SC9 - Linked Occupation – Morden Grange (RC9);
 3. SC39 - Restrict Use to Class – Class B2 (Reason - To ensure that the Local Planning Authority retains control over any future change of use of the buildings that might result in an increase in the number of vehicles using the existing access to the A505.);
 4. SC36 - No Outside Storage (RC36);
 5. The use hereby permitted shall not commence until car parking for the unit has been provided in accordance with the details shown on the submitted drawing D1 – Layout Plan. That area shall thereafter be reserved for the parking of cars in association with the approved use. (Reason – To ensure adequate space is provided and thereafter maintained on site for parking of vehicles in association with the approved use);

6. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage shall be submitted to and agreed 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);
7. 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 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 ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage);
8. 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 agreed 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).

Informatives

Environment Agency informatives to be attached.

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:**
P2/6 (Rural Economy)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
EM10 (Employment in the Countryside)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Highway safety

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

- County Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Planning File Refs: S/1406/06/F & S/1942/05/F
- Documents referred to in the report including appendices on the website only and reports to previous meetings

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee 4th October 2006
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1420/06/F – GREAT SHELFORD
Erection of House and Garage Following Demolition of Existing Dwelling and Garage
at 12 Woodlands Road for David Reed Homes Ltd

Recommendation: Approval

Date for determination: 11th September 2006

Members will visit the site on Monday 2nd October 2006

Site and Proposal

1. The application relates to 0.24 hectare/0.6 acre site currently occupied by a two-storey roughcast render over red brick plinth and plaintile roof house and its gardens. The front/southeast boundary is marked by 2 metre high approximately hedge save for two existing accesses onto Woodlands Road. No.8, a two-storey plus accommodation in the roofspace dwelling stands beyond the 2 metres high approximately boundary hedge to the north. No.8 has a small first floor window, ground floor door and secondary kitchen window in its south elevation facing the application site. No.12 stands beyond the 2 metres high boundary hedge to the southwest and is a two-storey render, red brick and tile house with no windows in its side elevation facing the application site. The rear boundary with 5 Spinney Drive is marked by a 2.5m high boundary hedge with trees within 5 Spinney Drive's rear garden.
2. This full application, received on the 20th July 2006 and amended by plans date stamped the 1st September 2006, proposes the erection of a 5-bedroom detached dwelling faced in brick, render and boarding with a plaintile and pantile roof. It has a 32.5 metre approximately frontage. The main ridge is 10.6m long and stands 9.9 metres high. A 6.5m x 6.2m x 6.2m high render over red brick plinth and plaintile roof detached double garage close to the boundary with No.14 is also proposed. The density equates to approximately 4 dwellings to the hectare. The submitted Site Layout Plan indicates that 4 new lime trees would be planted on the roadside verge, but this land is outside of the control of the applicant. One of the plans date stamped 1st September indicates that No.8 has a ridge height of approximately 9.9m and No.14 has a ridge height of approximately 7.2m.

Planning History

3. An outline application for a dwelling on part of the application site between Nos. 8 and 12 was refused in 1990 under reference **S/1470/90/O** on the grounds that "The erection of a dwelling on this side garden plot would be out of keeping with the low density character of housing in Woodlands Road which comprises houses on well spaced plots, set in relatively large gardens and served by a road of informal rural character."

4. Full applications to erect 2 dwellings on the site following the demolition of the existing dwelling were withdrawn in 2005 and 2006 (planning references **S/1945/05/F** and **S/0027/06/F** respectively).

Planning Policy

5. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/3** relates to sustainable design in built development and requires a high standard of design for all new development which responds to the local character of the built environment.
6. Local Plan 2004 **Policy SE2** states that residential development will be permitted on unallocated land within the village framework of Great Shelford 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 which relates to the loss of employment sites. It also states that development should provide an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and affordability and should achieve a minimum density of 30 dwellings to the hectare unless there are strong design grounds for not doing so.
7. Local Plan 2004 **Policy HG10** states that residential developments will be required to make the best use of the site and promote a sense of community which reflects local needs. It also states that 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.
8. Local Plan 2004 **Paragraph 39.25** recognises the low-density character of the housing at Woodlands Road and Woodlands Close, and seeks to protect this by setting out a presumption against infill development in this part of the village.
9. **Great Shelford Village Design Statement**, adopted by the District Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance in February 2004, provides design guidance to ensure that new developments reflect local characteristics and qualities. Paragraph 9.3 states that “The earliest private estate developments were Coppice Avenue, the northern end of Buristead Road and Woodlands Road in the Edwardian period, with later additions and in-filling in both cases. Large detached houses in wooded privacy predominate ...”

Consultations

10. **Great Shelford Parish Council** made no recommendation in relation to the original submission “until additional information is forthcoming.” It stated “This is a very large house and although it does not fill as much of the frontage as the recently approved houses at 1 and 2 Woodlands Close will have a significant impact on the street scene. In order to properly assess this impact we would like to see an elevation to the street accurately showing the proposed building and its relationship to adjoining properties. The building at 10 metres is far too high and would dominate its neighbours – it obviously has a second floor but no plans have been included. If it is not proposed to occupy this level, the roof line could be much lower and in keeping with existing properties.”

11. In response to this request for additional information, the agent stated that the applicant feels that to produce a street scene would be extremely difficult and may result in inaccurate information due to the curvature of the road and the angle of the two adjacent properties. As an alternative, he submitted amended plans (date stamped 1st September) which indicated the ridge heights of the adjoining properties on the elevation drawings. These plans have been forwarded to the Parish Council. Any further comments received from the Parish Council will be reported verbally at the meeting.
12. **Trees & Landscape Officer** has no objection in terms of the proximity of the proposed new access to the adjacent false acacia.
13. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** recommends that conditions relating to the times when power operated machinery shall not be operated during the demolition and construction periods except in accordance with agreed noise restrictions and driven pile foundations are attached to any approval. He also recommends that informatives are attached to any approval stating that there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site during demolition and construction except with his Department's prior permission and, before the existing property is demolished, a Demolition Notice will be required.

Representations

14. Objections have been received from the occupiers of Riversdale, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 24 Woodlands Road on the following grounds:
 1. The existing dwelling is a substantial house of attractive design in a good state of repair which, like other properties in the road, is of individual style but which blends well and is of a size that allows a pleasing proportion of green space around it. It could also be sympathetically extended to make a very pleasant family house;
 2. The style of the proposed dwelling is at odds with anything currently existing in the road, except Mr Reed's existing house at No.25, and, if built, the proposed dwelling would, in one stroke, transform Woodlands Road as a result of its size (length and height) and incompatible style;
 3. The development would be dominant, overpowering, obtrusive, offensive and oppressive and would make this exceptionally attractive, charming residential road look more like a suburban street;
 4. The development would spoil the ambience of the road;
 5. The development would be overbearing and oppressive to the adjoining dwellings, and No.8 in particular;
 6. Loss of sunlight and heat to, and outlook from, No.8;
 7. Overlooking and overshadowing of No.8;
 8. The dwelling appears to have a second storey but no second floor plans have been submitted;
 9. The development will impact on many villagers as Woodlands Road is used by them as a safe and enjoyable walkway and cycleway; and
 10. The proposal is contrary to the Village Plan in terms of infill and architecture.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The main issues in relation to this application are: the impact on the street scene and the character and appearance of the area; and impact on neighbours. Whilst the existing dwelling is of some merit, provided its replacement did not harm the street scene and the character and appearance of the area and/or the amenity of neighbours, its replacement could not reasonably be resisted.
16. There is no doubt that the proposed dwelling is very large. That said, it is a very large plot with a frontage of approximately 66m. At its closest points, due to the shape of the site, the dwelling would be 5m from the boundary with No.8 and 10m from the boundary with No.14, albeit the proposed garage is sited between the proposed dwelling and No.14. The proposed dwelling is also similar in height to the existing, adjacent dwelling at No.8. The proposed dwelling is 9.9m high at its highest point and the plans accompanying an application for extensions and alterations to No.8 (S/2634/89/F) also showed No.8 to be approximately 9.9m high. The application site also marks the transition between the generally smaller and relatively tighter group of dwellings to the north and the generally larger dwellings set in significantly larger plots further along Woodlands Road. The architect has also adopted design principles to try and assimilate the scale of the development into its context by siting the higher elements closer to No.8 and stepping down towards the lower dwelling at No.14. The design, and the roof in particular, is also broken up into different elements to reduce the bulk of the proposal. Whilst this is a very large dwelling, it is considered that this particular plot can satisfactorily accommodate a dwelling of this scale without compromising the character and appearance of the area. Given the large size of the proposed dwelling, should Members be minded to approve the application, it is considered that permitted development rights for extensions/alterations and outbuildings should be removed.
17. The design of the dwelling is different to other dwellings along Woodlands Road but the character of Woodlands Road is partly a result of the differing design of dwellings. The design of the dwelling is considered to be acceptable.
18. The development will have some impact on the amenity of neighbours and the amenity of the occupiers of No.8 in particular in terms of loss of winter sunlight to its southern elevation. However, there is only one small first floor window, a ground floor door and a secondary kitchen window in its south elevation facing the application site. The development is not considered to result in serious harm to the amenity of neighbours and the impact on neighbours is not therefore considered to be reason to refuse the application. A condition should however be attached to any permission to ensure that any additional openings above ground floor level or in the roof of the dwelling and/or in the garage require a further planning application.
19. The Local Highway Authority has indicated that it would not support an application for further residential development along Woodlands Road until the road was widened close to its junction with London Road, and it appears unlikely that the 'Residents' Association' (Shelford Woodlands Properties Limited) will agree to this work. In view of this, the presumption in the Local Plan against in-fill development and my conclusions above, I consider that this application would ensure that the best use of the site is made without compromising the character of the area or the amenity of neighbours.

Recommendation

20. Approval (as amended by drawing nos. 06032-01A and 06032-02 date stamped 1st September 2006).
1. Standard Time Condition A – Time limited permission (RCA);
 2. SC5 – Details of materials to be used for the external walls and roofs and hard surfaced areas within the site (RC To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development);
 3. SC51 – Landscaping scheme (RC51);
 4. SC52 – Implementation of landscaping scheme (RC52);
 5. During the periods of demolition and construction ... SC26 (0800, 0800, 1800, 1300) – Restriction on hours of use of power operated machinery during demolition and construction periods (RC26);
 6. No additional windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted above ground floor level in the walls and/or in the roof of the dwelling hereby permitted and/or in the walls or roof of the garage hereby permitted unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf (RC22);
 7. SC21 (Part 1, Classes A (The enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse), B (The enlargement of a dwellinghouse consisting of an addition or alteration to its roof) and E (The provision of any building or enclosure or the maintenance, improvement or other alteration of such a building or enclosure) – Removal of permitted development rights (RC21c harm to the character and appearance of the area and/or the amenity of neighbours).

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 (Residential Development in Rural Growth Settlements) and
HG10 (Housing Mix and Design)
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 of the development in the street scene and on the character and appearance of the area; and impact on neighbours.

Informatives

Should driven pile foundations be proposed, before development commences, a statement of the method for construction of these foundations should be submitted to and agreed by the District Council's Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.

During demolition and construction, there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site except with the prior permission of the District Council's Environmental Health Officer in accordance with best practice and existing waste management legislation.

Before the existing property is demolished, a Demolition Notice will be required from the District Council's Environmental Health 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:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Great Shelford Village Design Statement 2004
- Planning file Refs: S/2634/89/F, S/1470/90/O, S/1945/05/F, S/0027/06/F and S/1420/06/F
- Documents referred to in the report including appendices on the website only and reports to previous meetings

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee 4th October 2006
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1615/06/F- STAPLEFORD
Fence at 8A Gog Magog Way for Mr & Mrs Philbrook

Recommendation: Approval
Date for Determination: 5th October 2006

Conservation Area**Site and Proposal**

1. No 8A Gog Magog Way is a 2 storey detached house set back from the road. The front boundary has a row of trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The existing frontage has low-level chain link fencing and at the sides of the entrance gate are hedges. The land drops from the public highway to the application site. There is a narrow verge between the trees and the footpath.
2. Properties opposite the application site, Nos. 7-13 Gog Magog Way, have open frontages. Nearby No 8 Gog Magog Way has hedges and entrance gates, and No 2a Dukes Meadow has close-boarded fencing facing Gog Magog Way.
3. The application, registered on 10th August 2006, seeks to erect a 2.4m high close-boarded fence along the 78 metre frontage of the site with Yew hedges fronting the proposed fencing. The proposed fence would be 1.8 metre high above the level of the footpath, albeit 2.4 metres above ground level.

Planning History

4. None related

Planning Policy

5. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 requires a high standard of design which responds to the local character of the built environment for all new development.
6. **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.
7. **Policy HG12** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 partly states that the alteration of dwellings will not be permitted where there would be an unacceptable visual impact upon the street scene and/or boundary treatment would provide an unacceptable standard of visual amenity.
8. **Policy EN5** of the Local Plan requires trees to be retained wherever possible in proposals for new development.

9. **Policy EN30** of the Local Plan requires for development within Conservation Areas to protect or enhance their character and appearance.

Consultation

10. **Stapleford Parish Council** recommends refusal and states that 'fence would be unduly high'.
11. **Conservation Manager** has no objection providing that a landscaping condition is imposed requiring the planting of an appropriate hedge and providing no damage will result to the trees.
12. **Trees and Landscape Officer** met the applicants' agent on the site. The agent showed the depth of the proposed fencing and she has no objection to the proposal.
13. **Landscape Design Officer** considers that the fence would not be in keeping with the surrounding area given that there are no other fences in the road and that the area is semi-rural in character and mostly hedged with privet. He considers that the proposed Yew hedge would be too formal and he would suggest a mix of native hedge species be planted. The plants will require careful planting to avoid competition from the existing trees and laurel.

Representations

14. The applicants' agent submitted letters to support the application:
- The Parish Council's objection due to height of the fence is because of the fact that certain adjoining residents believe that they have a right to a view of the pond or that the pond should form part of a village amenity;
 - The pond is under the private ownership of the applicants; and
 - The proposal is primarily for security purpose.
15. The applicants submitted letters to support the application:
- The original hedge on the site was dying in parts earlier this year as a result of Honey Fungus and the applicants were advised by Royal Horticultural Society to remove the hedge which resulted in lack of privacy and security;
 - Due to the cost of replacing a yew hedge, the applicants decided to seek permission to erect a fence with a small yew hedge (for the benefit of residents and passers by) along the roadside in order to soften the fence;
 - There are many 1.8 m high close boarded fences on Gog Magog Way and Hinton Way which are not screened by hedges;
 - As property owners, the applicants have a duty of care to passers by to keep them safe (particularly children) and from falling in the pond and drowning;
 - The applicants and their children had previous incidents in regard to intrusion and confrontation including oral abuse, missiles and objects thrown into their land, and damage to the property;
 - The proposed fence would help reduce the anti social behaviour of the minority of passers by and to provide security and privacy to the applicants and their children;
 - A small minority of Stapleford residents regard the pond as part of the village which is not a relevant consideration since the applicants are the legal owners of the pond; and
 - A list of properties with 1.8m high plus fences in the immediate locality (within 0.5 miles of the application site) has been submitted.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

16. The key issues in relation to this application are whether there would be an unacceptable visual impact upon the street scene and boundary treatment would provide an unacceptable standard of visual amenity; landscaping of the site; and any harmful impact to the trees on the site that are protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

Visual impact upon the street scene

17. I consider that, if the proposal is accompanied by appropriate planting to screen the fence, the resultant street scene would be acceptable and the proposed fence along the road frontage would not be very prominent in the streetscape. Regarding the height of the fence, due to the fact that the land drops away from the edge of the footpath, the height of the fence would be 1.8 metres above footpath level.

Landscaping of the site

18. It is considered that appropriate landscaping on the roadside of the proposed fencing would enhance the visual amenity of the development and it can be secured by conditions. The Landscape Design Officer considers that a mix of native hedge species would be more appropriate than the proposed Yew hedge. The applicants' agent agrees to submit revised drawings to state proposed hedge species to be agreed. This can be secured by condition.

Trees on the frontage that are protected by Tree Preservation Order

19. Given that the Trees and Landscape Officer has no objection to the proposal and that the protection of the trees on the site is subject to the imposition of condition on the foundation details of the fence, I do not consider that the proposal would be harmful to the TPO trees.
20. For the above reasons, the proposal is consistent with the local plan policies and my recommendation is one of approval.

Recommendation

21. Approve as amended by drawing number 662/01A date stamped 25th September 2006:
1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission, 3 years. (Reason A)
 2. SC 51 – Landscaping (RC 51)
 3. SC 52 – Implementation of landscaping (RC 52)
 4. No development shall commence until foundation details of the hereby permitted fence 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 protect the trees along the frontage of the application site.)

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:**
Policy P1/3 (Sustainable Design in Built Development)
Policy P7/6 (Historic Built Environment)

- **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
Policy HG12 (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks)
Policy EN5 (The Landscaping of New Development)
Policy 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:

- Visual impact in the street and Conservation Area.

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
- File references: S/1615/06/F

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee4th October 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

**S/1603/06/F - WATERBEACH
Bungalow at Land Adjacent to 16 Winfold Road
for Mr Smith****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 4th October 2006****Site and Proposal**

1. The 0.032 hectare site is part of the grassed side garden to no.16 Winfold Road, which is an end of terrace two-storey property (nos.18, 20, 22 and 24 inclusive). The site is located to the west of No.16 Winfold road, access to which is provided via an adopted footpath that runs along the frontage of the terrace which connects to a communal parking area, which is also part of the adopted highway. The western boundary of the site is defined by a close-boarded fence. Beyond this boundary which is the edge of the village framework, is the Cambridge Green Belt. No.14a Winfold Road is located directly opposite the site to the north and at present has a 2m high hedge, which separates the two sites. There is a communal parking area to the front of the terrace and two garage courts, which are accessed off the cul-de-sac all of which provide the residents with on and off street car parking. Nos. 2 and 14a are the only exceptions to the communal parking as both have off street parking areas.
2. This application, registered on 9th August 2006, seeks an amended design to that approved under Planning Application S/0089/06/F. The revision seeks to extend the roof height of the bungalow by 0.20m from 5.65m to 5.85m, with the inclusion of 4 roof lights to the south roof slope and a first floor port hole window within the west elevation. Apart from this revision the bungalow would be as approved on the 14th March 2006. The extension to the ridge height would allow the loft space to be used as an additional bedroom with en-suite bathroom. The property would then become a 3 bedroom chalet style bungalow. The proposed density equates to 31 dwellings per hectare.

Planning History

3. Planning application **S/2609/04/F**, which sought consent for the erection of a bungalow, was withdrawn.
4. Planning application **S/0391/05/F**, which sought consent for the erection of a bungalow, was approved at Committee in May 2005. The Decision Notice was date 17th June 2005.
5. Planning application **S/0089/06/F**, which sought an amended design to the original permission (S/0391/05/F) for the erection of a bungalow was approved on 14th March 2006.

Planning Policy

6. 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.
7. Policy **SE2** 'Rural Growth Settlements' of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 defines Waterbeach as a Rural Growth Settlement in which residential development will be permitted on unallocated land providing the development meets with the criteria of this and other policies included within the Local Plan. Development should provide an appropriate mix of dwellings and should achieve a minimum density of 30dph unless there are strong design grounds for not doing so.
8. Policy **SE9** 'Village Edges' of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that development on the edges of villages should be sympathetically designed and landscaped to minimise any impact on the surrounding countryside.

Consultations

9. **Waterbeach Parish Council** – The Parish Council recommends refusal and re-literates all comments previously made on applications on this site. With particular regard to this application the Council considers that with the increased height and the additional room the site would be overdeveloped.
10. **Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board** - The application is outside the District but within an area that drains into it. The application states that surface water will be disposed of "to soakaways". Providing this method of surface water disposal is incorporated into any development on this site, the Board will not object to this application.
11. **Trees & Landscape Officer** – This application is for the same site as application S/0089/06/F. The site has been visited in the interim and the changes required to the landscaping scheme have been discussed on site. The applicant is preparing a revised scheme as discussed. Scheme not approved until the following details are received:
 - a. Fencing painted dark colour
 - b. Plant climbers along the field edge of the fence (inside plot to climb over)
 - c. Front trellis removed from front garden
 - d. Plant species Picea Abies replaced with native Hawthorn within front garden

The above comments have been addressed for planning application S/0089/06/F and the landscaping condition has been discharged. The same scheme is awaited for this application.

12. **Local Highway Authority** – Suggests refusal unless off street car parking can be provided.

Representations

13. None received

Planning Comments – Key Issues

14. The main issues to consider in relation to this application are the impact of the amended design of the development on the residential amenities of neighbours and highway safety.

Residential amenities of neighbours

15. The raising of the ridge height of the bungalow would not be to the detriment of the amenities that the neighbouring residents currently enjoy as the adjacent property to the east, no.16, is a two storey dwelling and the opposite property to the north no.14a is some 9 metres away and has no windows within the elevation facing the site. The porthole window within the gable end of the west elevation would overlook the open fields and Green Belt and would not impact upon the surrounding properties.
16. The roof lights within the southern roof slope would have a sill height of 1.5m from floor level. Whilst this would normally cause concern as they would potentially overlook the rear garden of no.16 the two windows nearest the boundary with no.16 would serve a stairwell and an en-suite bathroom. Therefore one window would be above head height and the other would not serve a habitable room. The remaining two roof lights would serve the bedroom and would be at an adequate distance from the boundary that no material loss of privacy to the immediate amenity area of no.16 would occur.

Highway Safety

17. Neither previous applications (S/0089/06/F & S/0391/05/F) attracted adverse comments from the Highway Authority regarding the car parking issues of this site. In regard to application S/0391/05/F, the applicant carried out a detailed car parking survey of the area where a total of 15 spaces were available, all serving the 17 properties within the vicinity, only 8 of which about the communal spaces who do not have off street parking provision. All of these properties have access to the 17 single garages within the two garage courts.
18. As before in the previously approved application it is proposed that the occupiers of the bungalow would park within communal parking area sited in front of the terrace. Whilst this area is heavily used and the new dwelling would increase congestion, the provision of on and off street car parking appears reasonable. Demand for spaces is high within this area, however considering the merits of this application, Members must consider the extent of harm that will be caused by the proposed additional bedroom to previously approved applications. Waterbeach is defined as a Rural Growth Settlement and is a sustainable village. Public transport links within the vicinity are reasonable and the train station is within 1km of the site.
19. With regard to the adopted car parking standards a maximum of 12 spaces would be required to serve the 8 dwellings, which currently about the parking area. In relation to the approved bungalow a further 1.5 spaces would be required and therefore sufficient on-street car parking spaces are available within the communal parking area. The addition of the 3rd bedroom would not warrant an increase of maximum parking over 1.5 spaces for the site and therefore the communal parking area could accommodate 13.5 spaces, which is deemed enough to serve the surrounding properties.

Other Matters:

20. Planning Permission S/0089/06/F has had several conditions discharged to date including the submission of drainage details, landscaping scheme, proposed materials for the external elevations and roof and the submission of a construction management scheme. The approved landscaping scheme however has not been received as part of this application and therefore a condition is recommended seeking the submission of a scheme. The submitted construction management scheme is acceptable as it is unreasonable to condition that the provision of turning, parking, loading and unloading is to be clear of the public highway. This is not possible considering the constraints of the site. A condition will be attached to ensure that the construction phase adheres to this scheme.
21. The comments of the Parish Council have been previously addressed by the approved applications S/0089/06/F & S/0391/05/F. In my opinion the circumstances have not changed in light of this current application. Whilst the amended design does seek the use of the loft space within the approved bungalow, it would not result in an increase of the footprint of the dwelling or an increase in site coverage and would therefore not warrant the refusal of planning permission as overdevelopment.

Recommendation

22. Approve, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
(Reason - To ensure that consideration of any further application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development, which have not been acted upon.)
 2. Notwithstanding the submitted details no development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft 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 and specification of all proposed trees, hedges and shrub planting, which shall include details of species, density and size of stock.
(Reason - To enhance the quality of the development and to assimilate it within the area.)
 3. 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 dwellings 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.)

4. During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08:00am on weekdays and 08:00 am on Saturdays nor after 18:00 pm on weekdays and 13:00 pm 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.)
5. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management scheme (Drawing no.07) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason – To ensure the impact upon the surrounding area is properly managed.)
6. The materials used for the external walls and roof shall be Hanson, London Flettons, Cotswold facing brick and Redland, Grovebury Brown interlocking concrete roof tiles, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason – To ensure that visually the development accords with neighbouring buildings.)

Informatives

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**
SE9 (Village Edges)
SE2 (Development in Rural 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
 - Highway safety

General

Environmental Health informatives regarding driven pile foundations and bonfires and Environmental Agency standing advice regarding soakaways.

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/2609/04/F, S/0391/05/F, S/0089/06/F and S/1603/06/F
- Documents referred to in the report including appendices on the website only and reports to previous meetings

Contact Officer: Mike Jones– Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713253

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

4th October 2006

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/0626/06/F - Landbeach**Two dwellings, following demolition of existing 18-20 Waterbeach Road,
for Hinkins Partnership****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 10th July 2006****Site and Proposal**

1. The 0.134 ha application site is currently a gap in the built form of Landbeach on the eastern entrance to the village. The site contains a vacant building which was once a workshop. The existing structure is sited hard to the eastern boundary of the site. The remainder of the site is overgrown with vegetation.
2. The full planning application, received on 29 March 2006, proposes the erection of two dwellings following the demolition of the existing vacant building. Both dwellings are to have four bedrooms and a detached garage. The density equates to 15 dwellings per hectare.
3. The application was formally amended on 1 April 2006 and 05 September 2006.

Planning History

4. **S/2407/05/F** – The application sought the erection of two dwellings following the demolition of the existing structure. This application was withdrawn, and discussion continued as to the best way to develop the site.

Planning Policy*South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004*

5. Landbeach is identified in **Policy SE5** as an infill only settlement. This provides for residential development within the Framework of not more than two dwellings where there is a gap in an otherwise built-up frontage to an existing road, and the conversion or re-development of non-residential buildings where this would not lead to a loss in local employment.
6. The general presumption in favour of residential development within village frameworks is explained in **Policy SE8**.
7. The quantity of affordable housing required from residential development is discussed in **Policy HG7**. As Landbeach has a population of fewer than 3000, a contribution of up to 50% of the total number of dwellings applied for will be sought. This is also dependent upon the identified need for affordable housing and the other factors including the proximity to services and access to public transport.

8. **Policy HG11** outlines the criterion for residential development to the rear of existing properties. The Policy states that development will only be permitted provided it would not;
- a. Result in overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing of the existing residential properties;
 - b. Result in noise and disturbance to the existing residential properties through the use of its access;
 - c. Result in highway dangers through the use of the access; or
 - d. Be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.

While this is not an application for backland development the proposal should satisfy these criteria.

9. The maximum car parking standard for development in the District are outlined in Appendix 7/1 of **Policy TP1**. It states that the maximum for dwelling houses is an average of 1.5 spaces dwellings, however dwellings in poorly accessible locations with 3 or more bedrooms up to 2 spaces will be permitted.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

10. **Policy P1/3** promotes sustainable development in the built environment and with particular reference to this application strives to respond to the local character of the built form and integrate development with adjoining landscapes.
11. The Council has a target for 37% of new dwelling to be sited either on previously development land or to utilise existing buildings. **Policy P5/2**
12. **Policy P5/3** states that the average density of residential development is to be increased across the District in order to maximise efficiency of sites. The highest densities will be sought for those locations close to a good range of facilities and services. Densities of less than 30 dwellings per hectare will not be acceptable.
13. **Policy P5/5** of the approved Structure Plan 2003 permits small - scale housing developments in villages, taking into account the need for affordable housing, the character of the village and its setting and the level of services infrastructure and public transport in the area.

Consultations

14. **Landbeach Parish Council** recommends refusal of the scheme as revised 05 September 2006, noting that preferred the original design of the garages and dislikes the placement of the garages to the front of the dwellings as it is out of keeping with the surrounding properties.
15. **Strategic Housing Services**, the site is well situated and an affordable housing requirement of 50% is sought. A commuted sum in lieu of on site provision was agreed with the portfolio holder on 20 July 2006.
16. **Old West Drainage Board**, no comment on the proposals.

Representations

17. None received

Planning Comments – Key Issues

18. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:
 - a. The impact of the proposed development on the street scene; and
 - b. The impact of the proposed development on neighbour amenity.

Impact on street scene

19. The application site is currently a vacant plot in the otherwise built frontage of the eastern entrance to the village. The site contains a small building which was once used as a work shop and now stands vacant. The remainder of the site is overgrown with vegetation.
20. The dwellings to the east of the application site are semi-detached properties, dwellings to the west are a mixture of detached and semi-detached. Dwellings are not on the same alignment on either side of the application site.
21. The scheme proposes two detached dwellings to be of similar design to be sited so as to effectively link the dwellings on either side of the site in visual terms.
22. The garages are to be detached from the dwelling and located on the front boundary of the site. A 2-metre buffer is proposed to allow adequate foliage to be established.
23. The width and depth of the gable to both dwellings at the front, has been reduced to improve the appearance of the scheme within the existing street scene. As a result the proposal is better proportioned.
24. The proposals have been carefully designed and following negotiation with Officers amended to be of a similar pattern to development in the vicinity. The site in its current form does not form an essential part of the village character and the scheme is considered to be in accordance with Policy SE5 of the Local Plan.

Residential Amenities

25. The existing vacant workshop is sited hard to the boundary of number 22, with the workshop set some distance behind the dwelling. The dwelling proposed on plot 1 is to be constructed adjacent to number 22 Waterbeach Road, the two-storey forward projecting element will not come beyond the front of number 22. This policy does not require a minimum density in infill villages, having regard to the limitation in the policy of not more than two dwellings on such sites.
26. To the rear the two-storey element of the proposed dwelling continues beyond the existing property by approximately 3 metres. It is not considered that this will harm the amenity of the existing dwelling, particularly when the siting of the vacant workshop is considered.
27. Plot 2 proposes a dwelling of almost identical design to that of plot 1, however the adjacent dwelling number 16 Waterbeach Road has a single storey side extension built hard to the shared boundary. As a result the design of the property has been subject to additional negotiation.
28. The depth of the main two-storey structure has been reduced so that it does not project further than the single storey element of number 16. Beyond this is a single storey sunroom; it is not considered that this arrangement will be of detriment to the existing property.

29. In addition to the reduction in depth the dwelling on plot 2 has also been sited 1.5 metres from the shared boundary with number 16. This reduces the perception of the overbearing nature of the proposals on the existing property. The combined result of these amendments is that the two-storey element of the proposed dwelling is not within a 45-degree angle from habitable room windows within the existing; and thus is in considered acceptable.
30. Neither property has habitable room windows on the east or west elevations. This reduces potential overlooking as a result of the development.
31. The proposals are considered to be in accordance with Local Plan Policies SE8 and the criteria of HG11.

Recommendation

32. Subject to the prior signing of a S.106 Legal Agreement to secure an affordable Housing contribution, approve, subject to conditions.
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 3. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 5. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment (Rc60);
 6. Sc26 Restriction of hours of use of power operated machinery during the period of construction - 0800 hours to 1800 hours (weekdays) and to 1300 hours (Saturdays) 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:**
 - Policy P1/3** – Sustainable Design in the Built Environment
 - Policy P5/2** – Re-using Previously Developed Land & Buildings
 - Policy P5/3** – Density
 - Policy P5/5** – Homes in Rural Areas
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
 - Policy SE5** – List of Infill Villages
 - Policy SE8** – (Village Frameworks)
 - Policy HG7** – Affordable housing on sites within village frameworks
 - Policy TP1** – Planning for more sustainable travel
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 and overlooking issues
 - Visual impact on the locality

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/2407/05/F and S/0626/06/ F

Contact Officer: Melissa Reynolds – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713237

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee4th October 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1539/06/F - THRIFLOW**Erection of House and Garage Following Demolition of Existing Bungalow at
7 Middle Street for Mr & Mrs R Taylor****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 26th September 2006****S/1668/06/CAC - THRIFLOW****Total Demolition of Bungalow and Garages at 7 Middle Street
For Mr & Mrs R Taylor****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 13th October 2006****Members will visit this site on Monday 2nd October 2006****Conservation Area****Site and Proposal**

1. The 0.02 hectare application site is located on the east side of Middle Street and is occupied by a modest single storey dwelling. To the north-west is No.5 Middle Street, a render and slate cottage sited adjacent to the road. Planning permission has been granted for the significant extension of this dwelling to the rear and these works are presently under construction. Beyond the site to the south is a two storey detached brick dwelling for which there is an extant planning consent for an extension on its south side. To the rear/east of the site are agricultural buildings whilst, to the north, are fields located within the Green Belt which are protected by an Important Countryside Frontage designation along School Lane.
2. The existing dwelling lies inside the village framework but the framework boundary cuts through the rear garden, meaning that around half of the existing rear garden lies in the countryside, albeit not in the Green Belt.
3. The full application, submitted on 1st August 2006, seeks to demolish the existing dwelling and to erect a 5-bedroom two storey house in its place. The two storey element of the proposed replacement would be sited approximately 24 metres back from the road frontage of the site, some 7 metres further away from the road than the existing dwelling. It would be 9.3 metres high and incorporate two slightly lower (9 metre high) forward projecting gables. A single storey swimming pool building would project forwards of the main dwelling and adjacent to the northern boundary of the site to a point around 5 metres away from the front of the site. The proposal also seeks to erect a double garage at the front of the dwelling adjacent to the southern boundary of the plot. The materials proposed for the two storey element of the

dwelling are clay plain tiles for the roof and gault brickwork for the walls, whilst the single storey elements would comprise brick walls and clay pantile roofs.

4. The Conservation Area Consent application seeks consent for the demolition of the existing bungalow and garages.

Planning History

5. None

Planning Policy

6. Thriplow 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.
7. **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.
8. **Policy P1/3** of the County Structure Plan requires a high standard of design that responds to the local character of the built environment.
9. **Policy EN30** of the Local Plan requires development in a Conservation Area to either preserve or enhance the character of the area.

Consultation

10. **Thriplow Parish Council** recommends approval of the planning application, stating:

“Two parish councillors object to the demolition of the existing property, commenting that it is a typical design of the late 60’s early 70’s and should probably be listed, that it will result in the loss of a perfectly usable, medium sized dwelling in order to provide space for a grandiose design and that it should be preserved as an example of the architect’s work. Although two councillors suggest that consideration should be given to putting the pool at the rear and one suggests that the roofline should be lowered to the same height as No.9, the majority of parish councillors have no objections to the scheme. They feel that the design fits in well with the street scene, are pleased to see that the part of the proposed building immediately adjacent to Duck Cottage (No.5) is all single storey, therefore respecting the setting of Duck Cottage, any overlooking of Duck Cottage would be minimal, the two storey element is far enough away from the road to not impose and the view from Peck’s Close would not be disadvantaged. It is also felt that the chimneys are an important element of the design and these should not be removed from the scheme at a later date.”

Approval is also recommended for the Conservation Area Consent application:

“Two councillors feel that medium sized dwellings are needed in the village and object to the demolition of a perfectly serviceable home, however, the majority of councillors raise no objections to the proposal. The Parish Council recommendation, therefore, is for the approval of this application.”

11. **The Conservation Manager** raises no objections. The existing bungalow is considered to be of little architectural merit, although it is very modest and therefore has a minimal impact on the Thriplow Conservation Area. The proposed replacement dwelling is significantly bigger but the main part of the dwelling is set some distance back into the site (much further than the existing bungalow) such that its greater bulk will not impose excessively on the streetscene. There are no particularly important views across the site that would be blocked as a result of the replacement house, and the scale and massing of the replacement dwelling is broadly similar to that of the adjacent 20th Century house immediately to the south. To the north there is a more traditional cottage, albeit much extended, set tight to the street and the proposed dwelling will be significantly higher than this. However, the pool building provides a degree of articulation between these two buildings and, because the main two storey block of the new house is set over 20 metres back from the road, it will not visually overpower or dominate the old cottage. The new dwelling is quasi-Edwardian in style and this is considered to be appropriate for a building of this size. Thriplow contains a variety of built forms and providing appropriate traditional materials are used (eg – clay plain and pan tiles, gault brick and timber windows) the replacement dwelling should fit into the context of Thriplow. It is noted that the chimney stacks will be an important feature when viewing the house from the street and these should be located slightly forward of the valleys between the front roof slope and the gables as suggested on the roof plan. No objections are raised in respect of the solar panels proposed to the south facing roof slope to the main house. It is recommended that any consent be subject to conditions requiring sample materials, large scale details for the eaves, chimneys, external joinery and the patent glazing to the pool roof, details of rooflights, and the use of Flemish bond brickwork for the main house.
12. **The Trees and Landscape Officer** raises no objections.
13. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** raises no objections in principle although does express concern about noise disturbance to nearby residents during the construction period. As such, a condition restricting the hours of use of power operated machinery during the construction period needs to be attached to any planning consent.

Representations

14. Letters of objection have been received from 3 local residents, Nos. 5 and 14 Middle Street, and No.3 Lower Street. The main points raised are:
- a. No objections are raised in principle to the demolition of the existing bungalow and its replacement with a two storey dwelling;
 - b. The scale of the proposed dwelling is inappropriate and out of keeping with the scale of adjoining dwellings, including No.5 as extended;
 - c. The dwelling would fill the entire width of the plot and obstruct views of trees to the rear;
 - d. The general character of the village is of small houses set in an open pattern enclosing areas of agricultural land. The present trend of replacing small and medium sized dwellings with large residences is destroying this character and reducing the supply of 'affordable' housing;
 - e. It would be very dominant within the street scene and would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
 - f. The pool building at the front would be very dominant and have a harmful impact upon the street scene. It should be located elsewhere, such as at the side or rear of the dwelling;

- g. The dwelling would be dominant and overbearing in the outlook from No.5's patio, conservatory and upper floor windows;
- h. The value of No.5's garden would be diminished as a result of the presence of a house in a backland location;
- i. The house would be very conspicuous across Green Belt land from the Important Countryside Frontage on School Lane and from the green space opposite the site.

Representations from District Councillor Quinlan

15. Councillor Quinlan has written two letters in response to the application. The first letter states:

"I have studied the submitted drawings of the proposed development, viewed the site and discussed the scheme with the neighbours. I am writing to convey my strong objections to the proposed development on the following grounds:

1. The scheme involves the demolition of the existing unobtrusive single storey house designed by the distinguished local architect, now deceased, Bill Twist one of the founders of Twist & Whitley, Architects of Cambridge. This unobtrusive single storey dwelling which fits in so well in this location is to be replaced by an overblown house of large size, scale and dominant presence. This is perhaps the only the latest manifestation in this village where the perpetrators desire for conspicuous display exceeds their taste!
2. The scale of the proposed house is grossly excessive in this location where it is flanked by existing houses, that the north Listed, of significantly smaller scale and height to the proposed new house. This is particularly important when viewed from School Lane across the meadows to the south which are now within the Green Belt. The existing low pitched roof, single storey building barely registers in the view whereas the behemoth now proposed will be extremely intrusive and destroy the pleasant rural character of the area and the special character of the location recognised by the Conservation Area Status. You will recall that strenuous efforts were made in the extension to the neighbouring dwelling to the north, now nearing completion, to minimise the scale and impact of the new building on the special character of the area. This involved employing a low eaves line, keeping the ridge line as low as possible and careful attention to ground floor levels to exploit existing topography. In my opinion that has been highly successful.
3. The placing of the swimming pool building forward of the proposed house and extending virtually to the road frontage is inappropriate and it should be placed to the rear of the proposed house. The existing proposed location has the effect of pushing the main building back into the plot thereby increasing its impact upon the open meadows to the north and increasing the impact of the main house on the amenities of the neighbours to the north. The intrusion of the swimming pool building, virtually to the road frontage, make it extremely intrusive in the street scene. Again when compared to the nearly complete extension to the building to the north which does not impact in views south along Middle Street the proposals are crude and ill-mannered.
4. The new dwelling, in view of its scale and bulk and fenestration on its north elevation is grossly detrimental to the amenities of the residents of the dwelling to the north by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking and loss of privacy and loss of daylight and sunlight. The effect upon the neighbours is made even worse by the

new house being set so far back on the plot which also allows direct overlooking of the neighbours gardens and swimming pool from the windows on the front elevation of the new house.

Please can you ensure these comments are included, in full, in the committee report. I intend speaking at the meeting in support of refusal of the application.”

16. The subsequent letter states:

“I refer to my letter dated 27 August 2006 in which I expressed my serious reservations about the proposal and my inclination to support a refusal of the scheme. As you will be aware I am still refining my views on the scheme and have not finally decided on my approach at the planning committee; much will depend upon the debate and views expressed by my fellow councillors.

I have today received from the Parish Council Clerk a document setting out the views of individual members of that Council. It is fair to say that the individual responses are mixed and some Members expressing very similar concerns to those raised in my preliminary letter. Of the “village” members of the Parish Council half the members objected to the proposal.

It is possible that the main concerns raised in my original letter might be amenable to resolution by revisions to the scheme. The location of the main building and its detrimental effect upon the important School Lane Meadows, between Baroness Boothroyd’s house and the Holmes House now in the Green Belt and Conservation Area, can be resolved by transposing the location of the house and the swimming pool building such that the house is placed further forward towards the street frontage and the single storey pool building, which would have far less impact upon the character of the meadows, placed at the rear which would be the “normal” relationship in any case. This will also reduce the overlooking of the adjacent house’s gardens from the windows on the west elevation of the new house which was another of the concerns raised in my first letter.

The second main concern is the scale and height of the house which is significantly higher than the surrounding dwellings. I referred in my first letter to the great care taken with the design of the extensions to the adjoining house to the north and how successful that design has been at keeping the scale down; low eaves line, low pitched roof and exploitation of natural landforms. There is no reason why a skilled architect cannot achieve a similar solution in this case. A reduction in the depth of the building and a reduced roof pitch would significantly reduce the scale. The height of the building should, at the very least, be brought down to the level of the ridge of the house to the south.

I would ask that you raise these points with the architect and seek the submission of a revised scheme. If acceptable revisions are made it is possible that the concerns raised by members of the Parish Council and by me as set out in my first letter could be overcome. Please keep me informed of the progress of such negotiations.

Please can you ensure these comments are included, in full, in the committee report if the case is dealt with at Committee.”

Response from Conservation Manager to Councillor Quinlan's comments:

17. The Conservation Manager expresses concern that the revisions suggested by Councillor Quinlan would not be beneficial to the Conservation Area for the following reasons:

"1. From my observations looking across the meadows in School Lane, the main bulk of the 2 storey house in the position as indicated on the application drawings would be seen in front of the existing 20th Century house that is located immediately to the south of the site, while the single storey pool range will be largely hidden behind the new structures recently constructed as part of the redevelopment of the cottage to the north. Furthermore, the house will be seen against a backdrop of trees and will therefore not break the skyline. Transposing the pool and house would result in the new dwelling being seen alongside the existing 20th century dwelling, i.e. one would see two buildings rather than one. To my eye, the most visible structure in this view over the meadow from School Lane is the recently constructed extensions to the rear of the cottage to the north of the site.

2. As noted in item 1 of my comments on the application (dated 23rd August 2006), the main part of the dwelling as currently proposed is set some distance back into the site (much further than the existing bungalow), such that its greater bulk will not impose excessively on the streetscene, and while the ridge is some 0.5 metre higher than the adjacent house to the south, because it is set further back into the site the scale and massing of the replacement dwelling will be broadly similar to that of the adjacent 20th Century house immediately to the south. In respect of the cottage to the north, the single storey pool structure provides a degree of articulation between the two structures and, because the main two storey block of the new house is set over 20 metres back from the road, it will not visually overpower or dominate the cottage. I note also that the Parish Council appreciated the role performed by the single storey pool structure in the streetscene and the relationship between the new house and the existing cottage to the north. Transposing the house and pool structure would lose this 'articulation', and even if the house were reduced in height by 0.5 metres (ie down to the ridge line of the dwelling to the south) if moved forward I am concerned that it would then dominate the lower cottage.

In conclusion, I believe the house is proportionate to its site and the present arrangement of the elements within the site will minimise its impact on both the adjacent dwellings, the streetscene from Middle Street and the view over the meadows from School Lane. The Thriplow Conservation Area contains a wide variety of built forms, with both smaller cottages set close to the street, cottages set at right angles to the street and larger dwellings and agricultural buildings set further back from the street. For this, and the reasons outlined above, I do not share Councillor Quinlan's concerns over the impact of this dwelling, but am concerned that to revise the scheme as suggested might actually result in greater visual harm."

Planning Comments – Key Issues

18. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:

- Impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
- Impact upon the countryside and Green Belt;
- Residential amenity;

- Impact on trees.

Visual impact including Conservation Area and Green Belt issues

19. The Conservation manager has raised no objections in principle to the demolition of the existing dwelling which is considered to be of little architectural merit. The proposed replacement dwelling would have a ridge height of 9.3 metres and it is acknowledged that it would be significantly higher than No.5 Middle Street to the north (which has a ridge height of 7 metres) and the 8.7 metre high dwelling to the south. However, No.5 is sited at the frontage of its plot alongside the road and No.9 to the south is sited in line with the existing dwelling on the plot. By being set much further back from the road than the existing and adjacent dwellings, it is considered that a dwelling of this height and scale can be accommodated on the site without resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The success of the scheme would be very much dependent upon the use of quality materials and detailing and these would need to be secured through conditions of any planning consent. The Conservation Manager has commented on a discrepancy between the roof plan and elevations regarding the position of the chimneys. I have discussed this matter with the applicant's agent and the elevation drawings will be amended to ensure that the chimneys are located as shown on the roof plan – ie – forward of the valleys between the front roof slope and gables.
20. Concerns have been raised by Councillor Quinlan and by local residents regarding the forward projecting swimming pool element which it is argued should be sited to the rear of the dwelling. However, the existing dwelling has a forward projecting element that extends closer to the road than the proposed pool building and there are dwellings sited along the road frontage to the immediate north (No.5) and to the south (No.23). Forward projecting outbuildings are not untypical of the character of the area. For instance, further to the south, at No.22 Middle Street, permission was granted earlier this year for a dwelling with a detached double garage at the front sited gable end to the road. The Conservation Manager considers this element provides a degree of articulation between the extended cottage to the north and the proposed dwelling. In addition, it is essential to ensure that any development is confined to the part of the curtilage that lies inside the framework and, if the dwelling was transposed without moving it forwards, the building would encroach beyond the framework boundary.
21. The Conservation Manager has separately assessed the alterations suggested by Councillor Quinlan. He considers the arrangement as proposed in the application would minimise the impact on both the adjacent dwellings, the streetscene from Middle Street and the views over the meadows from School Lane. The alterations suggested by Councillor Quinlan are considered to result in greater visual harm the scheme proposed in the application.
22. Concerns have also been expressed about the visual impact of the development when viewed from the Important Countryside Frontage along School Lane, across the Green Belt land and open fields to the north of the site. I have considered the impact of the development from this viewpoint and accept that the new dwelling would be visible from here, albeit at a distance of in excess of 100 metres away from the site. At present, when looking south from School Lane across the fields towards the village, the existing view is represented by a backdrop of built development and I consider that this view would not be significantly altered or harmed as a result of setting the dwelling well back into the site.

Residential amenity

23. The dwelling has been designed with its principal openings facing west towards the road and east towards its rear garden. The north and south elevations, which face towards Nos. 5 and 9 respectively, only have obscure glazed bathroom windows at first floor level, therefore ensuring that the development would not overlook either adjoining property. The occupiers of No.5 have raised concern about the first floor windows in the front elevation of the dwelling. However, these are in excess of 24 metres away from windows in the south side elevation of No.5. In addition, as can be seen from the front/street scene elevation drawings, the height and position of the forward projecting swimming pool building would make it impossible to look down from these windows into No.5's windows or garden area.
24. The proposed dwelling would be sited around 30 metres away from No.5's patio, conservatory and private sitting out areas. Whilst the development would be visible from these parts of the neighbouring house, at this distance I do not consider it to be unduly overbearing in the outlook from No.5 nor to result in a significant loss of light to the dwelling.

Impact on trees

25. The application proposes the removal of a tree within the rear garden to which the Trees and Landscape Officer has raised no objections.

Recommendation

26. Subject to the receipt of amended elevations to ensure the chimney positions accord with that shown on the roof plan, approval of the planning application subject to the following conditions:
 1. Standard A (Reason A);
 2. No development shall commence until details of the following 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:
 - a) Samples of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs of the dwelling and garage;
 - b) Sample of the materials to be used for the new section of wall between the existing front boundary wall and proposed swimming pool building;
 - c) Large scale details (1:10 minimum) for the eaves, chimneys, external joinery (including head, cill and jamb details) and the patent glazing to the pool roof;
 - d) The manufacturer and size of the rooflights.
(Reason – To ensure that the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area).
 3. The walls of the main dwelling shall be constructed in Flemish Bond brickwork
(Reason – To ensure that the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area).
 4. The first floor windows in the north and south side elevations of the dwelling, hereby permitted, shall be non-opening and fitted and permanently maintained with obscured glass (Reason – To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of the adjoining properties to the north and south, Nos. 5 and 9 Middle Street respectively).

5. Save for the windows shown within the approved plans, no further windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted at first floor level in the north and south side elevations of the development, 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 to the north and south, Nos. 5 and 9 Middle Street respectively).
 6. 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 by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions (Rc26).
 7. Sc60 - Boundary treatment details (Rc 60).
 8. Sc51 - Landscaping (Rc51).
 9. Sc52 - Implementation of landscaping (Rc52).
27. Approval of the application for Conservation Area Consent subject to the following condition:
1. The demolition, hereby permitted, shall not be undertaken before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been made and planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment for which the contract provides.
(Reason - To ensure that redevelopment closely follows the demolition hereby permitted.)

Informatives

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) 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 the Conservation Area;
 - Impact upon the Green Belt;
 - Residential amenity.

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 to 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.
3. Before the existing property is demolished, a Demolition Notice will be required from the Environmental Health 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:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning File Refs: S/1539/06/F and S/1668/06/CAC

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Services

4th October 2006

S/1653/05/F – WILLINGHAM
**Siting of 1 Mobile Home and 1 Touring Caravan, at Cadwin Lane off Schole Road
for Mrs. E. Smith**

Recommendation: Temporary consent

Date for Determination: 21st October 2005

Retrospective Application

Site and Proposal

1. Schole Road is an area of generally flat agricultural Fen land with few hedges. The application site itself is a rectangular 24 metres wide and 28 metres deep. The plot is sited behind the property known as The Barns fronting onto Schole Road.

Planning History

2. The site is in an area where there are a number of existing sites some of which have the benefit of planning permission while others are unauthorised.
3. The site does not have any relevant planning permission but has in the past been the subject of illegal dumping including cars

Planning Policy

4. The relevant Development Plan comprises the approved Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
5. **Policy P5/4** of the Structure Plan says that local plans should make provision to meet the locally assessed need for housing specific groups including Gypsies and Travellers.
6. **Policy P1/2** says, inter alia, that development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
7. **Policy 7/4** says that development must relate sensitively to the local environment and contribute to the sense of place, identity and diversity of the distinct landscape character areas.
8. **Policy SE8** of the Local Plan says that there will be a general presumption in favour of residential development within village frameworks and that residential development outside these frameworks will not be permitted.

9. **Policy EN1** relates to Landscape Character Areas, and in respect of this site, it is concerned with respecting, retaining and wherever possible, enhancing the Fens Landscape Character & Natural Area.
10. **Policy HG23** is a specific policy concerned with caravan sites for Gypsies and Travelling show-people. It indicates that proposals for caravans for Gypsies will only be considered when the need for a site is shown to be essential to enable the applicants to exercise a travelling lifestyle for the purpose of making and seeking their livelihood. Where the need is proven 9 criteria have to be met if planning permission is to be granted for such sites. The criteria in summary are as follows:

- (1) The site is reasonably located for schools, shops and other local services.
- (2) The site would have minimal impact on the amenities of existing local residents and adjoining land uses; concentration of sites will be avoided.
- (3) The site would not, either on its own, or cumulatively, have a significant adverse effect on the rural character and appearance, or the amenities of the surrounding area.
- (4) The site can be satisfactorily assimilated into its surroundings by existing or proposed landscaping; an approved landscaping scheme will be required.
- (5) The use of the site would not give rise to unacceptable parking, highway access or service provision problems.
- (6) The site would not adversely affect any buildings of historic or archaeological importance, or sites of wildlife or nature conservation value.
- (7) Where planning permission is allowed, built forms of development will not be permitted except for utility outhouses. Small stables will be considered on their merits depending upon need and the nature of the site.
- (8) The site has adequate infrastructural connections to local services including water supply.
- (9) The use would not detract from convenient, safe and enjoyable use of a public right of way.

11. Also relevant is **Circular 1/2006 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and PPG3 Housing. Circular 1/2006** confirms that the Government is committed to ensuring that members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities should have the same rights and responsibilities as every other citizen and provides updated guidance on the planning aspects of finding sites for Gypsies and Travellers and how local authorities and Gypsies and Travellers can work together to achieve that aim. The policies in this Circular apply throughout England.
12. Advice on the use of temporary permissions is contained in paragraphs 108 – 113 of Circular 11/95, *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permission*. Paragraph 110 advises that a temporary permission may be justified where it is expected that the planning circumstances will change in a particular way at the end of the period of the temporary permission. Where there is unmet need but no available alternative Gypsy and Traveller site provision in an area but there is a reasonable expectation that new sites are likely to become available at the end of that period in the area which will meet that need, local planning authorities should give consideration to granting a temporary permission. Such circumstances may arise, for example, in a case where a local planning authority is preparing its site allocations DPD. In such circumstances, local planning authorities are expected to give substantial weight to the unmet need in considering whether a temporary planning permission is justified.

13. The fact that temporary permission has been granted on this basis should not be regarded as setting a precedent for the determination of any future applications for full permission for use of the land as a caravan site. In some cases, it may not be reasonable to impose certain conditions on a temporary permission such as those that require significant capital outlay.

Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document

14. Consultants CDN Planning began working on this project in April 2006. The first draft Issues and Options report is currently subject to a Strategic Environment Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal SEA/SA. The Member Reference Group will consider the draft issues and Options report and the SEA/SA on 14 September and they will go to Council on 28 September. Once any changes have been made it will be available for public consultation from mid October. This initial Issues and Options stage is looking at criteria for site location. A second Issues and Options report will be prepared following representations on the first, and this will specifically identify potential sites within South Cambs for Gypsy/Traveller sites using the criteria already agreed. At this stage we expect the second Issues and Options report to be consulted on in Summer 2007.

Consultations

Parish Council

15. Willingham Parish Council recommends refusal, on the basis of proportionality (relating to the numbers of such sites already in Willingham), and consistency (with Parish Council's existing view on proportionality).
16. The question was also raised as to whether the site was within the village envelope, although that on its own would not have constituted an argument for rejection. N.B. site is outside the Village Framework

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

17. No objections.

Chief Environmental Health Officer

18. The application has been considered in respect of noise and environmental pollution and it is concluded that there are no significant impacts. It is recommended that, if the application is successful, the applicant should be able to comply with the attached site license conditions relating to permanent residential caravan sites.

Traveller's Liaison Officer

19. The family and educational details set out later in this report are confirmed. If evicted, the family states that it would probably have to go back on the road. This family has a local connection with Cambridgeshire.

Old West Internal Drainage Board

20. Has no comment from a drainage point of view.

Environment Agency

21. In the eventuality of not being able to connect to the public foul sewer system, the suitability of any non-mains sewerage system needs to be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the LPA. Accordingly conditional permission is recommended.

Representations

22. Notice on site posted 22/01/05.

Personal Circumstances

23. The applicant has completed a Needs Audit in support of her proposal. She confirms that she previously lived on a rented site in Earith but had to leave because of on-going social problems, and she wanted to own her own site. There are 5 children ranging in age from 1 to 9 living on her site. Her main aim is to get the children to school locally so that they receive a proper education

Equal Opportunities Implications

24. Under the Race Relations Act 1976 and the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, the Council has a statutory duty to eliminate unlawful discrimination and to promote race equality and good race relations. The Race Equality Scheme, updated by the Council in July 2006 with an update of the 2005 - 2008 action plan, gives priority to actions relating to Travellers, as the biggest single ethnic minority in the District (around 1.0% of the District's population). The Council is committed to treating everyone fairly and justly, whatever their race or background and the scheme gives priority to actions relating to Travellers. It also incorporates recommendations from the Commission for Racial Equality's "Common Ground" report.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

25. The key issue is conflict with countryside policies and policy for Gypsy caravan sites with regard to the need to limit impact on the landscape and rural character of the area, and having regard to the special circumstances that are argued here, together with the advice in circular 1/2006 concerning temporary consent while councils such as South Cambs are preparing a Development Plan Document.
26. From the evidence of the photographs, a considerable amount of fly tipping had taken place on the site, and it is now much tidier. Further the applicant has refrained from other improvements while their application has been determined.
27. In terms of the relevant criteria it is reasonably well located for schools shops and other local services. Indeed the applicant wants her children to attend local schools. The site does not impact on the amenities of neighbours and no letters of objection are on the file. It is seen in the context of the adjacent permitted and unauthorised Traveller sites, and to that extent it does add to the concentration of sites. However, I am not aware of any service provision issue.
28. The site is already well landscaped and the existing barn building on the adjacent site already has a significant visual impact. It follows that neither the applicant's proposal, nor the other two reported on this agenda, do not in themselves, have a significant impact on the landscape. If it is granted permission, I am confident that appropriate landscaping could take place to further reduce its impact.

29. There are no highway issues resulting from its use, nor are there any significant conservation, archaeological or wildlife issues.
30. There have been no adverse comments from any of the service providers, and drainage will be conditioned and subject to further approval. It would not adversely detract from the use of a public right of way.
31. The consultation on the options for Traveller site provision within the District are proceeding and it seems to me that this is an entirely appropriate case to be considered for a temporary consent on a without prejudice basis. Such consent would enable the Parish Council's reasonable concerns about the cumulative impact of Traveller sites within the Parish to be properly considered since this is one of the issues that the Council will be consulting on in preparing it's G&TDPD.

Recommendation

32. That the applicant be invited to amend the application to a temporary application for 3 years and if they do so, delegated authority be granted subject to conditions including 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
- Circular 1/2006
- Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment 2006
- Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document
- Planning application file ref: S/1653/05/F

Contact Officer: G.H.Jones – Head of Planning
Telephone: (01954) 713151

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee4th October 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Services

S/1654/05/F – WILLINGHAM**Siting of 1 Mobile Home and 1 Touring Caravan, at 2 Cadwin Lane off Schole Road for Mr. J. Holmes****Recommendation: Temporary consent****Date for Determination: 21st October 2005****Retrospective Application****Site and Proposal**

1. Schole Road is an area of generally flat agricultural Fen land with few hedges. The application site itself is a rectangular 24 metres wide and 28 metres deep. The plot is adjacent to the plot also on this agenda ((S/1653/05- Mrs E. Smith) sited behind the property known as The Barns fronting onto Schole Road.

Planning History

2. The site is in an area where there are a number of existing sites some of which have the benefit of planning permission while others are unauthorised.
3. The site does not have any relevant planning permission but has in the past been the subject of illegal dumping including cars

Planning Policy

4. The relevant Development Plan comprises the approved Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
5. **Policy P5/4** of the Structure Plan says that local plans should make provision to meet the locally assessed need for housing specific groups including Gypsies and Travellers.
6. **Policy P1/2** says, inter alia, that development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
7. **Policy 7/4** says that development must relate sensitively to the local environment and contribute to the sense of place, identity and diversity of the distinct landscape character areas.
8. **Policy SE8** of the Local Plan says that there will be a general presumption in favour of residential development within village frameworks and that residential development outside these frameworks will not be permitted.

9. **Policy EN1** relates to Landscape Character Areas, and in respect of this site, it is concerned with respecting, retaining and wherever possible, enhancing the Fens Landscape Character & Natural Area.
10. **Policy HG23** is a specific policy concerned with caravan sites for Gypsies and Travelling show-people. It indicates that proposals for caravans for Gypsies will only be considered when the need for a site is shown to be essential to enable the applicants to exercise a travelling lifestyle for the purpose of making and seeking their livelihood. Where the need is proven 9 criteria have to be met if planning permission is to be granted for such sites. The criteria in summary are as follows:

- (1) The site is reasonably located for schools, shops and other local services.
- (2) The site would have minimal impact on the amenities of existing local residents and adjoining land uses; concentration of sites will be avoided.
- (3) The site would not, either on its own, or cumulatively, have a significant adverse effect on the rural character and appearance, or the amenities of the surrounding area.
- (4) The site can be satisfactorily assimilated into its surroundings by existing or proposed landscaping; an approved landscaping scheme will be required.
- (5) The use of the site would not give rise to unacceptable parking, highway access or service provision problems.
- (6) The site would not adversely affect any buildings of historic or archaeological importance, or sites of wildlife or nature conservation value.
- (7) Where planning permission is allowed, built forms of development will not be permitted except for utility outhouses. Small stables will be considered on their merits depending upon need and the nature of the site.
- (8) The site has adequate infrastructural connections to local services including water supply.
- (9) The use would not detract from convenient, safe and enjoyable use of a public right of way.

11. Also relevant is **Circular 1/2006 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and PPG3 Housing**. **Circular 1/2006** confirms that the Government is committed to ensuring that members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities should have the same rights and responsibilities as every other citizen and provides updated guidance on the planning aspects of finding sites for Gypsies and Travellers and how local authorities and Gypsies and Travellers can work together to achieve that aim. The policies in this Circular apply throughout England.
12. Advice on the use of temporary permissions is contained in paragraphs 108 – 113 of Circular 11/95, *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permission*. Paragraph 110 advises that a temporary permission may be justified where it is expected that the planning circumstances will change in a particular way at the end of the period of the temporary permission. Where there is unmet need but no available alternative Gypsy and Traveller site provision in an area but there is a reasonable expectation that new sites are likely to become available at the end of that period in the area which will meet that need, local planning authorities should give consideration to granting a temporary permission. Such circumstances may arise, for example, in a case where a local planning authority is preparing its site allocations DPD. In such circumstances, local planning authorities are expected to give substantial weight to the unmet need in considering whether a temporary planning permission is justified.

13. The fact that temporary permission has been granted on this basis should not be regarded as setting a precedent for the determination of any future applications for full permission for use of the land as a caravan site. In some cases, it may not be reasonable to impose certain conditions on a temporary permission such as those that require significant capital outlay.

Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document

14. Consultants CDN Planning began working on this project in April 2006. The first draft Issues and Options report is currently subject to a Strategic Environment Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal SEA/SA. The Member Reference Group will consider the draft issues and Options report and the SEA/SA on 14 September and they will go to Council on 28 September. Once any changes have been made it will be available for public consultation from mid October. This initial Issues and Options stage is looking at criteria for site location. A second Issues and Options report will be prepared following representations on the first, and this will specifically identify potential sites within South Cambs for Gypsy/Traveller sites using the criteria already agreed. At this stage we expect the second Issues and Options report to be consulted on in Summer 2007.

Consultations

Parish Council

15. **Willingham Parish Council** recommends refusal, on the basis of proportionality (relating to the numbers of such sites already in Willingham), and consistency (with Parish Council's existing view on proportionality).
16. The question was also raised as to whether the site was within the village envelope, although that on its own would not have constituted an argument for rejection. N.B. site is outside the Village Framework

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

17. No objections.

Chief Environmental Health Officer

18. The application has been considered in respect of noise and environmental pollution and it is concluded that there are no significant impacts. It is recommended that, if the application is successful, the applicant should be able to comply with the attached site license conditions relating to permanent residential caravan sites.

Traveller's Liaison Officer

19. The family and educational details set out later in this report are confirmed. If evicted, the family states that it would probably have to go back on the road. This family has a local connection with Cambridgeshire.

Old West Internal Drainage Board

20. Has no comment from a drainage point of view.

Environment Agency

21. In the eventuality of not being able to connect to the public foul sewer system, the suitability of any non-mains sewerage system needs to be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the LPA. Accordingly conditional permission is recommended.

Representations

22. Notice on site posted 22/01/05

Personal Circumstances

23. The applicant's wife has completed a Needs Audit in support of her proposal.
24. She confirms that she previously lived on a rented site in Earith but had to leave to protect her family from social problems on that site, and she wanted to own her own site. As well as her, there are 5 children on the site ranging in age from 6 to 12.

Equal Opportunities Implications

25. Under the Race Relations Act 1976 and the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, the Council has a statutory duty to eliminate unlawful discrimination and to promote race equality and good race relations. The Race Equality Scheme, updated by the Council in July 2006 with an update of the 2005 - 2008 action plan, gives priority to actions relating to Travellers, as the biggest single ethnic minority in the District (around 1.0% of the District's population). The Council is committed to treating everyone fairly and justly, whatever their race or background and the scheme gives priority to actions relating to Travellers. It also incorporates recommendations from the Commission for Racial Equality's "Common Ground" report.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

26. The key issue is conflict with countryside policies and policy for Gypsy caravan sites with regard to the need to limit impact on the landscape and rural character of the area, and having regard to the special circumstances that are argued here, together with the advice in circular 1/2006 concerning temporary consent while councils such as South Cambs are preparing a Development Plan Document.
27. From the evidence of the photographs, a considerable amount of fly tipping had taken place on the site, and it is now much tidier. Further the applicant has refrained from other improvements while their application has been determined.
28. In terms of the relevant criteria it is reasonably well located for schools shops and other local services. Indeed the applicant wants her children to attend local schools. The site does not impact on the amenities of neighbours and no letters of objection are on the file. It is seen in the context of the adjacent permitted and unauthorised Traveller sites, and to that extent it does add to the concentration of sites. However, I am not aware of any service provision issue.
29. The site is already well landscaped and the existing barn building on the adjacent site already has a significant visual impact. It follows that neither the applicant's proposal, nor the other two reported on this agenda, do not in themselves, have a significant impact on the landscape. If it is granted permission, I am confident that appropriate landscaping could take place to further reduce its impact.

30. There are no highway issues resulting from the proposal, nor are there any significant conservation, archaeological or wildlife issues.
31. There have been no adverse comments from any of the service providers, and drainage will be conditioned and subject to further approval. It would not adversely detract from the use of a public right of way.
32. The consultation on the options for Traveller site provision within the District are proceeding and it seems to me that this is an entirely appropriate case to be considered for a temporary consent on a without prejudice basis. Such consent would enable the Parish Council's reasonable concerns about the cumulative impact of Traveller sites within the Parish to be properly considered since this is one of the issues that the Council will be consulting on in preparing it's G&TDPD.

Recommendation

33. That the applicant be invited to amend the application to a temporary application for 3 years and if they do so, delegated authority be granted subject to conditions including 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
- Circular 1/2006
- Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment 2006
- Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document
- Planning Application File Ref: S/1654/05/F

Contact Officer: G.H.Jones – Head of Planning
Telephone: (01954) 713151

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee4th October 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director/ Head of Planning Services

S/1238/06/F - OVER**Change of Use of Redundant Farm Building A, Part Rebuild Part Refurbish
To Accommodate Agricultural Veterinary Practice,
Highgate Farm, Willingham Road for Mr B Papworth****Recommendation: Approval****Date for determination: 11th October 2006****Departure Application****Site and Proposal**

1. The site lies on the western fringe of Willingham, in the Parish of Over. It has a frontage and access onto the C-class Road. The site is a former pig farm with a farm owner/ manager's bungalow. A number of the former agricultural buildings have been converted at different times to business and retail use, but several buildings remain in use for ancillary storage of farm equipment and supplies. The existing converted buildings are served by two accesses that are located to the west of the current part of the site. A private road, Over Haden, runs along the eastern boundary of the site, which provides access to the application site and several dwellings to the north. There is a mature Horse Chestnut on the western corner of the junction of this road with Over/Willingham Road.
2. The application, dated 29th March 2006, as amended by plans received 16th August and 6th September 2006, and ownership certificate received 16th August 2006, proposes the part rebuilding/ part refurbishment of an existing former pig building to provide premises for an agricultural veterinary practice. A second part of the application, relating to a retrospective use of a second building for a small car repair business, has been withdrawn following the closure of this enterprise. The proposed veterinary building will have the marginally larger footprint and floor area compared to the existing. The ridge height on eastern part of it will be increased from 2.7m to 3.0m, to match the remaining building. This part will be rebuilt to match the remaining, with shiplap boarding and brick plinth. Car parking for 21 vehicles will be provided on site. Access will be via Over Haden, which is to be widened and improved for the first 15m from its junction with Over/Willingham Road.

Planning History

3. No previous planning history on these buildings.

Planning Policy

4. The site lies beyond but close to the village framework boundary.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

5. **P1/1** (Approach to Development) For development on the periphery of settlements, previously developed land and buildings should be preferred over the use of land that has not been developed previously. Development should be located where travel distances by car can be minimised, walking and cycling encouraged and where good transport accessibility exists or can be provided.
6. **P1/2** (Environmental Restrictions on Development)- development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
7. **P2/6** (Rural Economy) – sensitive small-scale development in rural areas will be facilitated where it contributes, *inter alia*, to supporting new and existing businesses; to farm or rural diversification where appropriate to the rural area; to the re-use of existing buildings; towards helping to maintain or renew the vitality of rural areas.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

8. **SE9** (Village Edges)- development on the edge of villages should be sympathetically designed and landscaped to minimise the impact of development on the countryside.
9. **EN3** (Landscaping and design standards for new development in the countryside) – new development in the countryside should reinforce local distinctiveness in terms of scale, design, layout, materials and landscaping.
10. **EM6** (New Employment at Rural Growth and Limited Rural Growth Settlements) – Within village frameworks and on brownfield sites very close to the village frameworks of RGS and LRGS, planning permission will be granted for small-scale developments in classes B1-B8 provided that:
 - a) There would be no adverse impact on residential amenity, traffic conditions, village character and other environmental factors, and
 - b) The development would contribute to a greater range of employment opportunities or where initial development is dependant on the use of locally-based skills and expertise.
11. **EM7** (Expansion of Existing Firms at Villages) – expansion of existing firms within village frameworks or on suitable brownfield sites next to or very close to the village framework will be permitted subject to the provisions of Policy EM3 and EM6.
12. **EM10** (Conversion of Rural Buildings and Future Extensions) – outside village frameworks planning permission will be granted for the change of use and conversion of rural buildings to employment use subject to a number of provisions including:
 - (a) The buildings do not require major reconstruction;
 - (b) The conversion will not prejudice village vitality;
 - (c) The appearance after conversion is in keeping with the surroundings;
 - (d) The conversion does not materially change the material character of the building or the surrounding countryside;
 - (e) Safe access and satisfactory provision for parking and turning of vehicles can be achieved without detriment to the setting of the building or the surrounding landscape;

- (f) Scale and frequency of traffic generated can be accommodated on the road system without undue effects.

13. **Paragraph 5.49** states: “Because most rural buildings in South Cambridgeshire are small the potential scale of activity of converted buildings will usually be similarly modest. Any elements of increased floorspace contained within conversion proposals will be strictly controlled and usually limited to that which may be necessary to achieve an enhanced design or integrate the scheme with its surroundings”.

Consultations

14. **Over Parish Council** – Refusal – Over-industrialisation of the site. There is already a business park within Over which currently has spare capacity. This appears to be creeping development from Willingham towards Over. Concerns re inadequate visibility splays in an area where traffic is approaching the village at high speed.
15. **Willingham Parish Council** – No objection in principle, but making no recommendation as the site is in Over Parish.
16. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – No objection in principle. Recommends conditions and informatives to control the hours of use of power operated machinery and the details of power driven plant and equipment.
17. **Local Highway Authority** – initially concerned at further business uses at this site, and requesting a consolidation of accesses using the existing accesses onto Willingham Road only. Specific concerns about visibility splays have been discussed with the applicant. The amended plan received 6th September is considered acceptable from this point of view and the Highway Authority has lifted its objection.
18. **Environment Agency** – No objection, subject to a recommended condition and informatives requiring a scheme of pollution control to be submitted and approved.
19. **Willingham Combined Charity** – The Charity uses this road to access its land and does not expect it to be obstructed at any time.

Representations

20. A resident of Over Haden (also known as Mere Way) has expressed concern about the means of access. This road is only single track, it has no street lighting and is privately maintained. The applicant should use his existing accesses onto Willingham Road, where visibility would be better.

Planning Comments

21. The proposal lies outside the village framework, but it is close to it and it is located amongst an existing group of buildings. The renovated/refurbished building would not have any more impact on the appearance of the countryside in this location than the existing. The proposal conforms with Structure and Local Plan policies P1/1, P2/6, EM6 and EM7. Because rebuilding is proposed, the proposal does not conform with the first criterion of Policy EM10. I do not consider this to be a serious non-compliance in this instance, given these other considerations. Such policies encourage the reuse of redundant rural buildings for economic use, contrary to the concerns expressed by Over Parish Council.

22. The concerns of the Local Highway Authority have been met in the amended plan. The use will generate only small volumes of traffic, particularly when compared with the former use as a pig farm. I consider that the parking provision should be reduced to take account of the removal of the car repair business from the application, which can be the subject of a condition to the planning permission, if issued.

Recommendation

23. Approval of the application, as amended by plans date stamped 16th August and 6th September 2006, (drawings no. 2554/06/04a and site location plan) subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 3. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 4. Scheme of pollution control (Rc To ensure a satisfactory method of surface/foul water drainage and to prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment);
 5. Visibility splays to be provided and maintained (Rc In the interests of highway safety);
 6. Improvements to the access to be carried out before the use commences (Rc In the interests of highway safety);
 7. Details of parking to be submitted and agreed (Rc In the interests of highway safety);
 8. Restriction of hours of use of power operated machinery, during the period of renovation/construction and following the approved use commencing (Rc26);
 9. Sc27 Control of emissions (Rc27(a)).

Informatives

As recommended by the Environment Agency and the Chief Environmental Health Officer.

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:**
P1/2 (Environmental Restrictions on Development)
P2/6 (Rural Economy)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
EM6 (New Employment at Rural Growth and Limited Rural Growth Settlements)
EM10 (Conversion of Rural Buildings and Future Extensions)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Highway safety
 - Need for further industrial units

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/1238/06/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

4th October 2006

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Services

S/0788/06/F – WILLINGHAM

**Siting of Two Gypsy Caravans and Utility Building, at Cadwin Lane off Schole Road
for Mrs. D. Smith**

Recommendation: Temporary consent

**Date for Determination: 19th June 2006
Retrospective Application**

Site and Proposal

1. Schole Road is an area of generally flat agricultural Fen land with few hedges. The application site itself is a rectangular 28 metres wide and 54 metres deep. The plot is sited 114 metres behind the property known as The Barns fronting onto Schole Road, and at the end of what is being called Cadwins Lane.

Planning History

2. The site is in an area where there are a number of existing sites some of which have the benefit of planning permission while others are unauthorised.
3. The site does not have any relevant planning permission but has in the past been the subject of illegal dumping including cars.

Planning Policy

4. The relevant Development Plan comprises the approved Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
5. **Policy P5/4** of the Structure Plan says that local plans should make provision to meet the locally assessed need for housing specific groups including Gypsies and Travellers.
6. **Policy P1/2** says, inter alia, that development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
7. **Policy 7/4** says that development must relate sensitively to the local environment and contribute to the sense of place, identity and diversity of the distinct landscape character areas.
8. **Policy SE8** of the Local Plan says that there will be a general presumption in favour of residential development within village frameworks and that residential development outside these frameworks will not be permitted.

9. **Policy EN1** relates to Landscape Character Areas, and in respect of this site, it is concerned with respecting, retaining and wherever possible, enhancing the Fens Landscape Character & Natural Area.
10. **Policy HG23** is a specific policy concerned with caravan sites for Gypsies and Travelling show-people. It indicates that proposals for caravans for Gypsies will only be considered when the need for a site is shown to be essential to enable the applicants to exercise a travelling lifestyle for the purpose of making and seeking their livelihood. Where the need is proven 9 criteria have to be met if planning permission is to be granted for such sites. The criteria in summary are as follows:

- (1) The site is reasonably located for schools, shops and other local services.
- (2) The site would have minimal impact on the amenities of existing local residents and adjoining land uses; concentration of sites will be avoided.
- (3) The site would not, either on its own, or cumulatively, have a significant adverse effect on the rural character and appearance, or the amenities of the surrounding area.
- (4) The site can be satisfactorily assimilated into its surroundings by existing or proposed landscaping; an approved landscaping scheme will be required.
- (5) The use of the site would not give rise to unacceptable parking, highway access or service provision problems.
- (6) The site would not adversely affect any buildings of historic or archaeological importance, or sites of wildlife or nature conservation value.
- (7) Where planning permission is allowed, built forms of development will not be permitted except for utility outhouses. Small stables will be considered on their merits depending upon need and the nature of the site.
- (8) The site has adequate infrastructural connections to local services including water supply.
- (9) The use would not detract from convenient, safe and enjoyable use of a public right of way.

11. Also relevant is **Circular 1/2006 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and PPG3 Housing**. Circular 1/2006 confirms that the Government is committed to ensuring that members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities should have the same rights and responsibilities as every other citizen and provides updated guidance on the planning aspects of finding sites for Gypsies and Travellers and how local authorities and Gypsies and Travellers can work together to achieve that aim. The policies in this Circular apply throughout England.
12. Advice on the use of temporary permissions is contained in paragraphs 108 – 113 of Circular 11/95, *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permission*. Paragraph 110 advises that a temporary permission may be justified where it is expected that the planning circumstances will change in a particular way at the end of the period of the temporary permission. Where there is unmet need but no available alternative Gypsy and Traveller site provision in an area but there is a reasonable expectation that new sites are likely to become available at the end of that period in the area which will meet that need, local planning authorities should give consideration to granting a temporary permission. Such circumstances may arise, for example, in a case where a local planning authority is preparing its site allocations DPD. In such circumstances, local planning authorities are expected to give substantial weight to the unmet need in considering whether a temporary planning permission is justified.

13. The fact that temporary permission has been granted on this basis should not be regarded as setting a precedent for the determination of any future applications for full permission for use of the land as a caravan site. In some cases, it may not be reasonable to impose certain conditions on a temporary permission such as those that require significant capital outlay.

Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document

14. Consultants CDN Planning began working on this project in April 2006. The first draft Issues and Options report is currently subject to a Strategic Environment Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal SEA/SA. The Member Reference Group will consider the draft issues and Options report and the SEA/SA on 14 September and they will go to Council on 28 September. Once any changes have been made it will be available for public consultation from mid October. This initial Issues and Options stage is looking at criteria for site location. A second Issues and Options report will be prepared following representations on the first, and this will specifically identify potential sites within South Cambs for Gypsy/Traveller sites using the criteria already agreed. At this stage we expect the second Issues and Options report to be consulted on in Summer 2007.

Consultations

Parish Council

15. **Willingham Parish Council** recommends refusal on the following grounds:
- (a) The site is outside the village envelope.
 - (b) Willingham PC has a great concern as to the effects of such settlements, should they continue to be allowed, on the local facilities and especially on the school. Willingham Primary School already has about 10% Traveller children, with enough additional educational needs to impact adversely on the school's ability to give adequate resources to all its pupils.
 - (c) There is no such road as "Cadwin Field" – the PC does not recognise this as a valid address.
 - (d) Willingham PC has repeatedly requested guidelines from SCDC on Traveller settlements. They are extremely concerned that such settlements are very unevenly spread across the villages within S Cambridgeshire. They are perfectly willing to accept a fair share of such sites, but only proportionally and within reason. They are not prepared to approve any more sites until SCDC has given clear guidance about proportionality.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

16. No objections.

Chief Environmental Health Officer

17. The application has been considered in respect of noise and environmental pollution and it is concluded that there are no significant impacts. It is recommended that, if the application is successful, the applicant should be able to comply with the attached site license conditions relating to permanent residential caravan sites.

Traveller's Liaison Officer

18. The family and educational details set out later in this report are confirmed. If evicted, the family states that it would probably have to go back on the road. This family has a local connection with Cambridgeshire.

Old West Internal Drainage Board

19. Has no comment from a drainage point of view.

Environment Agency

20. In the eventuality of not being able to connect to the public foul sewer system, the suitability of any non-mains sewerage system needs to be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the LPA. Accordingly conditional permission is recommended.

Representations

21. 5 letters of objection have been received and the following comments have been made in them against the proposal:
- (a) The land is outside the development framework and hence any development is contrary to the Plan Policies that seek to limit development in these areas to essential development.
 - (b) While it is the Council's responsibility to ensure that there are sufficient sites to meet Travellers' needs, Willingham has enough already and the village school is experiencing problems accommodating the children of Travellers.
 - (c) No further consents should be given until the Council has some definitive procedures in place in respect of Traveller sites.
 - (d) The Council should ensure its decisions are adhered to.
 - (e) The area is Green Belt where such development should not be permitted – NB the land is not in the Green Belt.
 - (f) There could be 40 caravans on this site and the associated land.
 - (g) Site has been used for burning all manner of combustible materials, and this has been reported to the police.
 - (h) Site has been used for vehicle breaking.
 - (i) Since the site has been used there has been a general increase of local nuisance including trespass, dogs roaming off lead.
 - (j) Although circumstantial it is also claimed that there has been a general increase in the level of crime in the area.
22. In response to these comments the Council's Enforcement Officer has stated the following;

Having checked computer records from 2003 there has not been any complaints registered with Councils Environment team with regards to burning/ bonfires at the above premises or at any other plots within Cadwin Field. Both the Enforcement team and the Travellers Officer have also not received complaints relating to the burning of materials at this location.

The Cadwin Field site (plots 1 to 6) historically had been subject to vehicles and other material being burnt and deposited on site however since the change of ownership to the Smith family. Cadwin Field has been cleared of all abandoned vehicles and vehicle parts along with general rubbish. The site since their occupation has been

dramatically improved. However further investment in completing its transformation is currently on hold pending the outcome of the planning application.

With regards to fire damaged fir trees there is no current evidence of burning on plots 1, 2 and 6 however there is a little damage on plot three which is currently unoccupied and relates to fires that had been made prior to the Smiths purchase of the land.

The Site since the change of ownership has not been used for vehicle breaking.

With regards to children at plot 6 there are currently four boys living on the site aged between 2 and 12 of which three attend schools in both Cottenham and Willingham – Additionally Plot 1 has five children (3 in school) aged between 1 and 9 living on site and plot 2 has 4 children aging from 5 to 11 years old - Enforcement and the Travellers Officer are not aware of any incidents or complaints involving the children and or pet dogs.

Finally with regards to livestock at plot 6 all dogs and chickens have been sold and Officers were advised that they are unlikely to be replaced.

Personal Circumstances

23. The applicant has completed a Needs Audit in support of her proposal. She confirms that she previously lived on a rented site in South Cambs but left because she wanted to own her own site. As well as her, there are 4 children ranging in age from 2 to 12. Her main aim has been to get the children to school locally so that they receive a proper education

Equal Opportunities Implications

24. Under the Race Relations Act 1976 and the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, the Council has a statutory duty to eliminate unlawful discrimination and to promote race equality and good race relations. The Race Equality Scheme, updated by the Council in July 2006 with an update of the 2005 - 2008 action plan, gives priority to actions relating to Travellers, as the biggest single ethnic minority in the District (around 1.0% of the District's population). The Council is committed to treating everyone fairly and justly, whatever their race or background and the scheme gives priority to actions relating to Travellers. It also incorporates recommendations from the Commission for Racial Equality's "Common Ground" report.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

25. The key issue is conflict with countryside policies and policy for Gypsy caravan sites with regard to the need to limit impact on the landscape and rural character of the area, and having regard to the special circumstances that are argued here, together with the advice in circular 1/2006 concerning temporary consent while councils such as South Cambs are preparing a Development Plan Document.
26. From the evidence of the photographs, a considerable amount of fly tipping had taken place on the site, and it is now much tidier. Further the applicant has refrained from other improvements while their application has been determined.
27. In terms of the relevant criteria it is reasonably well located for schools shops and other local services. Indeed the applicant's children attend local schools. It is seen in the context of the adjacent permitted and unauthorised Traveller sites, and to that

extent it does add to the concentration of sites. However, I am not aware of any service provision issue.

28. The site is already well screened and the existing barn building on the adjacent site already has a significant visual impact. It follows that neither the applicant's proposal, nor the other two reported on this agenda, do not in themselves, have a significant impact on the landscape. If it is granted permission, I am confident that appropriate landscaping could take place to reduce its impact.
29. There are no highway issues resulting from its use, nor are there any significant conservation, archaeological or wildlife issues.
30. There have been no adverse comments from any of the service providers, and drainage will be conditioned and subject to further approval. It would not adversely detract from the use of a public right of way.
31. Concerns have been raised by neighbours about the development of this site in the countryside. However, as set out in the policy section, the principle of Travellers' sites in the countryside are acceptable. There is nothing intrinsically wrong about this site's relationship with the other properties in the area since it is some distance from any other residential property, and the use of the access would not affect residential amenity. The other issues are not planning matters and should not be taken into account when the decision is made since they are dealt with under different legislation. However I can say that the Council is undertaking work to improve relationships between the Travelling and settled communities and this work has, and will involve Willingham Parish Council.
32. While there have been issues of car breaking and burning in the past, these by and large pre-date the current residential use.
33. The consultation on the options for Traveller site provision within the District are proceeding and it seems to me that this is an entirely appropriate case to be considered for a temporary consent on a without prejudice basis. Such consent would enable the Parish Council's reasonable concerns about the cumulative impact of Traveller sites within the Parish to be properly considered since this is one of the issues that the Council will be consulting on in preparing its G&TDPD.

Recommendation

34. That the applicant be invited to amend the application to a temporary application for 3 years and if they do so, delegated authority be granted subject to conditions including 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
- Circular 1/2006
- Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment 2006
- Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document
- Planning Application File Ref: S/0788/06/F

Contact Officer: G.H.Jones – Head of Planning
Telephone: (01954) 713151

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee4th October 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Services

S/0264/06/F- OVER**Erection of House and Bungalow in the Parking Area at Queens Close,
for The Papworth Trust****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 15th May 2006****Update**

1. This application was reported to Planning Committee on 10th May 2006. At Committee it was decided that the application could be approved, subject to revisions made to the proposed car parking provision on the application site. Revised plans have now been received (date stamped 16th August 2006), which include a 1.8 metre brick wall along the boundary of flats 3-6 and the parking area, and 900mm high hit and miss fencing at the rear of parking areas to screen vehicle headlights from front rooms of adjacent dwellings. (A copy of the 10th May 2006 Committee report, agenda item 13, is included as an electronic appendix.)

Consultation

2. **Over Parish Council** - Given the level of negative feeling regarding this application from surrounding residents the alternative car parking arrangements are intrusive and ill conceived. The loss of car parking and green space is unacceptable. Recommend refusal.

Representations

3. Objections from the occupiers of numbers 3, 13, 17, 18 and 20, Queens Close were reported to Committee on the 10th May Committee Report.
4. Adjoining residents have been consulted on the amended drawings. No further comments have been received.

Planning Comments***Re-use of Site***

5. The application site is currently an unmarked car park, used by the existing residents of the flats in Queens Close. However, this parking area is under-used, as has been explained in a letter dated 24th October 2005 from the Neighbourhood Manager at South Cambridgeshire District Council. It is noted that residents have advised the Council that the area is too far away from their homes to use for car parking. Consequently, many park on the grassed area outside their flats. It is stated that better use of the land could be made, if resident's parking needs are met with any proposals for the site.

Design and Layout

6. Following the report of this application to the Planning Committee in May 2006, contact was made with the agents to obtain amended plans that would help to prevent glare from vehicle headlights into the front rooms of properties in Queens Close. Revised plans were received that include a 1.8 metre brick wall along the boundary of flats 3-6 and the parking area, and 900mm hit and miss fencing at the rear of the parking areas. It is considered that these revisions address previous concerns of the Committee.
7. No concerns are raised by officers over the design of the application proposals, since the new dwelling and bungalow have been designed for particular occupiers under the Papworth Trust.
8. There are a variety of dwellings in the vicinity of the application site, which include flats, detached dwellings and semi-detached houses. Thus the application proposals do respect the character and appearance of the site and its vicinity.

Neighbour concerns

9. In relation to concerns raised by the current occupiers of the flats in the vicinity of the application site, the agent states that the right to park a single vehicle in an unallocated space as given in the 'Right to Buy' sales transactions of some of the flats in Queens Close will be unaffected by the application proposals. Private residents will still retain a right to park, and in all cases the application proposals will result in parking being available in much closer proximity to the flats than is the current case. The current problem regarding parking provision in Queens Close, with its segregated parking with poor surveillance from individual flats, which has encouraged residents to park on the grass areas closer to their dwellings, will be addressed by the application proposals.
10. The agent notes in a letter dated 15th March 2006, that there has been ongoing issues with the poor positioning of the current parking area for some years, and that the District Council's Housing Directorate has considered parking arrangements in Queens Close similar to the application proposals to address this problem.

Bicycle and car parking provision

11. There has been some discussion with the applicant's agent regarding external bicycle storage provision in Queens Close. The agent has stated that he believes the preferred solution by residents would be to 'park' the cycles in the covered entrance foyers within the flats, or to store bicycles in their rear gardens. Whilst bicycle parking provision could be included within the application scheme, the agent believes that it would not actually be used, and that in any case the applicants would have made no costing provision for such additional features in their bid for funding from the Housing Corporation.
12. In relation to car parking, the application proposals include parking for 20 vehicles. In terms of car parking standards adopted by the Council, there are currently 16 flats in Queens Close, which should result in a maximum of 24 spaces being provided. It is considered that 20 spaces provided for in the application proposals is an appropriate amount.

Conclusions

13. On the basis of the above, I recommend that this application as amended by drawings QCO-PL-03 and QCO-PL-01B be approved subject to conditions.
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5aii);
 3. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 4. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 5. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment (Rc60);
 6. Sc5f – Details of materials to be used for hard surfaced areas within the site including roads, driveways and car parking areas (Reason – To minimise 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),
P5/2 (Reusing Previously Developed Land and Buildings) and
P5/4 (Meeting Locally Identified Housing Needs)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
SE3 (Limited Rural Growth Settlements),
SE8 (Village Frameworks) and
HG10 (Housing Mix and Design)
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 and car parking issues

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 Committee Report S/0264/06/F (10th May 2006)
- Documents referred to in the report including appendices on the website only and reports to previous meetings

Contact Officer: Area Team 3

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee4th October 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1308/06/F – CHILDERLEY
Variation of Condition 1 of Planning Permission S/0386/03/O
To Allow an Additional Two Year Period for the Submission of Reserved Matters for
the Erection of 2 Single Storey Dwellings at
Land north of A428 for M Jenkins and J Poulton

Recommendation: Approval

Determination Date: 29th August 2006

Departure Application**Site and Proposal**

1. The site lies in open countryside to the north of the A428. It forms part of a large arable field. There is a field hedge to the west.
2. The full planning application, received 4th July 2006, seeks to extend the period for submission of reserved matters for a further two years from 11th September 2006.
3. The applicant's agent states:

“The consent was granted on 11/09/03 due to the A428 road improvement scheme to help enhance security measures at Childerley Estate owing to the severance of the existing front lodge cottage by the new road scheme. Work on the scheme only started in October 2005 and as a result of services installations alongside the landscaping strip, the siting of the properties cannot yet be finalised. We therefore would like further time to decide on the exact siting of the properties until the works are more advanced.

This planning application previously gained consent at Planning Control Committee where they agreed that it cohered to Policy SP12/1 of the 1995 Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. This policy has not altered since the consent was initially granted on 11th September 2003 and we feel that extending the existing consent should be allowed especially as the work on the A428 scheme has only just commenced”.

Planning History

4. Planning permission was granted at the April 2003 committee meeting for two dwellings under reference **S/0386/03/O**. The permission was subject to a S106 agreement that requires the dwellings to be single storey only, that no development shall take place until the A428 trunk road dualling and other improvements have been confirmed, and the dwellings should not be occupied other than by any member of the family occupying Childerley Hall or an employee or tenant of the Childerley Hall estate.

5. The minutes from the April 2003 meeting are reproduced below:

“Members were minded to **APPROVE** the application for two dwellings, contrary to the recommendation contained in the Planning Director's report, subject to it being advertised as a Departure from the Development Plan, being referred to the Secretary of State and not being called in by him for determination. Members were conscious that this application had security implications for the occupants, and that any appeal process could delay progress in dualling the A428. They indicated that the two dwellings should not be bungalows, but should be constructed so as to reflect the local character of the area and adhere to the Council's Corporate Objectives. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant would be required to complete a Section 106 Legal Agreement restricting the construction of the dwellings until the Compulsory Purchase Orders for the new route of the A428 had been confirmed and served. Members asked that consent be subject to a Condition that occupation of the dwellings be restricted to tenants or employees of the Estate”.

Planning Policy

6. Policy **P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (the Structure Plan) states (in part) that development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
7. Policy **SE8** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states (in part) that residential development outside of identified village frameworks will not be permitted.

Consultation

8. **Caldecote Parish Council**
No recommendation
9. **Boxworth Parish Council**
Recommends approval and states that it has no objections.
10. **Dry Drayton Parish Council**
No recommendation.
11. **Bourn Parish Council**
Comments are awaited.
12. **Highways Agency**
“...the application will not adversely affect the A428...the Highways Agency does not intend to issue a direction and would not wish to comment further...”
13. **Environment Agency**
“Your Council will be required to respond on behalf of the Agency in respect of flood risk and surface water drainage related issues”. Previous comments and suggested conditions and informatives remain relevant.

Representations

14. No representations have been received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:
- (a) The principle of residential development on the site.
 - (b) Changes since the granting of planning permission reference S/0386/03/O.

(a) Principle of residential development

16. The proposal is for two dwellings in the countryside. Policy SE8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 is clear that residential development outside of village frameworks shall not be permitted. The proposal is clearly contrary to this policy and there is an in principle objection to the development.
17. The applicants require the dwellings for specific reasons prompted by the works to the A428. At the April 2003 meeting Members considered that there was sufficient justification, in this case, to overturn the normal strong policy objection to dwellings in the countryside. The principle has therefore been accepted by the Council as a departure from the Development Plan. The Secretary of State did not wish to 'call in' the application.

(b) Changes since the granting of the 2003 consent

18. Contrary to the claims of the agents that Members considered the proposal complied with Policy SP12/1 of the 1995 Structure Plan and that it remains unchanged, the application was not considered to comply with Policy SP12/1 and this policy is no longer extant. However, the thrust of this policy on protecting the countryside from development that is not essential remains in the current Development Plan and I do not consider there are any materially significant changes in the thrust of policies that would justify a refusal of this planning application.
19. The main impact of this proposal is to extend the life of the permission for a further two years. I consider the applicants have good reason to do this due to the only recent commencement of the works to the A428 and I do not consider that such an extension will harm any interests of acknowledged importance.
20. As the principle of this development has already been accepted and not 'called in' I do not consider it necessary to refer the matter to the SoS.

Recommendation

21. Approval subject to the following conditions and revisions to the S106 agreement if necessary to relate it to this permission.
- 1. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of 2 years from the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
(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 full details of the following reserved matters have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:-
 - a) the siting of the buildings;
 - b) design and external appearance of the buildings;

(Reason – The application is for outline permission only and gives insufficient details of the proposed development.)

3. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage shall be submitted to and agreed 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).

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 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 ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage).

Reasons for Approval

Although the application proposes two dwellings in the countryside, contrary to Policies SP1/2 of the Structure Plan 2003 and SE8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, it is considered that there is an essential security need for the development to serve the new access to Childerley Estate, which will replace the existing access at Childerley Lodge when the A428 dualling scheme is completed.

Informatives

Environment Agency Informatives.

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 reference S/1308/06/F and S/0386/03/O
- Documents referred to in the report including appendices on the website only and reports to previous meetings

Contact Officer: Nigel Blazeby – Area Planning Officer Area 3
Telephone: (01954) 713165

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

4th October 2006

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director/ Head of Planning Services

**S/1560/06/F - CALDECOTE
One Bungalow and One Chalet Bungalow, 82 West Drive, Highfields
for Mr T Mendham**

Recommendation: Approval

Date for determination: 28th September 2006

Site and Proposal

1. The site, which is within the framework boundary and which is 0.07ha in area, is at present occupied by a single storey dwelling. To the north-east, the site is adjoined by a bungalow at 80 West Drive, which has windows in its south western elevation facing the site, within 1.5m of the boundary. To the south west, recent development has taken place to provide a chalet bungalow at the rear of the site, leaving an unimplemented consent for a second chalet bungalow at the front of the site.
2. This full application, dated 1st August 2006, is for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of two dwellings upon the site. Plot 1, adjacent to No. 80, is shown as a 2 bedroom bungalow with a ridge height of 5.0m. Plot 2, adjacent to the driveway to the recently constructed chalet bungalow to the rear, is shown to be developed with a 3 bedroom chalet bungalow with a ridge height of 6.6m. The development is to be served by a shared access with a forecourt providing parking and turning for four cars.

Planning History

3. There have been two recent planning applications on the site. Planning permission was granted in February 2006 for the erection of two bungalows, each of similar design and having a ridge height of 4.6m (**S/0013/06/F**). The second application was for two chalet bungalows with a ridge height of 6.7m (S/1089/06/F). This application was withdrawn following concerns expressed about the effect on the amenity of the occupiers of No. 80 adjoining.

Planning Policy

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

4. **Policy P1/3** (Sustainable Design in Built Development). A high standard of design and sustainability for all new development will be required.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

5. **Policy SE4** identifies Highfields Caldecote as a Group village in which residential development of up to 8 dwellings will be permitted within the framework provided the site is not essential to the character of the village, it would be sensitive to village

character, landscape and ecological features and the amenities of neighbours, infrastructure capacity is available and the proposal would not conflict with another policy of the plan.

6. **Policy HG10** requires development to contain a mix of units and to make the best use of the site.

Consultations

7. **Caldecote Parish Council** – Refusal. Comments that the plot has permission for 2 bungalows which is considered to be more than appropriate, but that was considered to be overdevelopment. This is one step worse. The Parish Council has put forward recommendations for conditions on any planning permission issued.
8. **Building Control Manager** – Surface water soakaways should work in this area but will need to be carefully sized from results of a percolation test. Rainwater harvesting would seem ideal but will still need a soakaway for overflow.
9. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – Recommends a condition to ensure the dwellings are protected from noise from the nearby industrial premises at TKA Bourn.
10. **Environment Agency** – Soakaways unlikely to function satisfactorily due to underlying boulder clay. Surface water harvesting may be an option.

Representations

11. The occupiers of 80 West Drive have expressed concern at the proximity and height of the proposed chalet bungalow leading to loss of light and privacy. They indicate that their bungalow is lower than adjacent land. They want the new bungalow to be the same height as No. 80.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

12. The proposal represents an increase in size of dwelling on both plots compared with what has been permitted under planning permission S/0013/06/F. I consider that the proposed chalet bungalow on plot 2 will be in keeping with the character of the area, where other similar dwellings have been erected or have permission outstanding. The dwelling on plot 1 will be sited 1.2m from the boundary with No.80, and 2.8m from the kitchen window in its facing elevation.
13. The main issue, in my opinion, is the possible loss of light to that room as a result of this development. The previously approved scheme showed a bungalow with ridge height of 4.6m. The current proposal adds 400mm to this. While this will worsen the loss of light, I am not convinced that this will be so bad as to warrant a refusal of planning permission. However, the applicant has indicated that he is willing to reduce this ridge height to match the previous approval but, even if no such plans are received, I can see no reasonable ground for withholding planning permission.

Recommendation

14. Approval of the application dated 1st August 2006, subject to the following conditions:
 1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5aii);

3. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
4. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
5. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment (Rc60);
6. Before development commences, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of a scheme for protecting the dwellings from noise from the nearby industrial premises. The approved scheme shall be carried out before occupation of either dwelling, hereby approved.
(Rc - To safeguard future occupiers from noise disturbance from the nearby industrial premises);
7. (Sc5(b) Surface water drainage details.
(Rc -To ensure satisfactory drainage of the site);
8. D5 – Visibility splays 2m x2m edge of carriageway.
(Rc - In the interest of highway safety);
9. During the period of construction restriction of hours of use of power operated machinery. (Rc - To protect the amenities of nearby residents).

Informatives

1. During construction there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on the site except with the prior permission of the District Council's Environmental Health Officer in accordance with best practice and existing waste management legislation.
2. Before the existing buildings are demolished, a Demolition Notice will be required from the Council's Environmental Health Section, in order to establish the means by which the demolition will take place including the removal of any asbestos present, the removal of waste, minimisation of dust, capping of drains, and establishing hours of working operation, so as to ensure the protection of the residential environment of the area.
3. Environment Agency informatives
4. Environmental Health advise regarding a noise attenuation scheme.

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)
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 and overlooking issues
 - Visual impact on the locality

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 Refs S/1560/06/F, S/1089/06/F and S/0013/06/F.

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee4th October 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1548/06/F - FOWLMERE**Extensions at the Chequers Inn, High Street
for Beaumont Pubs Ltd****S/1547/06/LB - FOWLMERE****Removal of 4 Stores and Replacement by Five Bedrooms with Shower Rooms
and Staff Sitting Room/Kitchen Stores, Bin Storage Area and Covered Area with
Pitched Roof. New 2.1m High Picket Fence Inserts
for Beaumont Pubs Ltd****Recommendation: Delegated Approval****Date for Determination: 27th September 2006****Members will visit this site on Monday 2nd October 2006.****Conservation Area and Listed Building****Site and Proposal**

1. This application, registered 2nd August 2006 seeks consent for extensions to the Chequers Inn, High Street, Fowlmere for the erection of kitchen and staff accommodation. The former measures 5m x 4.5m under a double span plain-tiled pitched roof, one wing of which would extend a further 4.5m to provide an open-sided covered area. The latter would replace stores on the west side and would extend some 28m along the west boundary to provide office, staff sitting room/kitchen and 5 no. staff rooms.
2. The application site is located inside the village framework for Fowlmere, within the Conservation Area and is a Listed Building.
3. Located to the north of the site is the adjoining car park and public house garden. It is bound to the east and west by residential dwellings and to the south by the High Street. The site is accessed via the High Street.
4. The site comprises approximately 0.2ha, which is made up of lawn and hard standing located to the north of the public house. The building is located hard against the public footpath in the south west corner of the plot.
5. The application is accompanied by a supporting planning statement and Design Statement.

Planning History

6. The history of this site is quite extensive dating back to the late 1950's for the siting of caravans. Various applications have been submitted for extensions to the building, of which a kitchen extension was approved in 1975 under reference **S/0009/75/F** and

additional extensions applied for in 1983 and 1988 under references **S/0395/83/F** and **S/1321/88/F**, again approved.

Planning Policy

7. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 relates to sustainable design in built development and requires a high standard of design for all new development, which responds to the local character of the built environment.
8. **Policy P3/4** of the Structure Plan 2003 states that Local Planning Authorities will support the vitality of rural communities by encouraging the retention and expansion of village shopping facilities on a scale appropriate to their location and serving a local function, and key community services.
9. **Policy P7/6** 'Historic Built Environment' of the Structure Plan 2003 states Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
10. **Policy EN28** 'Development within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building' sets out the requirements for development within the curtilage or setting of listed buildings.
11. **Policy EN30** 'Development in Conservation Areas' of the Local Plan 2004 sets out the requirements for development within Conservation Areas.

Consultation

12. **Fowlmere Parish Council** made recommendations for refusal. For the extensions to the kitchen it stated:

“ The meeting has no objection to this section of the application as the new construction will greatly improve an unsightly existing structure. The meeting is concerned about the extractor unit and ask that the Environmental Health Officer be consulted to ensure there is no noise or odour problems for neighbours”.

With reference to the staff accommodation block it stated “The meeting would in principle support a single storey extension but feel this application is far too extensive and would ask for this section to be redesigned to be more proportionate and sympathetic to the Listed Building. Any new design should incorporate evidence of thorough sound proofing against neighbouring boundaries. The meeting wish to know the exact distance of the gap between the existing fence and the proposed building wall”

13. The **Conservation Manager** has no objections and its comments are as follows: “The site comprises a late 15th or early 16th century, grade II listed building with 17th century additions and 20th century additions and alterations. The building is timber framed and plastered with a plain tiled roof and comprises a two storey main range with a one and a half storey range to the east, formerly the 17th century kitchen. In the 20th century the building was altered and extended to the rear with several flat roofed extensions and a conservatory.
14. Demolition of the stores will be an enhancement and relocation of the cold store nearer to the kitchen will be more practical. The proposed extension to the kitchen to provide a cold store and storage for linen and freezers in addition of a bin store will increase the massing of the existing extension but the impact on the character and appearance of the Listed Building is not considered to be significant. Roofing the

extension and part of the existing flat roofed extension with a double gable will mask the existing extract and skylight and will result in a more traditional roof form that will enhance the existing extension.

15. The applicant has demonstrated that there is a need for staff accommodation and that the most cost effective way of providing this is on site. The scheme has been carefully considered so that it reads as a range of outbuildings and although it will increase the massing of the existing extensions, it is modest in scale, traditional in form and design and will not damage the special character and appearance of the Listed Building or its setting. The Parish Council has raised concerns about the extent of the proposal and the impact on the neighbour. While the Conservation Team has no objection in principle to the proposal, a reduction in the number of rooms or the omission of the office or sitting room/kitchen would possibly reduce the impact on the neighbour and would be supported.
16. The only comment regarding the design is of the roofing material on the proposed extensions. There is a hierarchy of roofing materials and whereas the roof of the main building is covered in plain tiles it would be appropriate to have pan tiles, however this could be dealt with by condition.
17. By virtue of the above comments the proposed extensions are considered to preserve and enhance the character of the wider Conservation Area”.
18. Conditions are suggested to seek details and approval of proposed windows and doors, stained black weatherboarding and all external joinery, proposed roof tiles and a sample panel of brickwork to be constructed on site to enable the Local Planning Authority to agree the type of brick, the bond, the joint detail and the mortar mix.
19. The **Chief Environmental Health Officer** has no objection to the development and has provided conditions and informatives required for construction and foundations.
20. Further consultation with the EHO following neighbour objections regarding the extractor units, noise and disturbance was also commented on. Its response states in part
 - (a) That there are no records of complaints regarding the existing extraction unit serving the kitchen and given that the extension is not proposed to allow for intensification of cooking facilities, but act as an increased storage area, no reason is seen for the renewal or replacement of the existing system.
 - (b) From an Environmental Health standpoint it is not possible to confirm that the erection of the accommodation block along the western boundary will necessarily have an adverse affect on nearby residents. The Building Control department would be responsible for ensuring that the buildings comply with the relevant standards in respect of construction and insulation.

Representations

21. There have been three letters of objection received from neighbouring residents.
22. The occupier of “Laurel Hurst”, High Street located to the west, immediately adjacent the site raises concerns regarding the following:
 - (a) Noise and nuisance, particularly late at night close to the writer’s kitchen, dining room and children’s bedrooms;

- (b) Lack of detail and clarity in the plans submitted;
 - (c) Provenance use and relevance of historical buildings;
 - (d) Weak grounds for justification;
 - (e) Context of the planning application, in terms of scale and use along the full length of the writer's eastern boundary;
 - (f) Development and potential use in the future for bed and breakfast accommodation creating further noise, nuisance and disturbance;
 - (g) Unacceptable scale dominating the rear aspect of the Listed Building and the rear garden of "Laurel Hurst";
 - (h) Out of character with the Listed Building;
 - (i) Proposal involves change of use of the garden;
 - (j) Out of keeping with the Conservation Area status.
23. The occupier of "The Cottage", High Street located next door but one, neighbours to "Laurel Hurst", have raised concerns regarding the following:
- (a) Change of character to the gardens of the properties on the High Street;
 - (b) Weak grounds for justification;
 - (c) Employment in Fowlmere and other Public Houses in the villages;
 - (d) The loss of garden space within the grounds of the public house;
 - (e) Detract from the character of the site and the Listed Building.
24. The occupier of "Stoneyfield", High Street located to the rear of the site immediately adjacent the car park area has raised the following concerns:
- (a) Positioning and efficiency of the extraction system, times of operation and smell;
 - (b) Scale and height of the accommodation block;
 - (c) Scale in relation to the character of the Listed Building;
 - (d) Loss of garden;
 - (e) Unacceptable levels of noise;
 - (f) Visual loss to east aspect of neighbour's garden at "Laurel Hurst";
 - (g) Weak justification.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

25. The main issues in relation to this application are: the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and Listed Building; and impact on neighbours. Whilst the existing outbuildings are of no merit, provided their replacement and redevelopment does not harm the setting of the Listed Building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and/or the amenity of neighbours, the development should not reasonably be resisted, given the policy presumption of supporting essential rural services.
26. There is no doubt that the existing outbuildings and kitchen area of the public house are of very little architectural merit to the Listed Building, neither preserving or enhancing, and the proposed scheme is very different in form. The existing outbuildings comprise random concrete block work with corrugated metal roofs; the kitchen is currently flat roofed with a highly visible extractor unit and raised roof light. That said it is a functional building with a large plot with adequate space for the proposed scheme.
27. The design, and the roof in particular, is broken up into different elements to reduce the bulk of the proposal. In particular the accommodation block located close to the occupiers of "Laurel Hurst" has flat roof elements along the boundary that take the

development further away than first impressions may give. The roof is pitched away from the boundary and the visual impact considered to be minimal.

28. The design of the proposed kitchen extension helps mask the existing extractor unit and will result in a more traditional roof form that will enhance the existing extension. The accommodation block takes on the form of a range of single storey outbuildings, which can be conditioned to use traditional materials. Flat roof elements of the scheme are hidden within the development where necessary to link the buildings together.
29. Although the mass of area used has increased, the scale in relation to the existing building is modest. The design of the extensions is considered to be acceptable.
30. The accommodation part of the development will have some impact, particularly on the amenity of the occupiers of "Laurel Hurst", in terms of potential noise. There are 7 small windows located in the proposed west elevation of the accommodation block that I am apprehensive about. The openings on this elevation are for light and easy access to maintain the rear of the building, and I am informed a drain also. The windows are not for visual gain as there is a currently a fence on this boundary that restricts views and potential overlooking; I am informed by the agent that these windows are to be fitted with obscure glass and double-glazed. The removal of these windows would lessen any noise that may be heard from the rooms and in particular the staff sitting room/kitchen area. The development is not considered to result in serious visual harm to the amenity of neighbours and the issues regarding noise can be addressed with further amendments to the design and attenuation of the building. Omitting these windows would be preferable, however the Party Wall Act 1996 would enable work to be carried out efficiently from the neighbouring property if necessary. This is not a material planning issue but can be a contentious issue between landowners.
31. Further discussions with the Agent prior to the Committee meeting have enabled concerns to be raised and negotiation has already taken place to address the loss of the windows on the west elevation of the staff area with a possibility of relocating them within the roof slope, facing in towards the garden using conservation style roof lights; this will provide the ventilation and light source required by the client. Other discussions have involved moving the kitchen/staff area further along the accommodation block, away from the neighbouring property to reduce any noise impact it may have. This is still being negotiated, although the agent informs me that this may not be an option the client wants to pursue. I have also been informed that there will be no cooking facilities available in the kitchen area other than that of a microwave and no additional extraction units will be necessary.

Recommendation

32. Subject to the receipt of amended drawings in terms of the elevations and noise attenuation of the proposed accommodation block, approve both applications subject to conditions recommended by the Conservation Manager and related to hours of work during the period of construction and to implementation of an agreed scheme of noise attenuation in the proposed accommodation block.

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/1548/06/F, S/0009/75/F, S/0395/83/F and S/1321/88/F

Contact Officers: Saffron Garner – Senior Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713256

Barbara Clarke - Conservation Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713179

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee 4th October 2006
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

**APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION:
SUMMARIES OF DECISIONS OF INTEREST – FOR INFORMATION**

Purpose

1. To highlight recent Appeal decisions of interest forming part of the more extensive Appeals report, now only available on the Council's website and in the Weekly Bulletin.

Summaries

Mr & Mrs S Sharpe – Erection of dwelling and reorganisation of restaurant car park – 1 Church Street, Little Shelford – Appeal dismissed

2. The main issue in this appeal was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the village conservation area.
3. This is a prominent corner site which the inspector found to form part of a significant undeveloped gap along Hauxton Road. It is a welcome open aspect in what is otherwise built up frontage. While it is not designated as a Protected Village Amenity Area, the inspector considered it forms an essential part of village character as set out in LP Policy SE5.
4. Regard was had to the possible enhancement of boundaries, the verdant setting of the site, a better screened location for car parking and no overall increase in hard surfacing overall. Nevertheless, the appeal proposal would create a dominant and unwelcome visual intrusion into the street scene. The shape and form of the new dwelling would articulate its mass and this would appear excessive. The resultant loss of distinctive open character would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
5. The Parish Council and local residents had also objected on the grounds of inadequate access and safety. The inspector did not accept that these were matters on which the application could be refused.

Persimmon Homes – Retention of Walls (temporary period 2 years) – High Street, Longstanton – Planning and enforcement appeals dismissed

6. Both appeals concerned the retention of two walls either side of an entrance to an area of new housing (Phase 1, Home Farm). There are plaques on the wall labelled 'St Michaels Park' in front of which are planted areas and floodlights.
7. The inspector found that the development amounts to an entrance feature and advertisement and noted the presence of several other advertisements near by. He was concerned about the likely timing of events including the handover of the village green to the Parish Council

8. The inspector accepted that the walls and adjacent planted beds are not unsightly.. On the other hand, they do add to the clutter of advertising material and intrude into an area intended to be open space. The presence of the floodlights also draws attention to the walls.
9. Development plan policies are aimed at ensuring recreational facilities are protected. The longer the walls remain, the greater the likelihood that their presence could inhibit the community use of the open space. The walls do not provide a sense of place which responds well to the character of the environment being suburban rather than helping to maintain what is left of the village or semi-rural character.
10. The possibility of a shorter temporary permission was considered but rejected given there was no clear evidence regarding the future timing of events. On balance, the inspector concluded that both appeals should be dismissed.
11. The developer has until 4 October 2006 to demolish the walls and remove the resulting materials.

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

- Planning Inspectors' appeal decisions dated 30th August and 4th September 2006

Contact Officer: John Koch – Appeals Manager
Telephone: (01954) 713268

INDEX OF CURRENT ENFORCEMENT CASES
4th October 2006

Ref No	Location	See Page No for full update	Remarks
18/98	Plot 10 Setchell Drove COTTENHAM	1-2	Variation of condition 2 of Planning Permission S/0416/06/F refused. Awaiting appeal. Plots 7 and 7A not currently occupied
34/98	Camside Farm Chesterton Fen Road MILTON	3-7	Compliance period extended to 1 st November 2006.
17/02	Land at Sandy Park Chesterton Fen Road MILTON	7-8	Currently considering options for dealing with the breach of the Enforcement Notice.
18/02	Rose and Crown Road SWAVESEY	8-10	Currently considering options for dealing with the breach of the Enforcement Notice.
8/03	Land adjacent to Setchell Drove COTTENHAM (B Land - Pineview)	10-12	Injunction issued by The High Court. Compliance date for removal of hardstandings 7 th October 2006. To be considered by Planning Sub Committee 11 th October 2006.
9/03	Land adjacent to Setchell Drove COTTENHAM (G Land - Pineview)	12-13	Injunction issued by the High Court. Travellers had until 7 th September 2006 to remove their caravans and buildings from the site and until 7 th October 2006 to remove hard standing and some access roads. Site to be checked after 7 th October 2006 to establish if injunction and Enforcement Notice have been complied with. To be considered by Planning Sub Committee 11 th October 2006.
10/03	Victoria View, Land at Plot 2 and R/O Plot 3 Setchell Drove COTTENHAM	13-14	Appeal dismissed. Enforcement Notice takes effect on 7 th December 2006. Application made for leave to appeal to the High Court. Due to be heard on 30 th November.

Ref No	Location	See Page No for full update	Remarks
15/03	Victoria View Land to rear of Plots 3, 4 and 5 Setchel Drove COTTENHAM	15-16	Appeal dismissed. Enforcement Notice takes effect on 7 th December 2006. Application made for leave to appeal to the High Court. Due to be heard on 30 th November.
19/03	Land adjacent to Moor Drove Cottenham Road HISTON	16-17	Currently considering options to deal with the breach of the Enforcement Notice. Planning application S/0647/06/F withdrawn.
9/04	Land adjacent to Cow Fen Drove SWAVESEY	17-18	On 31 st August the defendants approved at Cambridge Magistrates Court. Each fined £1000 with costs. Further prosecution being considered.
11/04	43A High Street LANDBEACH	19	Enforcement Notice complied with. Remove from active list.
13/04	Scholes Road WILLINGHAM	19-20	Appeal allowed. Application being made to the High Court by the Council against the decision.
15/04	Land adjacent 12 The Common WEST WRATTING	20-21	Enforcement Notice withdrawn. New planning application being submitted.
16/04	2 Manor Farm Barns and land adjoining Cockhall Lane LITLINGTON	21-22	Enforcement Notice issued. Refusal of planning permission (S/2153/04/F) appealed.
18/04	The Orchard Smithy Fen COTTENHAM	22	Matter to be reviewed in January 2007.
3/05	Land adjacent to Hilltrees Babraham Road STAPLEFORD	23	Planning application S/1469/06/O refused. Prosecution file submitted to Legal Office.
10/05	6A Dale Way SAWSTON	23-24	In breach of Enforcement Notice matter being investigated.
13/05	Plots 5, 5a, 6, 10 & 11 Orchard Drive COTTENHAM	24	Planning Application S/1631/06/F submitted.
15/05	White House Farm Cambridge Road MELBOURN	24-25	Compliance period extended to 1 st December 2006.

Ref No	Location	See Page No for full update	Remarks
17/05	Manna Ash House Common Road WESTON COLVILLE	25	Enforcement Notice issued. Refusal of planning permission appealed.
18/05	Land off Schole Road (known as Cadwin Lane) WILLINGHAM	25	In breach of extent Enforcement Notice. Planning applications submitted.
18/99	Vatches Barn Comberton Road BARTON	26-28	Defendant appeared before Cambridge Magistrate Court on 29 th August and was fined £4,000 with our costs awarded. Remove from active list.
19/05	Former Plough Public House Swavesey Road FEN DRAYTON	28	Planning application S/1431/06/F being considered.
1/06	Slate Hall Farm Huntingdon Road OAKINGTON	28	Negotiations to resolve issues continue.
2/06	The Old Stack Yard Mill Green SHUDY CAMPS	28	Appeal against refusal of planning permission S/2330/05/F.
3/06	Land at High Street (Persimmon Development) LONGSTANTON	29	Appeal dismissed compliance date 5 th October 2006.
4/06	Plot 15 Water Lane Smithy Fen COTTENHAM	29	Enforcement Notice appealed.
5/06	Plot 17 Adjacent to Pine View Smithy Fen COTTENHAM	29	In breach of Enforcement Notice Legal options being considered.
6/06	79 Rooks Street COTTENHAM	29-30	Enforcement Notice Complied with. Remove from active list.
7/06	Land adjacent to Mill Lane and A1301 SAWSTON	30	Enforcement Notice appealed.
8/06	Plot 15 1 London Way Clunchpits MELBOURN	30	Enforcement Notice appealed.

Ref No	Location	See Page No for full update	Remarks
10/06	The Old Well 55 Station Road Stow-cum-Quy	30	Enforcement Notice appealed
11/06	Tesco Store Viking Way BAR HILL	30	Enforcement Notice appealed.
12/06	Unit J Broad Lane COTTENHAM	31	Enforcement Notice issued. Compliance date 5 th December 2006.
13/06	Rose Cottage High Street HORNINGSEA	31	Enforcement Notice issued. Compliance date 8 th December 2006.
14/06	Fern Farm Short Drove COTTENHAM	31	File submitted to Legal Office for the issue of an Enforcement Notice.