

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



28 November 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, 6 DECEMBER 2006 at 10.00 a.m.**

Yours faithfully
GJ HARLOCK
Chief Executive

AGENDA

	PAGES
PROCEDURAL ITEMS	
1. Apologies	
2. Declarations on Interest Members are requested to complete and return the attached form, and to declare interests immediately prior to the relevant item on the agenda. Should Members wish to declare an interest in an item to be discussed after they have left the meeting, and to have that declaration recorded in the Minutes, they should make their declaration 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.)	1 - 2
3. Minutes of Previous Meeting To authorise the Chairman to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2006 as a correct record. A draft of these Minutes was included in the Weekly Bulletin dated 22 November 2006 and is available on the Council's website.	
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER ITEMS FOR DECISION	
4. S/2025/06/F – FOWLMERE (Amberley, Long Lane)	3 - 6
5. S/2033/06/F – FULBOURN (11 Teasel Way)	7 - 12
6. S/1742/06/F- GIRTON (Howe Close Sports Field, Whitehouse Lane, Off Huntingdon Road)	13 - 16
7. S/2103/06/RM – GIRTON (Land off Wellbrook Way)	17 - 24

8.	S/1919/06/F – HARDWICK (6 Main Street)	25 - 28
9.	S/2069/06/F – HARSTON (41 London Road)	29 - 36
10.	S/1222/06/F – HASLINGFIELD (The Barn, Charity Farm, Harston Road)	37 - 42
11.	S/1870/06/F - LINTON (Land R/O 20 Back Road)	43 - 50
12.	S/1907/06/F- LINTON (Land r/o 42 Back Road)	51 - 56
13.	S/1875/06/RM & S/1877/06/RM – LONGSTANTON (Land within Phase 2, Home Farm)	57 - 68
14.	S/1876/06/RM – LONGSTANTON (Land within Phase 2, Home Farm)	69 - 78
15.	S/1981/06/F – GREAT CHISHILL (Barn B, May Street Farm)	79 - 82
16.	S/2009/06/F – MILTON (5 Pearson Close)	83 - 92
17.	S/2034/06/F – GRAVELEY (Hillcrest Farm, Toseland Road)	93 - 96
18.	S/2085/06/F – SAWSTON (Land Adjacent 9 Dale Way)	97 - 100
19.	S/1502/06/LB & S/1503/06/F- BABRAHAM (The George Inn at the Black Barns, High Street)	101 - 110
20.	S/1902/06/F - HINXTON (Lordship Farm, Mill Lane)	111 - 118
21.	S/1839/06/F – GREAT SHELFORD (Scotsdale Garden Centre, 120 Cambridge Road)	119 - 124
22.	S/2061/06/F - GREAT SHELFORD (Land Adjacent to 1 Davey Crescent)	125 - 130
23.	S/1857/06/F – WILLINGHAM (Fox’s Meadow, Priest Lane)	131 - 138
24.	S/2102/06/CC – WILLINGHAM (Willingham Travellers Site, Meadow Road)	139 - 144
25.	S/1889/06/F – OVER (Land Rear of 54 The Lanes)	145 - 150
26.	Cambourne Phase 6 Upper Cambourne development briefing document	151 - 156

INFORMATION ITEMS

The following item is included on the agenda for information and is available in electronic format only (at www.scambs.gov.uk/meetings and in the Weekly Bulletin dated 29 November 2006). Should Members have any comments or questions regarding issues raised by the report, they should contact the appropriate officer.

27. **Appeals against Planning Decisions and Enforcement Action**
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.

Mobile Phones

Please ensure that your phone is set on silent / vibrate mode during meetings.

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 (as amended) 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 Head of Planning Services.

This page is intentionally left blank

South Cambridgeshire District Council

Planning Committee – 6 December 2006 – Declaration of Interests

Councillor

Personal / Personal and Prejudicial [delete as appropriate]

Item no: App. No. Village:

Reason:

Personal / Personal and Prejudicial [delete as appropriate]

Item no: App. No. Village:

Reason:

Personal / Personal and Prejudicial [delete as appropriate]

Item no: App. No. Village:

Reason:

Personal / Personal and Prejudicial [delete as appropriate]

Item no: App. No. Village:

Reason:

Please return the completed form to ian.senior@scams.gov.uk prior to the meeting, or leave it with the Democratic Services Officer in the Chamber, or leave it with the Democratic Services Section.

Personal / Personal and Prejudicial [delete as appropriate]

Item no: **App. No.** **Village:**

Reason:

Personal / Personal and Prejudicial [delete as appropriate]

Item no: **App. No.** **Village:**

Reason:

Personal / Personal and Prejudicial [delete as appropriate]

Item no: **App. No.** **Village:**

Reason:

Personal / Personal and Prejudicial [delete as appropriate]

Item no: **App. No.** **Village:**

Reason:

Please return the completed form to ian.senior@scams.gov.uk prior to the meeting, or leave it with the Democratic Services Officer in the Chamber, or leave it with the Democratic Services Section.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

**S/2025/06/F - FOWLMERE
Extension, Amberley, Long Lane, for Mr and Mrs Roberts****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 15th December 2006****Notes:**

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the applicant is a member of the Council.

Site and Proposal

1. Amberley is a detached bungalow, with limited accommodation in the roof, located to the north of Long Lane, north west of Fowlmere village. To the west is a detached bungalow. To the east the site is bounded by a hedgerow beyond which is agricultural land. The property has been previously extended (see History below).
2. This application, registered on 20th October 2006, proposes the demolition of an existing flat roof rear dining room extension, which currently projects 3.7m from the rear of the dwelling, and its replacement by a larger dining room extension with a pitched and hipped roof.
3. The new extension will project 5.2m from the rear of the dwelling (an additional 1.5m) and will have a ridge height of 4.1m, 1.5m below the height of the main dwelling.
4. The property is located outside the village framework.

Planning History

5. There have been a number of previous planning consents for extensions to Amberley in the 1970's and 1980's, some of which were not implemented. The property has been extended in accordance with a 1986 consent (**Ref: S/1614/86/F**) which resulted in the original footprint of the dwelling being extended by almost 100%.

Planning Policy

6. **Policy HG13** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that extensions to dwellings in the countryside will be permitted where the proposed development would not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling; the extension does not exceed the height of the original dwelling; the extension does not lead to a 50% increase or more volume or gross internal floor area of the original dwelling; the proposed extension is in scale and character with the existing dwelling and would not materially change its impact on its surroundings. In addition any proposal should accord with the criteria set out in Policy HG12 (neighbour impact etc).

Consultation

7. **Fowlmere Parish Council** makes no recommendation stating, “ as Mrs Roberts is a member of Fowlmere Parish Council the whole meeting declared a personal and prejudicial interest and therefore no discussion took place on the application.”

Representations

8. None received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

9. The proposed pitched roof extension will replace an existing flat roofed rear extension and will extend the depth of the dwelling on that side by an additional 1.5m.
10. Previous alterations and additions to the property have already resulted in a doubling of the footprint of the original dwelling. Although the volume of the original and proposed property has not been calculated the increase will be in excess of the 50% referred to in Policy HG13 of the Local Plan.
11. The 50% restriction was introduced to help maintain the stock of smaller and medium sized dwellings in the countryside, as well as to limit the impact of any extensions on the landscape. In this case, although the proposal will not comply with this particular criterion of Policy HG13, in so far as it exceeds the 50% figure, it will not result in the loss of a small or medium sized dwelling.
12. The site is screened on its southern boundary and the ridgeline of the proposed extension is 1.5m below that of the existing dwelling. Although part of the roof of the extension of the proposed extension may be visible when approaching the property from the south it will not materially change the impact of the dwelling on its surroundings. The use of matching materials for the roof will help reduce any impact further.
13. The design of the proposed extension is in keeping with the existing property, and whilst larger than the existing flat roofed dining room extension it will replace, it will enhance the appearance of the property. The net increase in footprint will be only some 5.4 square metres over the existing building.
14. The proposed extension will have no impact on adjacent residential properties.

Recommendation

15. That the application be approved subject to the following conditions.
 1. SCA 3 Years RCA;
 2. The materials to be used for the proposed roof shall be identical to those used on the existing dwelling unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. (Reason – To ensure that the appearance of the extension blends with the existing dwelling and to minimise any visual impact of the proposal on the adjoining countryside.)

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
HG13 (Extensions to Dwellings in 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
- Planning Files Ref: S/2025/06/F and S/1614/86/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

**S/2033/06/F - FULBOURN
Additional Dwelling at 11 Teasel Way for Mrs A Dean****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 15th December 2006****Notes:**

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the Parish Council's Recommendation of Refusal is contrary to that of the Officer's recommendation.

Members will visit this site on 4th December 2006

Site and Proposal

1. The 0.028 ha site consists of a terraced property (Nos. 7 and 9 inclusive). The site as existing has two garages to the side of the property one of which has been converted into living space. The other garage appears to be once within the ownership of No.9, but has since been sold and is now part of the property at No.11. Teasel Road is a through road, which links to several cul-de-sacs within the Cherry Hinton development adjacent to the City boundary. There is a public footpath adjacent to the dwelling, which links Teasel Way to the cul-de-sac at the rear, which is Harebell Close.
2. The application received 20th October 2006 proposes the erection of a 3 bedroom house attached to the flank wall of No. 11 to replace the existing garage and "music room". Both plots would provide two parking spaces at the front of the dwelling with adequate amenity space to the rear with the sub-division of the existing garden. The new dwelling would also have a small single storey rear kitchen projection at the rear.

Planning History

3. Several Planning Applications all-relating to the development of Cherry Hinton but no specific planning history that relates to No.11 Teasel Way.

Planning Policy

4. **Policy SE2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states; Residential development and redevelopment will be permitted on unallocated land within village frameworks of Rural Growth Settlements provided that:
 - (a) The retention of the site in its current 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 any other policy of the local plan.

Development should provide an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and affordability and should achieve a minimum density of 30 dph unless there are strong design grounds for not doing so.

5. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that a high quality of design will be required for all new developments and promotes more compact forms of development through higher densities.

Consultation

6. **Fulbourn Parish Council** objects on the following grounds:

“We object to this application due to the provision of inadequate parking for the whole terrace. We request a site visit to ascertain the impact on the area.”

Representations

7. Owner of No.4 Comfrey Court has the following objections:
- (a) The original plans for this area allowed for the maximum amount of houses with parking spaces to be built on the estate and no more;
 - (b) Many houses on the estate have been extended, but not to the detriment of off street car parking;
 - (c) If approved Teasel Way, which is not a wide road, will become dangerous at the junction with Comfrey Court due to additional on road parking forcing traffic into the middle of the road making it difficult to turn left or right out of Comfrey Court;
 - (d) This turning is on a curve and creating blind spots in both directions when exiting the court;
 - (e) The development leaves open spaces between buildings saving the area from being claustrophobic;
 - (f) The higher end wall adjacent to the public footpath will serve as a shelter for young people;
 - (g) The proposal would upset the visual aspect of the street as it was originally designed.
8. Owner of No.1 Comfrey Court has the following objections:
- (a) The development would result in a loss of off street car parking, which in turn will make access and egression to Comfrey Court difficult thus resulting in a loss of value for my property;
 - (b) There is a narrow footpath adjacent to the dwelling, which would become dark and dangerous.

9. Owner of 13 Harebell Close has the following objections:
- (a) The property is already surrounded by tall buildings that block the sunlight to my house to the extent that part of my residence is deprived of sunlight throughout the day;
 - (b) Another building to the right of the property will exacerbate the situation further;
 - (c) This is of prime importance as any development should take into account the immediate neighbours quality of life.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

Parking

10. The proposal would provide the maximum requirement of 2 parking spaces for both the existing dwelling (No.11 Teasel Way) and for the proposed adjoined dwelling. This would satisfy the parking requirements and in my opinion would not result in any detriment to the highway. It is recognised that No.11 has bought the land and garage of No.9 and has converted one of these garages to provide habitable living space, however this existing situation would not compromise this proposal as the plans clearly show that both dwellings would accommodate 2 parking spaces.

Neighbour Amenity

11. The design of the proposed house is in keeping with the existing and would continue the existing terrace. There is a public footpath adjacent to the site as well as a sub-station, therefore the distance between the proposed house and that of the back of the adjacent dwelling (No.1 Harebell Close) would be approximately 15m. Furthermore the proposed dwelling would be north east of the nearest dwelling to the rear (No.11 Harebell Close) and would have the nearest first floor window obscure glazed as it would serve a bathroom. The dwelling directly to the rear of No.11 at No.13 Harebell Close has a blank elevation fronting the site. In conclusion, I do not consider that the development would be detrimental to the amenities that the surrounding properties currently enjoy. It is felt that the proposal would not warrant a refusal of permission due to the fact that development may result in anti social behaviour through the use of the existing public footpath, given that the existing single storey building abuts it.

Conditions

12. A condition should be included to ensure that the facing materials for the new dwelling match that of existing. The Permitted Development Rights for the insertion of fenestration within the northwest elevation should be removed to ensure that no material loss of privacy would occur to the adjacent neighbours. To ensure that the provision of off road parking is maintained a condition should be attached to ensure that before the dwelling is occupied the spaces shall be provided and thereafter permanently maintained. The existing landscaping shall be retained by condition to ensure that the site is suitably screened and provides an attractive frontage to the street scene. The first floor window, which would serve the bathroom of the new dwelling should be conditioned to be obscure glazed so that overlooking to the property at the rear shall not be possible.

Recommendation

13. That the application be approved subject to the following conditions.
 1. SCA (RCA)
 2. SC5a (Rca(i))
 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of Regulations 3 and Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order) no windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted in the north west elevation 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).
 4. The first floor window serving the en-suite bathroom in the southwest rear elevation of the building hereby permitted, shall be fitted and permanently maintained with obscured glass. (Reason - To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of the adjoining properties).
 5. The existing landscaping to the front of the dwellings shall be retained except unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority; and any trees or shrubs within it which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development or the occupation of the buildings, whichever is the sooner, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. (Reason - To ensure the visual enhancement of the street scene).
 6. The building, hereby permitted, shall not be occupied until the provision for 2 off street parking spaces has been provided for each of the existing and approved dwellings and thereafter permanently maintained. (To ensure the provision of off road parking).

Informatives

1. See the standard Environment Agency information on soak aways.

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
SE2 (List of Rural Growth Settlement)
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:**
P1/3 (Sustainable Design)

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 Application file ref: S/2033/06/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

6th December 2006

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1742/06/F - GIRTON

Floodlighting at Howe Close Sports Field, Whitehouse Lane, Off Huntingdon Road

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 31st October 2006

Departure Application

Site and Proposal

1. The sports field site is situated to the end of Whitehouse Lane and forms part of the Anglia Ruskin University. The site is approximately 0.5ha and consists of a small sports pavilion and car park, positioned to the south of the site; the remainder of the site is playing fields. This is a Green Belt site. The Hotel Felix is set to the south west of the site, and the residential properties of Thornton Close back on to the northwest boundary. The National Institute of Agricultural Botany is to the southeast.
2. The application, submitted on 5th September 2006, proposes to install 5 no. separate lights mounted 2m high from the flat roof of the pavilion, to floodlight a 24m sweep of land on the northeast and northwest sides of the pavilion. This is to allow for training during the hours of 4pm till 9pm four nights per week, during the months of November, December and February only.
3. The University estimates that 300 – 350 students and staff would benefit from the use of the facility in an average week and the provision of lighting would help support a key objective to increase participation in sport. To date the sports clubs have found it extremely difficult to find suitable floodlit training areas locally. Due to educational reasons it is rarely practical for training sessions to be held in the daylight hours and the floodlights would therefore provide the clubs with greater flexibility for training and increased participation leading to improved performance at local, regional and national levels.

Planning History

4. **S/0182/87/F** In 1987 an application for a college of further education was submitted and withdrawn prior to being determined.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy P9/2a 'Green Belt'** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003, states that a Green Belt will be maintained around Cambridge, which will define the extent of urban growth. The purposes of this Green Belt are to preserve the unique character of Cambridge; maintain and enhance the quality of its setting; prevent communities within the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the City. Within the Green Belt, new development will be limited to that required for.... outdoor sport...

6. **Policy GB2 'General Principles'** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development within the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Development is defined as inappropriate unless it comprises, amongst other things, buildings providing essential facilities for outdoor sports and recreation. Any development considered appropriate under the criteria of GB2 must be located and designed so that it does not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt.
7. **Policy GB5 'Recreational Role of the Green Belt'** of the Local Plan states that the District Council will not support proposals for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation in the Green Belt, which requires, amongst other things, floodlights.
8. **Policy ES3 'Commercial and Recreational Lighting Facilities'** of the Local Plan states that in considering proposals requiring external lighting facilities the District Council must be satisfied that; the lighting scheme is the minimum required for the task; there is no light spillage above the horizontal; appropriate measures are in place to ensure the lighting does not have an adverse effect upon neighbouring or nearby residential properties; in edge of village or countryside locations appropriate measures are taken to screen the lighting in order to reduce the impact on the surrounding countryside.

Consultation

9. **Girton Parish Council** recommends approval, but requests the lighting is limited to term time only – November, December and February, for the hours 4 – 9pm for a maximum of 4 evenings per week.
10. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** recommends various conditions be attached to any approval limiting the use of the lighting, requiring the lighting to be controlled automatically and restricting the beam of the main lights.

Representations

11. The application has been advertised as a departure from the Development Plan.
12. A letter has been received from residents of 28 Thornton Close, Girton, objecting to the lighting due to the impact on local residents, a drastic change to the rural and green belt setting, noise and disturbance from the use of the facilities late into the evening and potential light pollution.
13. Residents of 26 Thornton Close, Girton object to the use of portable lighting used on the sports field, which is inappropriately angled creating a nuisance and hazard by shining directly into the rear of the property. They object to permanent lighting, concerned about urban light pollution and the nuisance to residential properties.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

Impact on the Green Belt

14. While the site is Green Belt land and the proposal is considered to be inappropriate development, the proposed lighting is to be positioned towards the built up end of the site and not out in the middle of the countryside. In this respect the lighting is better related to its surroundings and less intrusive to the open countryside. The proposed

lighting is to enable the training facilities to be used during the winter months. Training grids are to be marked out and the lighting, positioned on the corners of the sports pavilion will cover a distance of circa 25m to the front and side of the building. The facility would otherwise be unused during the dark winter months. The use of the lighting facilities will be limited to University term times only, for the months of November, December and February and is to be restricted to 4 evenings a week only. Therefore, I consider that the impact on the Green Belt is minimal and its openness will be preserved since no additional structures are proposed.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties

15. While the objections of residents are noted, the actual impact on the properties of Thornton Close is considered to be minimal. The gardens of Thornton Close are over 50m away from the proposed lighting spill and as such it is unlikely that the lighting will cause any significant disturbance. Notwithstanding this, it will be conditioned that the lights be switched off automatically at 21:00hrs. Furthermore, the likely noise and disturbance to residents from the use of the site will be no greater than currently experienced during the lighter evenings.
16. I do not consider that the application needs to be referred to the Secretary of State as a Departure or under the Green Belt Direction 2005 on the grounds that its scale, nature and location would not have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Recommendation

17. Approval with conditions:
 1. SCA – RCA;
 2. The lighting hereby approved shall be turned off no later than 21:00 hours and shall not be turned back on until after 07:30 hrs the following day.
(Reason - To protect the amenities of adjoining residents and surrounding area);
 3. Notwithstanding the information submitted with the application, no development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, details of an automatic time control switch to be installed to demonstrate that the period of operation of the floodlights will be restricted to the hours detailed above in Condition 2, and the approved measures shall be implemented prior to first use of the floodlights and permanently retained thereafter.
(Reason – To protect the amenities of adjoining residents and surrounding area);
 4. The lights hereby permitted shall not be used for more than 4 evenings per week, and only in the months of November, December and February.
(Reason – To protect the amenities of adjoining residents and surrounding area);
 5. The floodlights, hereby permitted, shall not be installed other than in accordance with the recommendations of the Institute of Lighting Engineers “Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution” and the provision of BS 5489 Part 9.
(Reason – To protect the amenities of adjoining residents and surrounding area);

6. Within one month of the installation of the lights, they shall be inspected by a qualified lighting engineer in liaison with the Local Planning Authority and any defects identified shall be rectified within one month of the inspection.
(Reason - To protect the amenities of adjoining residents).

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. Although the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it is considered that the limited scale of the proposal, the siting of the floodlights upon an existing building, the protection of the openness of the Green Belt by reason of the absence of additional structures and the limited use of the floodlights, which are to be controlled by condition, all contribute to very special circumstances being demonstrated in accordance with Policies P9/2a of the County Structure Plan 2003 and GB2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Neighbouring Amenities

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridge and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003
- Planning Application File S/1742/06/F

Contact Officer: Emma Millband – Planning Assistant
Telephone: (01954) 713393

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

**S/2103/06/RM - GIRTON
Phase 2 Residential Development of 72 Dwellings
at Land off Wellbrook Way****Recommendation: Delegated Approval****Date for Determination: 1st February 2007 (Major)****Notes:**

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the recommendation for approval is contrary to the Parish Council's recommendation.

Site and Proposal

1. This site measuring 1.907 hectares forms part of the larger residential development at Wellbrook Way, off Girton Road. The land is at the north-western end of the development and lies adjacent to phase 1, which is under construction and partially occupied.
2. Thornton Road and Girton Road are to the south-west of the site. Houses on these roads have their rear gardens backing onto the site. Houses developed as part of phase 1 adjoin the site to the south-east. A spine road runs through the centre of the site on a north-west/south-east axis. South of this road, at the north-western end of the site, land has been reserved for community use, which is to be the subject of a separate planning application. North of this road land has been reserved for the development of 76 care homes and the provision of a balancing pond to serve the site. North-west of this land the remainder of Wimpey's phase 2 development is proposed, adjacent to land north-west of the site which has been given planning permission previously for a commercial development. The A14 lies beyond fields adjoining the site to the north-west.
3. This reserved matter application, registered on 2nd November 2006, seeks permission for details of siting, design and landscaping of phase 2 of the residential development. Access has already been determined at the outline stage. Unlike previous applications the area has been revised to include only the residential land i.e. land for community use, Locally Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) and balancing pond are or will be the subject of separate applications. The application proposes to increase the number of residential units to a total of 300. The mix of houses proposed for market housing is 11 no. 2-bedroom houses, 11 no. 3-bedroom houses, 30 no. 4-bedroom houses, with a total number of 52 on phase 2. In terms of affordable housing the mix proposed is 4 no. 2-bedroom houses, 4 no. 3-bedroom houses, 12 no. 1-bedroom flats, with a total number of 20 units. In total 72 dwellings are proposed on phase 2.

Planning History

4. An outline planning application (ref. **S/0175/99/O**) for residential development was considered by Committee on 2nd June 1999 (item 2). Members agreed to grant outline consent subject to the prior signing of a Section 106 Agreement. All details were reserved.
5. Outline planning application **S/1284/02/O** was allowed at appeal for residential development, including close care flats, community facilities, public open space and associated highway infrastructure and landscaping and included a condition that the reserved matters 'shall provide for a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare, but not more than a total of 300 dwellings on the residential land, inclusive of the appropriate public open space, but excluding the land proposed for community use'.
6. Application ref. **S/0691/03/RM** subsequently approved reserved matters of siting, design and landscaping of phase 1 subject to conditions.
7. Recently approved applications **S/2398/05/F** and **S/0061/06/F** vary condition 2 of planning permission **S/1284/02/O** to allow a further year (**S/0061/06/F**) and 3 years (**S/2398/05/F**) in which to submit details of reserved matters of siting, design and landscaping.
8. Two previous applications for reserved matters in relation to phase 2 have been considered. **S/0162/06/RM**, was withdrawn prior to being considered at Committee in April. It was recommended for refusal on grounds of:
 - a) The application failed to provide a suitable layout and design for the roads serving the site and as such is contrary to the proper planning of the area.
 - b) The application failed to include appropriate provision towards the identified local housing needs.
9. Other issues were to be reported verbally to Members following receipt of consultation responses. Subsequent application **S/1437/06/RM** was refused under delegated powers on grounds relating to:
 - a) Issues with the layout regarding crime prevention, refuse collections, highway safety and public rights of way.
 - b) Failure of the ecology proposals to adequately provide for the provision of bat and bird boxes.
 - c) Failure to include adequate provision for affordable housing and tenure mix.

Planning Policy

10. **RPG6:** Regional Spatial Strategy for the Eastern Region (2000) is not relevant in the consideration of this application.
11. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003):
 - a) **Policy P1/1** 'Approach to development' requires development to be located where travel distances by car can be minimised, walking and cycling encouraged and where good access to public transport exists.
 - b) **Policy P1/3** 'Sustainable Design in Built Development' states that a high standard of design and sustainability must be achieved for all new forms of development.

- c) **Policy P5/3** 'Density' requires developments to achieve a density appropriate to the area, with a minimum requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare.
- d) **Policy P5/4** 'Meeting Locally Identified Housing Needs' requires local plans to make provision for housing needs including for affordable and one and two bedroom homes.
- e) **Policy P6/1** 'Development-related Provision' restricts development unless additional infrastructure and community requirements generated by the proposals can be secured.
- f) **Policy P6/3** 'Flood Defence' requires measures and design features to be included to give sufficient protection against flooding on site or elsewhere locally.
- g) **Policy P6/4** 'Drainage' All new development should avoid exacerbating flood risk locally by utilising water retention systems.
- h) **Policy P7/2** 'Biodiversity' seeks to conserve and enhance biodiversity.
- i) **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.
- j) **Policy P8/5** 'Provision of Parking' requires car parking standards to be maximums, in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 13, "Transport".

12. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2004):

- a) **SE3** 'Dwellings in Limited Rural Growth Settlements' (LRGS). Developments should provide an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and affordability and should achieve a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare.
- b) **HG4** 'Allocations in LRGS allocates 6-7 ha of land north of Thornton Road for residential development.
- c) **HG7** 'Affordable Housing on Sites Within Village Frameworks' defines the Council's requirements for meeting locally identified housing needs and requires 30% of dwellings provided to be affordable in villages with a population of more than 3000.
- d) **HG10** 'Housing Mix and Design' requires residential developments to contain a mix of units providing a range of types, sizes (including 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings) and affordability, making best use of the site and that promotes a sense of community which reflects local needs. Design should be informed by the wider character and context, avoid inflexibility and promote energy efficiency.
- e) **TP1** and **TP2** 'Planning For More Sustainable Travel' seek to promote sustainable transport choices and provide appropriate car and cycle parking levels, and to secure appropriate traffic management measures in the village environment.
- f) **TP5** 'People With Disabilities and Limited Mobility' requires developments to include safe and convenient access for people with limited mobility.
- g) **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.
- h) **CS2** 'Public Utilities' – Planning permission will not be granted where there are inadequate water supply, sewerage or land drainage systems.

- i) **CS5** 'Flood Protection' restricts development where flood risk will be increased.
- j) **CS7** 'Underground Pipes, Fibres, Wires and Cables' are sought in order to reduce the visual impact of utilities, provided it would not damage ecology or archaeology.
- k) **CS10** 'Education' seeks financial contributions towards the provision of education where the development would cause the capacity of local schools to be exceeded.
- l) **CS13** 'Community Safety' seeks to minimise opportunities for crime within housing layouts, with subsequent reduction of the fear of crime.
- m) **RT2** 'The Provision of Public Open Space in New Development' sets out the standards for recreational space within developments.
- n) **EN5** 'The Landscaping of New Development' requires trees, hedges and woodland wherever possible to be retained within proposals for new development and landscaping schemes will be secured through appropriate conditions.
- o) **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.
- p) **EN15** 'Development Affecting Ancient Monuments or Other Archaeological Sites' and **EN16** 'Public Access to Archaeological Sites and Records' seek to protect, preserve and enhance known archaeological sites and to require developers to provide access to any records arising from excavations for the public.
- q) **ES2** 'Road and Footway Lighting' requires new lighting not to have light spillage above the horizontal.
- r) **ES5** 'Recycling/Waste Minimisation' seeks to encourage recycling and waste minimisation within new developments.
- s) **ES7** 'Noise from Road Traffic' seeks to minimise the impact of road traffic noise through planning conditions.
- t) '**GIRTON 1**' allocates 9.2 ha of land for mixed development, including housing, adjoining Thornton Road.

Consultation

- 13. **Girton Parish Council** recommend refusal on grounds that it deplores the inadequacy of the ecological measures being taken on the site. It requests details of the registered social landlord.
- 14. **Housing Strategic Services** comments include:
 - a) A proposed deed of variation to the Unilateral Undertaking is acceptable as it provides initial shares of 50%, staircasing to no more than 80% for the shared ownership units. This has been sought for some time.
 - b) They will accept that 66 affordable units are to be provided subject to:
 - 1. written confirmation from the Girton Town Charity;
 - 2. details of the arrangements made for transferring these four units to a registered social landlord;
 - 3. details of the house types and tenures, to be agreed by them;

4. no link for these units will be made with a potential land exchange with the Council.
- c) The proposed 66 affordable units will mean that 30% of all units across phase one and two will be affordable.
- d) 50:50 split between shared ownership and rented would be acceptable but no grant funding will be available for either type. An application for grant from the Housing Corporation would only be supported on the basis of a 70:30 rented to shared ownership split.

Further comments on mix are being sought and will be reported verbally.

15. **Building Control Officer** is satisfied that general issues have been overcome in this layout.
16. The **Local Highways Authority** requires an amended layout plan addressing the following points:
 - a) "Blockwork surfacing is used within shared surface domains and junction tables to provide drivers (and pedestrians) with a clear visual message of the combined shared usage. Consequently, (except in the case of junction tables), no separate footway is provided. If the street serving plots 1-11 is to remain block surfaced the metalled width should be a min of 5.5m with 0.5m maintenance strip each side (such strip not to be metalled except at the point of accesses). No separate footway in front of plots 7-11.
 - b) There is no highway *objection* to the layout of the street running in front of plots 33-36, but would it not provide a more coherent arrangement if the entire street was shared surface? Similarly, the small section of standard carriageway in front of plot 20.
 - c) The street serving plots 56-72 appears to comprise a junction containing two different radii on the eastern side, together with a footway that appears on the west side of the carriageway in front of plot 68. This may be simply a CAD glitch but it needs to be sorted.
 - d) All accesses to comprise 1.5m x 1.5m pedestrian visibility splays each side.
 - e) Whilst not necessarily a LHA issue, I would point out the difficulty that residents of plots 28-31 and 22-25 will have in accessing/egressing their houses. Are the residents of these properties really expected to squeeze between parked vehicles to reach a metalled surface on which to walk?"
17. Cambridgeshire Constabulary's **Architectural Liaison Officer** is satisfied with the layout and requires that utility meters be sited on the front wall/ or side wall as close to the front/public side as possible.
18. **Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service** requires a section 106 agreement or planning condition securing the provision of fire hydrants. The cost of provision is to be received from the developer.
19. Cambridgeshire County Council's **Countryside Access Team** has no objection to the development. However a public footpath runs through the middle of the site and along the proposed spine road. The plans submitted with the application when compared with the Definitive Map show that the spine road does not follow the exact line of the public footpath. The footpath begins on what would be the south side of the road and runs in a south-easterly direction, crossing the proposed road at a shallow

angle to end up running along the north side of the road. It is not clear whether the angle of the public footpath would mean a continuing divergence from the proposed spine road in the area of the site immediately to the south of this one. This may cause serious problems for that area, with the potential for buildings and/or gardens to be constructed on the definitive line of the public footpath. This is a serious issue and one that should be addressed before detailed plans for the whole area are approved. It recommends informatives to draw the applicant's attention to points of law.

20. At the time of writing comments are awaited from the following consultees and any responses will therefore be reported verbally:

- a) **Trees and Landscape Officer**
- b) **Landscape Design Officer**
- c) **Ecology Officer**
- d) **Drainage Manager**
- e) **Chief Environmental Health Officer**
- f) **General Works Manager**
- g) **Environment Agency**

Representations

21. At the time of writing one letter of representation have been received from the occupier of 74 Girton Road. This raises the loss of woodland in the western corner of the site, contrary to a number of national and local policies.

22. The period for public representations expires on the 8th December 2006. Any additional comments, if received, will be reported verbally to the Committee.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

23. The development has planning permission and, therefore, the key issues in relation to this reserved matter application relate to the affordable housing provision, highways, public rights of way, ecology and loss of trees.

Affordable housing

24. The affordable housing proposals appear to be generally acceptable and comply with the requirements of Policy HG7 of the Local Plan. Further details as requested by the Strategic Housing Manager have been sought and a revised section 106 is to be undertaken.

Highways

25. The issues raised by the Local Highways Authority can be overcome through the submission of a revised layout. A revised plan has been sought.

Public Right of Way

26. The applicants have provided details of the public right of way that runs through the centre of the site in relation to the main access road. These details appear to show the right of way as being entirely within the public route through the site and not within areas that are proposed to be private gardens. Confirmation has been sought from the County Council that this is satisfactory.

Ecology

27. The previous application included details that were acceptable to the Ecology Officer with the exception of bat and bird box provision. The applicant's Ecologist has liaised

with the Council prior to the re-submission and it is anticipated that this concern has now been overcome, although comments are awaited from the Ecology Officer. In any event this could be conditioned if necessary.

Loss of trees in the western corner of the site

28. There is an area of self-seeded trees in the western corner of the site. This has been examined on several occasions by the Council's Trees and Landscape Officers, Landscape Design Officers and Ecology Officer. In each of the previous applications no objections have been raised to the loss of this habitat. Comments of the relevant Officers in relation to the landscaping of the site are awaited and will be reported.

Recommendation

29. Subject to the receipt of amended plans detailing changes required to the highways layout and no other material planning issues being raised by consultees yet to respond, signing of a variation to the section 106 to address the affordable housing provision, it is recommended that **delegated approval** be granted subject to appropriate safeguarding 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
- Regional Planning Guidance
- Planning File Refs: S/1284/02/O, S/2398/05/F, S/0162/06/RM, S/1437/06/RM, S/0061/06/F, S/0691/03/RM, S/0175/99/O and S/2103/06/RM

Contact Officer: Melissa Reynolds – Area Planning Officer (Area 2)
Telephone: (01954) 713237

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1919/06/F - HARDWICK**Erection of Two Dwellings following Demolition of Existing Dwelling
(Amended Design) at 6 Main Street, for C McKee.****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 1st December 2006**

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the recommendation of Hardwick Parish Council does not accord with the officer recommendation.

Adjoining Conservation Area**Site and Proposal**

1. The site, which has an area of 0.4ha, is located within the village framework, adjacent to Hardwick Conservation Area. There is a bungalow on the site, served from an access onto the southern boundary on Main Street. The site has a number of mature trees, a pond, and a screen-height hedgerow fronting Main Street. The site rises quite steeply from Main Street.
2. To the west, the site is adjoined by a two-storey house at Victoria Cottage, 16 Main Street, which is sited close to the boundary with the existing bungalow. Beyond that to the west is a Listed Building at No. 26 Main Street. To the east there is a two-storey house at 4, Main Street, which is set some 5 metres from the boundary. An attractive Walnut tree grows on the boundary close to the existing bungalow, and in fact overhangs the site by a few metres.
3. The application for full planning permission, dated 19th September 2006, proposes the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of two 5-bedroom detached houses, served from the existing site entrance. Planning permission has recently been issued for similar development (see Para. 4 below). This application seeks consent for an amended design for the dwellings before they are constructed. The main difference is the addition of a conservatory at the rear of each dwelling, measuring 4.0m x 4.2 x 3.1m high.

Planning History

4. Planning permission for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of two detached dwellings was granted on 5th January 2006 (**S/2156/05/F**). Hardwick Parish Council made no recommendation at that time. Representations were received from the occupiers of No.16. Prior to this a similar proposal was withdrawn following concerns expressed by the Conservation Manager (**S/1706/04/F**). In 2002, outline planning permission was refused for the erection of three dwellings on the site. (**S/2391/01/O**).

Planning Policy

5. The site lies outside but adjacent to the Conservation Area. There is a Protected Village Amenity Area designation that extends through the southern part of the site. There is a pond on the site which is of ecological interest.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:

6. **Policy P1/3** (Sustainable Design in Built Development) requires a high standard of design and sustainability for all new development.
7. **Policy P5/5** (Homes in Rural Areas) permits small scale housing developments in villages, taking into account, amongst others, the character of the village and its setting.
8. **Policy P7/6** (Historic Built Environment) aims to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
9. **Policy P7/2** (Biodiversity) states that all developments will seek to conserve and enhance the biodiversity value of the areas which they affect.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:

10. **SE4** (Group Villages) of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that redevelopment up a maximum scheme of 8 dwellings will be permitted within the village framework provided that the retention of the site in its present form is not essential to the character of the village; the development would be sensitive to the character of the village and the amenities of neighbours.
11. **SE10** (Protected Village Amenity Areas) seeks to protect undeveloped land, the retention of which is of importance to the character and amenity of the village.
12. **EN12** (Nature Conservation: Unidentified Sites) expects features and habitat types of nature conservation value to be retained. Appropriate management will be sought by the imposition of conditions.
13. **EN30** (Development in Conservation Areas) – proposals in conservation areas, or affecting their setting, will be expected to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the area.

Consultations

14. **Hardwick Parish Council** – Recommends refusal, stating: “One of the proposed new houses is too close to No.16 Main Street. The gaps between the houses should be equalised by moving the first new house closer to the boundary on the east. This would improve the street scene in the Conservation Area. We think the tree is a lesser consideration in this case.”
15. **Trees and Landscape Officer** – concern over the possible loss of the Walnut tree in the grounds of No.4 Main Street. This tree had also been identified by the former Trees and Landscape Officer, Mr John Hellingsworth, as desirable for retention. The footprint of the development was moved in the previous application in order to accommodate this tree. The TLO would object if the footprint were to be moved back towards the Walnut.

16. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – Concern about possible noise disturbance to adjoining residents during the construction period. Recommends conditions/informatives to address this aspect if planning permission is granted.
17. **Ecology Officer** – No objection. A scheme of ecological enhancement for the restoration of the pond is underway and so far the applicant has been most co-operative.
18. **Conservation Manager** - Any comments received will be reported orally to the Committee.

Representations

16 Main Street, Hardwick:

19. The occupiers of this adjoining dwelling have stated that the addition of a conservatory onto each house will contribute to the enlargement of what are already very large houses on this limited plot. The houses are not situated 'squarely' on the site. The house on Plot 2 is pushed very close to the east wall of No.16, leaving a gap of less than 3 metres between the two properties. This compares with a gap of nearly 5 metres between the proposed two new houses, and almost 12 metres between the house on Plot 1 and the dwelling at No.4. This seems to be a major imbalance and detracts from the overall appearance of the design. The whole development should be moved at least two metres to the east and there should be a narrowing of the gap between the new houses. These adjustments would facilitate access for maintenance of the guttering and east wall of No.16 and would present a much more pleasing aspect when viewed from Main Street.

Planning Comments

20. The application site is located adjacent to Hardwick Conservation Area, where new development will affect the setting of the Conservation Area. The siting and design of the proposed development was considered carefully in the previous application S/2156/05/F, where the comments of the Conservation Manager and Trees and Landscape Officer were taken into account, together with those of the occupiers of 16, Main Street. As such, the applicant is at liberty to erect these dwellings in the approved positions.
21. The current application does not vary the approved siting of development and, as consent has been already granted, I do not consider that a sustainable reason for refusal can be based on this concern at this stage, notwithstanding the comments of the Parish Council and adjoining neighbours. The Trees and Landscape Officer is opposed to the suggested re-siting of development.
22. The additional conservatories on the rear elevation of each dwelling will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of either adjoining dwelling, nor on the appearance of the dwellings or the setting or character of the Conservation Area.

Recommendation

23. Approval with conditions and informatives as for S/2156/05/F.

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)
 - P5/5** (Homes in Rural Areas)
 - P7/2** (Biodiversity)
 - P7/6** (Historic Built Environment)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
 - SE4** (Group Villages)
 - SE10** (Protected Village Amenity Areas)
 - EN30** (Development in Conservation Areas)
 - EN12** (Nature Conservation: Unidentified sites)
2. The proposal is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material considerations, which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Visual impact upon the setting of Hardwick Conservation Area
 - Street scene
 - Neighbour amenity

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/1919/06/F, S/2156/05/F, S/1706/04/F and S/2391/01/O

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/2069/06/F - HARSTON**Erection of New House to Rear of Existing Property Following Demolition of Part of Existing Property at 41 London Road for Mr & Mrs Johnstone****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 20th December 2006****Notes:**

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because it is likely that the Officer recommendation will be contrary to the Parish Council's recommendation.

Site and Proposal

1. This 0.16 hectare application site is located on the north east side of London Road and comprises land that forms part of the rear garden area to No.41 London Road, a hipped roof brick and tile bungalow. Immediately to the south and north of No.41 are single storey dwellings.
2. The full application, submitted on 25th October 2006, seeks to erect a 9.4 metre high two and a half storey 7-bedroom brick and tile dwelling on the site. Access to the site would be along the south-eastern side of No.41's garden and would entail the demolition of an existing garage and outbuilding attached to the dwelling. The access would be shared between the existing and proposed dwelling and would be 5 metres wide for 10 metres into the site, after which it would narrow to a width of 3.7 metres. It would be some 80 metres long. The density of the development equates to 8 dwellings/hectare.

Planning History

3. **S/1524/06/F** – Full application for a dwelling on the same site as the current application was withdrawn. Officers had intended to refuse the application due to the scale/height of the dwelling and its impact upon the character of the area.
4. **S/1499/04/F** – Full application for two houses and garages on land to rear of No.41 following demolition of existing dwelling was refused for the following reasons:
 - a) The proposed development, by virtue of the identical design of the two dwellings and the minimal gaps between them, would result in a formal style of development that would be out of keeping with the character of backland development in the vicinity of the site which is typified by large houses of differing design set within spacious plots. This impact would be compounded by the demolition of the existing dwelling and the consequent opening up of the frontage of the site which would result in public views through to the new development and the creation of a large gap that would be out of keeping with the built up frontage

along this side of London Road. Consequently, the proposal would contravene Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 which requires a high standard of design that responds to the local character of the built environment, Policy SE4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 which requires development in Group Villages to be sensitive to the character of the area and Policy HG11 of the 2004 Local Plan which states that backland development will not be permitted if it would be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.

- b) The first floor elements in the proposed garage/studio building serving 'House 1' would overlook the rear garden area of No.39 London Road, resulting in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupiers of this property. The proposal would therefore contravene Policy SE4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 which requires development to be sensitive to the amenities of neighbours and HG11 of the 2004 Local Plan which states that backland development will not be permitted if it would result in overlooking of existing residential properties.
 - c) Notwithstanding the above, approving this application would make it difficult to resist further applications for the demolition of frontage dwellings and their replacement with 'backland' development to the progressive detriment of the character of the area.
5. **S/1582/05/F** – Application for detached garage at the front of No.41 London Road approved.
6. There are other approved applications in the immediate area that are of note. **S/0899/03/F** – An application to erect two dwellings at No.51 London Road (one frontage dwelling following the demolition of the existing and one to the rear) was approved. Under reference **S/1604/02/F**, an application for the replacement of a bungalow on an existing backland plot at No.55 London Road with a two storey dwelling was approved. Members may also recall that, at Committee in April 2006, consent was granted for the erection of a dwelling to the rear of No.37 London Road (**S/0329/06/O**).

Planning Policy

7. **Policy P1/3** of the County Structure Plan 2003 stresses the need for a high standard of design and a sense of place which corresponds to the local character of the built environment.
8. Harston is identified within **Policy SE4** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 as a Group Village. In such locations, Policy SE4 states that residential development up to a maximum of 8 dwellings will be permitted 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.
9. **Policy HG11** 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;
 - d) Be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.

10. **Policy DP/5** of the Local Development Framework Submission Draft 2006 relates to cumulative development and states that development will not be permitted where it:
- a. Forms part of a larger site where there would be a requirement for infrastructure provision if developed as a whole;
 - b. Would result in a piecemeal, unsatisfactory form of development;
 - c. Would prejudice development of another site adjacent or nearby.

Consultation

11. The comments of **Harston Parish Council** will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.

Representations

12. Letters of objection have been received from the occupiers of Nos. 43 and 45 London Road. The main points raised are:
- a) The proposed dwelling would be a 7-bedroom 3-storey house rather than the 5-bedroom, 2-storey property referred to in the application form. The dwelling should be no more than 9 metres and 2 storeys high;
 - b) The ridge would be 9.4 metres high and the dwelling would be sited just 3.5 metres from the boundary with No.45;
 - c) The chimney would have an adverse visual impact on the surroundings;
 - d) The house would be too large and would have an undesirable visual impact;
 - e) The location of the house is unclear because the location plan shows the rear boundary of No.43 closer to the road than it actually is (by approximately 4 metres). The ridge of the proposed dwelling should be no closer than 30 metres from the actual rear boundary of No.43;
 - f) The dwelling would only be built on one half of No.41's rear garden raising the prospect of a future application for another house on the other half.
13. The statutory consultation period expires on 6th December 2006 and any further representations will be reported verbally

Planning Comments – Key Issues

14. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:
- a. Impact upon the character of the area;
 - b. Affect upon the amenities of adjoining residents;
 - c. Impact upon trees;
 - d. Highway safety.

Impact upon character of area

15. The site lies inside the village framework. Harston is designated within the Local Plan as a Group Village where residential development is acceptable in principle providing

development is sensitive to the character of the area and the amenities of local residents.

16. To the south-east of the site are three backland plots located to the rear of Nos. 51, 53/57 and 59-65 London Road, these plots being occupied by substantial detached two storey dwellings (2 of which are just under 10 metres high) set within spacious gardens and located to the rear of single storey or 1 1/2 storey dwellings.
17. The previously refused application at No.41 London Road included the whole of the rear garden area (ie – approximately double the width of the currently proposed plot) and was considered to be unacceptable as the proposal sought to demolish the frontage dwelling and erect two properties set well back from the road. The creation of this large gap in the frontage together with the views this gap would afford to the proposed development was considered to represent a form of development out of keeping with, and harmful to, the character of the area.
18. The current application, in seeking to retain the existing dwelling and to site the new dwelling to the rear, would be in keeping, in this respect, with the pattern of the backland plots constructed to the south-east as well as the approved presently undeveloped site to the north-west at No.37 London Road. The principal differences between this application and the other sites referred to relate to the width of the plot and the size of the dwelling. The new dwellings constructed to the rear of Nos. 51 – 57 London Road are 20 + metre wide properties sited on approximately 25 and 36 metre wide plots respectively, whilst the site to the rear of No.37 London Road is 30 metres wide. No.41's rear garden area is 35 metres wide but the application only proposes to develop the southern parcel of the garden, with a 9.4 metre high, 12 metre wide dwelling on an 18 metre wide plot.
19. In pre-application discussions with the applicants' agent, Officers had expressed the view that, to reflect the character of backland development in the area, any development on this site should be in the form of a single large dwelling centrally positioned within the entire rear garden (ie – on the 35 metre wide plot). The siting of the dwelling on one half of the garden area does point to the strong possibility of a further application being submitted at a later date, resulting in a form and density of development that Officers consider would be alien to the backland character of the area. However, it is essential to consider the application before us on its own merits rather than on the basis of what might happen in the future. Whilst the proposed plot is narrower than other backland plots in the vicinity of the site, due to the space around the proposed dwelling (arising from the fact that the land to either side is undeveloped and does not have the benefit of planning permission) and its position on a backland plot set in excess of 100 metres away from London Road, this difference in the width/size of the plot would not be readily apparent. As such, although the proposal does not represent Officers' preferred form of development, it is extremely difficult to argue that this application, in its own right, is harmful to the character of the area.

Residential amenity

20. Concerns have been expressed by the occupiers of Nos. 43 and 45 London Road regarding overlooking from the proposed dwelling. The submitted plans indicate that the two storey element of the proposed house would be situated 28 metres away from the boundary with No.43 London Road and in excess of 70 metres away from the nearest windows within the neighbouring bungalow itself. Whilst I appreciate that No.43's dwelling and garden is presently completely private and agree that the proposal would introduce a degree of overlooking that does not presently exist, the

distance between opposing windows and between the dwelling and No.43's garden boundary is such that the proposal would not result in a serious overlooking problem.

21. The dimensions of the site and the accuracy of the submitted plans have been questioned by occupiers of neighbouring properties. Whilst I am presently seeking clarification on this point, and amended plans if applicable, from the applicant's agent, it does not introduce any new planning concerns given that the worst case scenario is that the proposed dwelling would be 4 metres closer to No.43's boundary than presently indicated.
22. The proposed dwelling would be sited just 3.5 metres away from the boundary with No.45's garden area and 2.5 metres away from the remaining garden to No.41. First floor bathroom and second floor means of escape bedroom windows are proposed in both side elevations and it would be necessary to ensure these would be obscure glazed as indicated in the submitted plans.
23. I am satisfied that the proposed means of access and traffic generated by one dwelling only over the substantial length of this access would not seriously harm the amenities of occupiers of either No.41 itself or of No.43 which has a garage and no windows on its north-western side.

Recommendation

24. Approval:
 1. Standard Condition - A (R -A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs of the dwelling (Rc5aai);
 3. The first and second floor windows in the north-west and south-east side elevations of the dwelling, hereby permitted, shall be fitted and permanently maintained with obscured glass (Reason – To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of adjoining properties);
 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 and Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order), no further windows, door or openings of any kind shall be inserted at first and second floor level in the north-west and south-east side elevations of the dwelling, hereby permitted, unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf (Reason – To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of adjoining properties);
 5. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 6. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 7. Sc60 – Boundary treatment details (Rc60);
 8. Sc5b – Surface water drainage details (Rc5b);
 9. Sc5c – Foul sewage details (Rc5c);

10. Para B9 – Access road – 5.0 metres for a minimum distance of 15.0 metres (Rc10);
11. Para B10 – Access road (Rc10);
12. Para D5 (a) – Visibility 2.0 metres x 2.0 metres (Rc10);
13. During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions (Rc26)

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:**
SE4 (Development in Group Villages)
HG11 (Backland Development)
2. Whilst the plot is narrower than other backland plots in the vicinity of the site, due to the space around the proposed dwelling (arising from the fact that the land to either side is undeveloped and does not have the benefit of planning permission) and its position on a backland plot set in excess of 100 metres away from London Road, this difference in the width/size of the plot and dwelling would not be readily apparent. The development is therefore not considered to be significantly detrimental to the character of the area. The proposal would also not be significantly detrimental to the following material planning consideration which has been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - 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 and agreed by the District Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.
2. During construction there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site except with the prior permission of the Environmental Health Officer in accordance with best practice and existing waste management legislation.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning File Refs: S/2069/06/F, S/1582/05/F, S/1524/06/F, S/1499/04/F, S/0329/06/O, S/0899/03/F and S/1604/02/F.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1222/06/F - HASLINGFIELD
Proposed Extension to Dwelling Incorporating Stable Block
The Barn, Charity Farm, Harston Road
for Mrs L Sorrentino

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 15th August 2006

Notes:

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because Haslingfield Parish Council recommends refusal.

Site and Proposal

1. The application site lies between the villages of Harston and Haslingfield. The site does not lie within the village framework of either village, and therefore is situated within the open countryside and the Cambridge Green Belt. The site is located to the south west of Haslingfield Road on a bend in the road.
2. "The Barn" is a single storey dwelling approximately 5 metres in height to the ridge, constructed from buff bricks with dark flat roof tiles above. A garage is situated along the east elevation. The dwelling has been designed to look out onto the courtyard area, created by the presence of the stable block, and the land between these buildings has been grassed. There is a 1.8 metre high wooden fence, which rises to approximately 3 metres by "The Barn", situated to the south of the courtyard area, with the access road to the barn to the west running alongside this fence.
3. The stable block is a lower structure, measuring 4.3 metres in height to the eaves, and is constructed from wooden weatherboarding with a corrugated roof above. There are openings in both the east and west elevations.
4. The northern boundary of the site is a 1 metre high post and rail fence, with open fields beyond. To the west is a parking area, again with fields beyond. To the south are the buildings of Charity Farm and an area of open land separated by a 1 metre high post and rail fence.
5. The application, received on 20th June 2006, proposes a single storey extension linking the bungalow to the existing stable block, which itself would be converted into residential space. The proposed extension would span 13.3 metres between the bungalow and the stable block, and would measure between 3 metres (corridor) and 4 metres (bedroom) in height to the ridge of the roof, with a width of between 1.5 metres (corridor) to 5 metres (corridor and bedroom). This section would provide one bedroom with an ensuite and a linked corridor to the stable, which itself would provide two bedrooms, a study and a bathroom. The stable would not be increased in size but there would be some changes to the fenestration.

Planning History

6. **S/1413/99/F** - Planning permission was granted for the conversion of the barn to a bungalow by decision letter dated 4th December 1999.
7. **S/0278/02/F** - Planning permission was granted for an extension to the property by letter dated 3rd April 2002 (small dining room section).
8. **S/0823/05/F** - Planning permission was refused for an extension to the dwelling incorporating a stable block by letter dated 16th June 2005. An appeal was lodged by the applicant but was later withdrawn.

Planning Policy

9. Government Planning Policy Guidance (**PPG**)2, "Green Belts" states at **PARA 3.6** that, "provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building, the extension or alteration of dwellings is not inappropriate in Green Belts". **PARA 3.7** says that, "with suitable safeguards, the re-use of buildings should not prejudice the openness of Green Belts, since the buildings are already there". The safeguards are listed in **PARA 3.8**.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

10. **Policy P1/2** states that development will be restricted in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
11. **Policy P9/2a** explains that within the Green Belt, new development including change of use will be limited to that required for agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport, cemeteries or other uses appropriate to a rural area.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

12. **Policy HG13** notes that extensions to dwellings in the countryside will be permitted where:
 - (a) The proposed dwelling would not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling.
 - (b) The extension does not exceed the height of the original dwelling.
 - (c) The extension does not lead to a 50% increase or more in the volume or gross internal floor area of the original dwelling.
 - (d) The proposed extension is in scale and character with the existing dwelling and would not materially change the impact of the dwelling on the countryside.
13. **Policy GB2** states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Development is defined as 'inappropriate' unless it comprises, amongst others, an extension or alteration that does not result in the dwelling having a materially greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and that the building is of a permanent and substantial construction and capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction. Any development considered acceptable within the Green Belt must be located and designed so that it does not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt.

Consultation

14. **Haslingfield Parish Council** - Recommends refusal: “unacceptable Green Belt development; unanimous decision.”
15. **Environment Agency** - The application falls within floodzone 1. No objections are raised.
16. **Building Inspector** - The Inspector accepts that conversion rather than re-building would take place; thus there are no objections.

Representations

17. None received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

18. This current application follows on from application reference S/0823/05/F, which proposed an extension of the dwelling to incorporate the stable block refused in June 2005. An appeal was withdrawn following discussions with an officer at the Council where it was agreed that if the corridor link to the stable was reduced in size and it was proved that the stable was structurally sound and capable of conversion, then officer support would be more likely to be forthcoming.
19. In a letter to the applicant it was confirmed that as the barn was within the residential curtilage of “The Barn”, if all of the following applied then planning permission would not be required for its use as additional accommodation to the existing building:
 - (a) The building is capable of conversion.
 - (b) The alterations are internal only or any external works would not materially affect the external appearance of the building.
 - (c) The building is not extended in any way.
 - (d) The accommodation is used as additional living space in connection with the occupation of the main dwelling only and is not used as a separate dwelling.
20. In relation to the limits imposed by Policy HG13 on additional floorspace in the open countryside, it has been calculated that the existing dwelling and garages amounts to 134.7 square metres in floor area. The floorspace of the proposed corridor and bedroom to link to the stable building amounts to 43.44 square metres, which together with the dining room extension approved in 2002, amounts to a 50% floorspace addition. The proposal would not create a separate dwelling, would not be capable of separation, does not exceed the height of the original dwelling, is in scale and character with the existing dwelling, would not change the impact of the dwelling on its surroundings and would comply with the criteria of Policy HG12 of the Local Plan.

Development in the Green Belt

21. The previous application for an extension to the dwelling to incorporate the stable block was refused, in part, as the site lies within the Green Belt where there is a presumption against inappropriate development. It was considered that the previous proposal for the site would have resulted in a single large structure that would have

had an adverse impact on the quality of the surrounding countryside and the openness of the Green Belt.

22. It is considered that the revised proposals, which have reduced the footprint of building on the site do not significantly affect the openness of the Green Belt. The proposed extension of floorspace on the site does not exceed a 50% increase or more in the volume or gross internal floor area of the original dwelling, and therefore it is considered that the application proposals are proportionate to the size of the original building and are therefore acceptable.

Conversion of the barn and its structural integrity

23. Concerns were raised during the application from the Building Inspector with regards to the structural integrity of the barn, and whether it was capable of conversion for residential purposes.
24. Information on the barn has been submitted from a structural engineer, and the Building Inspector is satisfied that the barn can be converted without wholesale reconstruction.
25. There are no remaining concerns regarding the application proposals. The barn is capable of conversion, and the proposed corridor and bedroom would not result in an excessive increase of footprint of development on the site (within 50% of the original dwelling). The proposals would not harm the openness of the Green Belt and there are no remaining objections to the proposals.

Recommendation

26. Approve, subject to conditions.
1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5a(ii)).

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:**
P1/2 (Environmental Restrictions on Development)
P9/2a (Green Belt)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
GB2 (Green Belts)
HG13 (Housing 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:
 - Impact upon the Green Belt
 - Structural condition of the barn

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/0823/05/F, S/0278/02/F, S/1413/99/F and S/1222/06/F

Contact Officer: Area Team 4

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1870/06/F - LINTON**Erection of Bungalow and Garage at Land r/o 20 Back Road for Highcliffe Properties Ltd****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 24th November 2006****Notes:**

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the Officer recommendation does not accord with the recommendation of the Parish Council.

Site and Proposal

1. This 0.15 hectare application site is a parcel of land situated to the north, and forming part of the garden area to, No.20 Back Road. To the east of the site is garden land lying to the rear of Nos. 12 – 18 Back Road, upon which planning permission has been granted for residential development. To the west is land used for equestrian purposes whilst, beyond a hedge forming the northern boundary of the site, lies open countryside.
2. The full application, submitted on 29th September 2006, proposes the erection of a bungalow and garage on the site. Access to the site would be on the east side of No.12 Back Road via the access proposed to serve the adjacent approved residential development of 7 dwellings (2 houses and 5 bungalows). The bungalow would be a 4 bedroom property comprising brick and timber boarded walls and a slate roof. The proposed density equates to 6.7 dph or 16.8 dph inclusive of the approved development.

Planning History

3. **S/1870/05/F** – Permission granted for erection of 2 houses and 4 bungalows following demolition of the bungalow at No.12 Back Road. The approved scheme was for 2 houses at the front of the site in place of the existing bungalow and 4 bungalows to the rear, on an L-shaped site wrapping around the rear/north side of Nos. 14 & 14a Back Road, all served off a single point of access.
4. **S/1212/06/F** – Permission granted for the erection of a bungalow and garage to the rear of Nos. 16 & 18 Back Road using the same point of access as approved under the aforementioned application. This application extended the number of dwellings served off the originally approved access from 6 to 7.

Planning Policy

5. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 stresses the need for a high standard of design and a sense of place which corresponds to the local character of the built environment.

6. Linton is identified within **Policy SE2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 as a Rural Growth Settlement where estates, groups of dwellings and infilling are acceptable subject to development being sympathetic to the character and amenities of the locality.
7. **Policy HG11** 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;
 - (d) Be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.
8. **Policy CS10** of the Local Plan requires education contributions for schemes of 4 or more dwellings.

Consultation

9. **Linton Parish Council** objects to the application stating:
 - (a) The continuation of this development located at the periphery of the village would create a more dense form of development creating a visually hard edge that would have an adverse impact of the open nature of the surrounding countryside which is designated as an area of best landscape.
 - (b) Councillors are concerned that the original access road does not have capacity for additional development and therefore would like the matter referred to CCC Highways.
 - (c) Councillors wish to be assured that appropriate flood assessments had been undertaken. In previous periods of heavy rainfall run off from the hill has caused serious problems to properties lower down.
 - (d) Councillors request that should this application be approved the position of the property is changed to prevent extension of the access road.
 - (e) The site backs onto a well used equestrian centre. Linton Parish Council supports rural pursuits and therefore is very concerned regarding the lack of privacy and protection (deciduous hedge) of this facility. Councillors do not wish this development to go ahead until this adequate protection is provided.
 - (f) If permitted the proposal would create a precedent for similar development of open land at the rear of other properties in Back Road; such development would further harm the open and rural character of the area and the amenities enjoyed by occupiers of frontage houses on Back Road”.
10. **The Local Highways Authority** advises that planning permission reference S/1212/06/F resulted in the total number of dwellings served direct from the private drive to 5. It is normal practice to allow a maximum of 5 dwellings served via a private drive. It is strongly recommended and highly desirable that development of a greater number than this should be served by an adoptable road. The proposed access width and visibility splays at the junction of the private access road with Back Road are acceptable to serve a further dwelling, but the planning authority must assess the acceptability of the principle of a further dwelling being served by the existing private drive. Issues that

should be considered include future maintenance of the access way, drainage, lighting and refuse collection.

11. **The County Education Officer** has requested that, in addition to the education contribution required under the original consent for 6 dwellings, a further contribution of £2500 for secondary education should be made.
12. The comments of the **Environment Operations Manager** will be reported verbally at the committee meeting.
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 the occupiers of No.27 Chalklands and No.22 Back Road. The main points raised are:
 - a. No further development should be permitted to the rear of properties on Back Road as the land behind rises to Rivey Hill and such development would detract from the visual amenities of the area;
 - b. The shared access road to the properties already approved should not continue to be extended to serve additional development;
 - c. If approved, this proposal could lead to further applications to develop at the rear of properties on this side of Back Road;
 - d. The established tree on Plot 5 should not be removed and all existing field hedges should remain;
 - e. The development would result in more traffic exiting on a blind bend onto Back Road.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to:
 - a. Impact upon the character of the area;
 - b. Residential amenity;
 - c. Highway safety;
 - d. Impact on trees/hedges;
 - e. Flood risk/surface water drainage

Character of area

16. Consent has already been granted for a scheme of seven dwellings, under two separate planning permissions. The approved schemes include the erection of three bungalows to the rear of Nos. 12 – 18 Back Road and the current planning application represents a continuation of this approved line through the addition of a 4th bungalow on this parcel land. The characteristics of the proposed site are very similar to those of the adjacent approved development land to the east. Whilst the land rises steeply up Rivey Hill to the rear, there is a mature deciduous hedge along the north-eastern boundary of the proposed and approved sites which would be retained, thereby helping to screen the development when viewed from the rear. The proposed dwelling is sited

sufficiently far from the rear boundary of the site to ensure that the hedge would not be compromised, although its retention would need to be secured by way of a landscaping condition. The design of the proposed dwelling and materials used would reflect the character of the previously approved bungalows to the east.

17. The Parish Council and local residents have expressed concern that approving this application would set a precedent for further development to the west, and have therefore requested that the proposed dwelling be sited in a manner to prevent this occurring. Each application must be determined on its merits. Beyond the western boundary of the site, the landscape takes on a very different character to that of the application site and the land to the rear of Nos. 12 – 20 Back Road. The land starts to fall into a valley before rising again, meaning that the parcel of land to the rear of Nos. 22 – 34 Back Road is extremely exposed and visible when viewed from the north/rear. Due to the characteristics of this site, Officers do not consider it to be appropriate for residential development and therefore do not consider it to be necessary to resite the dwelling and access to prevent further development to the west. The location of the bungalow, garage and access are in a line and in keeping with the character of the previously approved development to the east and any resiting would compromise this character.

Residential amenity

18. The proposed bungalow would be sited approximately 16 metres away from the southern boundary with No. 20 Back Road and around 50 metres away from the dwelling itself. The Parish Council has raised concerns (on behalf of the landowner) about overlooking of the land to the west which is used for business purposes as an equestrian centre. Given that the proposed dwelling is single storey, that there is a mature hedgerow along the western boundary of the site, and that there is no dwelling or private residential land immediately beyond the western boundary, I consider the proposal would not result in serious harm to the user of this land.

Highway safety

19. The Local Highways Authority has raised no objections on highway safety grounds to the application, advising that the proposed access width and pedestrian and vehicle visibility splays are acceptable. The applicant's agent has confirmed that it is not intended to adopt the access road and, as advised by the Local Highways Authority, this Council therefore needs to consider the implications of allowing eight dwellings served off a private driveway. The issues that arise from a private rather than adopted access are ones of maintenance, drainage, lighting and refuse collection, rather than highway safety.
20. The applicant's agent has confirmed that the maintenance of the road will be the responsibility of the owners of all of the new dwellings and that this obligation will be contained within the contract of sale for each property. In addition, there would be no intention to install street lighting, as would be required on an adopted road, as it would be highly visible from and adversely impact upon the adjoining countryside and upon the properties in Back Road. With regards to the issue of refuse collection, each property has been designed with its own private bin storage area.
21. The Council's Environment Operations Manager has been consulted and will advise in respect of the suitability of the layout and private nature of the road for refuse collection vehicles. The issues of maintenance and lighting are not strictly material planning considerations and planning permission could not therefore reasonably be withheld on either basis. They would be the responsibility of future residents. The issue of drainage is discussed in the next section.

Flood risk

22. The Parish Council has requested that a Flood Risk Assessment be carried out. The site does not lie within a medium or high flood risk area and there is no formal requirement for an FRA to be carried out as part of the application. However, there is a need to consider the impact of surface water run-off upon properties lying downhill to the south within Back Road. The applicant's agent has confirmed that the proposed bungalow (as well as the other approved dwellings) would be drained by soakaways, a sustainable urban drainage solution, and that the new estate road would also be well drained. It is argued that the overall development will help to alleviate the surface water run-off from the field to the north compared to the present situation whereby the existing open land allows the surface water to run off uninterrupted.
23. I have discussed these points with the Council's Building Inspector who has advised that the use of soakaways, as indicated on the plans, would be acceptable in principle. A condition requiring full details of the surface water drainage should be attached to any consent. With regards to the drive and access way, the Building Inspector has advised that it may be appropriate to introduce a drain/gully at the end of the access where it meets Back Road. As such, the scope of the surface water drainage condition should be widened to require details of drainage of the access/driveway.

Impact on trees/hedges

24. Concern has been raised by a local resident about the impact of the access road upon a tree within previously approved plot 5. The Trees and Landscape Officer was consulted on the original application and raised no objections to the impact of the access upon this sycamore tree. The current application does not propose any revision to the position of the previously approved access road and the proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Recommendation

25. Approval:
1. Standard Condition A (Reason - A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs of the bungalow and garage (Rc5aii);
 3. Sc5f – Details of materials to be used for hard surfaced areas (Rc5f);
 4. Sc5 – Details of the colour of the weatherboarding (Rc5aii);
 5. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 6. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 7. Sc60 – Boundary treatment details (Rc60);
 8. Sc5b – Surface water drainage details, including details of drainage of the access road and driveway (Rc5b);
 9. Sc5c – Foul sewage details (Rc5c);
 10. Para B9 – Access road – 5.0 metres for a minimum distance of 15.0 metres (Rc10);

11. Para B10 – Access road (Rc10);
12. Para D5 (a) – Visibility 2.0 metres x 2.0 metres (Rc10);
13. Visibility splays shall be provided on either side of the junction of the proposed access road with the public highway, the dimensions to accord with those shown within drawing number 623-007/B prior to the bringing into use of the new access (Rc10);
14. The 1.8 metre wide footway along the frontage of No.12 Back Road shall be provided before the occupation of the dwelling, hereby permitted, and thereafter maintained (Rc10);
15. During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions (Rc26);
16. No development shall begin until a scheme and completed S.106 Agreement for the provision of an education contribution has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the contribution shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme. (Reason – To ensure the provision of a financial contribution towards education facilities as required by Policy CS10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004).

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:**
SE2 (Development in Rural Growth Settlements),
HG11 (Backland Development)
CS10 (Education)
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 on character of area;
 - Highway safety;
 - Flood risk

General

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

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

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning File Refs: S/1870/06/F, S/1212/06/F and S/1870/05/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1907/06/F - LINTON**2 Houses and Garages at Land r/o 42 Back Road for Mr & Mrs B R H Wilson****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 29th November 2006****Notes:**

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the Officer recommendation does not accord with the recommendation of the Parish Council.

Site and Proposal

1. This 0.3 hectare application site is located on the north-western edge of the village of Linton and comprises a two storey detached dwelling on a substantial plot that rises steeply from south to north. To the east are residential properties whilst to the west is a public bridleway beyond which is telephone exchange building. The land beyond the northern boundary of the site consists of open fields that continue to rise steeply towards Rivey Hill.
2. The full application, submitted on 4th October 2006 and amended on 20th November 2006, proposes to erect two houses and garages on the site. The proposed dwellings would be detached two storey buff brick and slate properties sited in a line to the rear of the existing dwelling. Access to the site would be via the existing access on the west side of the plot which the plans indicate would be widened from its existing 4.5 metres to 5 metres for a distance of 10 metres back from the highway. The density equates to 6.7 dwellings per hectare.

Planning History

3. **S/2094/04/F** – Permission granted for the erection of a house and garage to the rear of the existing dwelling.
4. **S/2369/00/F** – Permission granted for the erection of a house and garage to the rear of the existing dwelling together with extensions to No.42.
5. **S/1109/00/F** – Application for three dwellings and garages following demolition of existing dwelling refused due to: the impact upon the character of the surrounding countryside; ‘tandem’ development being out of keeping with the character of Back Road; noise and disturbance from the access to occupiers of the frontage dwelling; and would set a precedent for similar development to the rear of properties in Back Road.

Planning Policy

6. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 stresses the need for a high standard of design and a sense of place which corresponds to the local character of the built environment.

7. Linton is identified within **Policy SE2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 as a Rural Growth Settlement where estates, groups of dwellings and infilling are acceptable subject to development being sympathetic to the character and amenities of the locality.
8. **Policy HG11** 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;
 - d) Be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.

Consultation

9. **Linton Parish Council** objects to the application stating:
 - a. "Councillors believe that this application would significantly intrude on this area of best landscape.
 - b. Councillors believe that this development would seriously harm the visual impact of the Icknield Way.
 - c. Council considers this application to be contrary to Policy SE2 (b) the development would be sensitive to the character of the village, local features of landscape or ecological importance, and amenities of the neighbours.
 - d. Should this application be permitted Councillors would wish it to be conditioned that the boundary hedges be reinforced by planting with native species, all gaps in the hedges closed so there is no longer vehicular and pedestrian access onto Bridleway 21."
10. **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.
11. **The Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** raises no objections, stating that additional water supplies for firefighting are not required.
12. **The County Footpaths Officer** raises no objections providing the adjacent bridleway remains unobstructed.
13. **The Ramblers Association** raises no objections providing there is no obstruction of the bridleway during the construction period.

Representations

14. A letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of No.40 Back Road who express concern about overlooking from the house on Plot 1. It is requested that the first floor bedroom window be reduced in width as, at present, it offers a broad sweep of vision over No.40's garden and rear bedroom. In addition, the house should be moved 5 metres further away from the boundary with No.40.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. An objection has also been received from the occupiers of No. 22 Back Road who express concern about the impact of the development upon the character of the area and the precedent it would set for similar applications.
16. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to:
 - a. Impact upon the character of the area;
 - b. Residential amenity;
 - c. Impact on public bridleway.

Character of area

17. Under planning reference S/1109/00/F, an application to erect three dwellings on this site following the demolition of the existing property (2 x 2 storey houses on the frontage of the site and 1 x bungalow to the rear in line with the telephone exchange) was refused for a number of reasons, as set out in paragraph 5 of this report. This decision, however, was in effect superseded by a later consent to erect a house and garage to the rear of No.42 adjacent to the western boundary of the garden (S/2369/00/F) and a further permission to relocate the backland plot to a position directly behind the existing dwelling. This is the starting point, therefore, for considering the current application with the impact of the northernmost backland plot (plot 2) upon the character of the area being a key consideration.
18. The application proposes a tandem form of development with the dwelling on plot 1 sited directly to the rear of the existing property and the house on plot 2 incorporating a curved design so that it rounds off the development. The land rises steeply from south to north, with a 5 metre difference in levels between the southern boundary of plot 1 and the northern/countryside boundary to plot 2. Both properties would be two storeys high and the Parish Council has raised strong concerns about their visual impact upon the surrounding countryside.
19. I am satisfied that these dwellings can be accommodated on the site without undue harm to the character of the area. The existing garden area is separated from the adjacent bridleway to the west by a mixture of mature hedgerows and trees whilst the northern boundary has substantial screening that I estimate ranges from 4 to 10 metres in height. I have viewed the site from the public bridleway to the north and consider that the dwelling on plot 2 would not be readily visible due to its height (7 metres above the existing ground level), the height of the rear/north boundary screening, the fact that the dwelling would be sited some 30 metres away from the rear boundary and the finished floor level of the dwelling on plot 2 being some 2.3m to 3.8m lower than the ground level at the north boundary.
20. When approaching the village from the west, the western gable end of the dwelling on plot 2 will be visible above the hedgerow forming the boundary with the public bridleway, as indicated on the submitted cross section. However, these views would be from in excess of 100 metres away and, at this distance, I consider that the development would be read in conjunction with the surrounding built up part of the village rather than being viewed as an encroachment towards the surrounding countryside.
21. The Parish Council has requested that any permission be subject to landscaping to ensure the reinforcement of existing boundary screening, particularly at the point of the gated vehicular access onto the public bridleway. I would concur with this view and consider landscaping and boundary treatment conditions to be essential as part of any consent.

Residential amenity

22. Under the previously approved application for a dwelling on the piece of land now referred to as plot 1, the dwelling was designed like that on plot 2 so that it curved away from the neighbour at No.40 Back Road. In the current application, the design of this dwelling has been straightened and the occupiers of No.40 have expressed concern about overlooking from the rear first floor bedroom which incorporates a balcony and substantial amount of glazing in the rear projecting gable. As a result of these concerns, the plans have been amended to reduce the amount of glazing to this bedroom and also to replace the balcony with safety railings (balustrade). I have visited No.40 and am satisfied that, with these changes, the dwelling would not seriously harm the amenities of the occupiers of this property. It would not be possible to look down into their main sitting out/ patio area (situated between the west side of the dwelling and the garage) and, although there would be a view of the balcony to No.40's master bedroom, this would be at a distance of in excess of 30 metres.
23. Resiting the dwelling on plot 1 further away from the boundary with No.40 is not considered to be appropriate as it would compromise the form of the development which, at present, follows a smooth line from the existing dwelling to the proposed plot 2.

Impact on public bridleway

24. The proposed development is not considered to have a serious impact upon the adjacent public bridleway. Informatives should be added to any permission advising of the need to ensure the bridleway is not obstructed during the course of development.

Recommendation

25. Approval, as amended by drawing numbers 15A and 16A date stamped 20th November 2006:
1. Standard Condition A (Reason - A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs of the dwellings and garages (Rc5a);
 3. Sc5f – Details of materials to be used for hard surfaced areas (Rc5f);
 4. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 5. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 6. Sc60 – Boundary treatment details (Rc60);
 7. Sc5b – Surface water drainage details (Rc5b);
 8. Sc5c – Foul sewage details (Rc5c);

9. During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions (Rc26);
10. Para B9 – Access road – 5.0 metres for a minimum distance of 15.0 metres (Rc10);
11. Para B10 – Access road (Rc10);
12. Para D5 (a) – Visibility 2.0 metres x 2.0 metres (Rc10).

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:**
SE2 (Development in Rural Growth Settlements)
HG11 (Backland Development)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Impact on character of area;
 - 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 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. The bridleway that runs beyond the western boundary of the site must remain open and unobstructed at all times. Building materials must not be stored on it, and contractors' vehicles must not be parked on it.
4. The development must not encroach onto the bridleway; any encroachment would constitute an obstruction, which is an offence under S.137 of the Highways Act 1980. If advice is required on where the boundaries of the right of way are the applicant should contact the Definitive Map Officer at Cambridgeshire County Council for assistance.

5. The bridleway must not be used for vehicular access to the site unless the applicant is sure they have lawful authority to do so (it is an offence under s34 of the Road Traffic Act to drive on a public bridleway).
6. No alteration to the surface of the bridleway is permitted without the consent of Cambridgeshire County Council's Countryside Access Team (it is an offence to damage the surface of a public right of way under s1 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971).
7. Any existing bridleway signs should not be obscured or removed during building work, and any temporary diversions should be clearly marked.

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/1907/06/F, S/2094/04/F, S/2369/00/F and S/1109/00/F

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1875/06/RM & S/1877/06/RM - LONGSTANTON
Erection of 18 Dwellings and Garages (S/1877/06 - Duplicate Application)
Land within Phase 2, Home Farm for George Wimpey, East Anglia Ltd.

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Date for Determination: 3rd January 2007 (Major Applications)

Notes:

These Applications have been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the Parish Council objection does not accord with the officer recommendation.

Site and Proposal

1. The 0.82 ha site forms part of a larger site comprising Phase 2 of the Home Farm development. The Phase 2 site extends to 6.4 hectares. Formerly agricultural land the site is now being developed as part of an overall planning permission for 500 houses.
2. Access is from Over Road which lies to the west. To the east is the High Street and to the north and east an awarded watercourse. A Public Footpath crosses the site from southwest to northeast.
3. These reserved matters applications, received on 2nd and 4th October 2006 provide details of the siting and design of, the means of access to and landscaping for 18 dwellings as a revision to part of the approved details for 153 dwellings on Phase 2. These proposals increase the number of dwellings on this part of the Phase 2 site from 11 to 18 by predominantly subdivision of units to form semi detached and terrace properties. This has increased the density from approximately 13 dwellings/ha to 22 dwellings/ha although it should be noted that this figure takes into account the application site area which includes the access and internal roads.
4. The development would be comprised of 5 (28%) no. 2-bedroom dwellings, 2 (11%) no. 3-bedroom and 11 (61%) no. 4-bedroom. This compares to the approved 8 (73%) no. 4-bedroom dwellings and 3 (27%) 5-bedroom dwellings.
5. 50% of the dwellings (9) would be 2-storey and 50% (9) 2½ storey. The ridge heights of the proposed dwellings range from 7.8 to 9.6 metres. This compares to the approved 27% (3) 2-storey, 36.5% (4) 2½ storey and 36.5% (4) 3-storey with ridge heights ranging from 8.8m to 11.4m.
6. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement.

Planning History

7. Outline planning permission for comprehensive phased development to provide B1050 Bypass for Longstanton and related road works together with housing (21Ha), a business park (6.3Ha), extension to village recreation ground (2.8Ha), village green including land for local shop and surgery, open space, landscaping and related infrastructure` on land west of Longstanton, including the application site, was granted in October 2000 (**S/0682/95/O**). The Decision Notice was issued following the signing of a legal agreement relating to education contributions and highway works. Condition 16 restricted development to no more than 500 dwellings unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.
8. An application to vary conditions 2 and 3 of **S/0682/95/O**, which relate to the timescales for the submission of details and the commencement of development, was submitted under reference **S/1268/02/F**. This application has been treated as withdrawn.
9. **S/1762/03/RM** - 91 dwellings and ancillary works (Phase 1) - approved 22.12.03.
10. An appeal against a refusal to vary condition 16 of the Outline Planning Consent **S/0682/95/O** to allow the construction of more than 500 dwellings was dismissed by an Inspector's letter dated 29th November 2004.
11. **S/0246/04/RM** – Reserved Matter application for 200 dwellings (Phase 2) - Appeal allowed for 196 dwellings August 2005.
12. **S/0696/04/RM** - Duplicate application for 200 dwellings (Phase 2) - Refused for the following reasons:
 - “1. The proposed density at 31.25 dwellings per hectare, which exceeds the approved density of Phase 1 (29.3 d/h), would be contrary to the development principles of the Adopted Development Brief for Home Farm, would fail, in the absence of an appropriate master plan, to coherently implement the phased provision of 500 dwellings over the whole Home Farm site as required by the Outline Planning Permission, reference **S/0682/95/O** dated October 2000 and would not reflect the character of the existing built environment; consequently the proposal would be contrary to Policies P1/3 - Sustainable Design in Built Development of the Approved Structure Plan 2003 and HG5, HG10 and Longstanton 1 of the approved South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
 2. The design and layout of the proposed development fails to achieve a sufficiently high standard of design and a sense of place as required by Policies P1/3 - Sustainable Design in Built Development of the Structure Plan 2003 and HG10 of the Local Plan 2004 and by the adopted Longstanton Development Brief 1998.”
13. **S/0625/04/RM** - Reserved Matters application for the construction of on-site roads and sewers (Phase 2) – Approved April 2005.
14. **S/1846/04/F** - Application for balancing pond and scheme of ditch widening to serve development approved by virtue of outline planning permission **S/0682/95/O** – Approved June 2006.
15. An appeal to vary Condition 16 of the Outline Planning Consent **S/0682/95/O** to allow the construction of 630 dwellings was withdrawn.

16. **S/2069/04/RM** – Application for 153 dwellings (Phase 2) was approved in May 2005.
17. **S/2415/05/F** – Application for 18 dwellings within Phase 2 has been withdrawn.
18. **S/1086/06/F** – Application to extend the period for submission of reserved matters for Phase 2 for an additional 2 years was approved in August 2006.
19. Approximately 10 revised designs have recently been approved for individual plots to include conservatories.

Planning Policy

20. The site forms part of the 21 hectare area of land allocated for some 500 dwellings on land north of Over Road in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: 2004 **Policy HG5**.
21. The principles of development are encapsulated in **Policy Longstanton 1** of the Local Plan 2004. The supporting text at Paragraph 67.17 states:

”The District Council has granted outline planning permission for residential, employment and recreation uses, which includes the provision of a development related bypass. The bypass between Hatton Road, Over Road and Station Road would provide access to Over or Willingham and onto Fenland without passing through the village. The District Council considers that the provision of the bypass is crucial for the village and therefore allocated a larger area for a housing estate than would otherwise be appropriate. In this instance there is no requirement for affordable housing as set out in **Policy HG7** because of the need to ensure the provision of the bypass and other community facilities such as a village green, shop and surgery”.
22. Longstanton is defined as a Group Village in South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: 2004 (**Policy SE4**).
23. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/3** requires all new developments to incorporate high standards of sustainability and design and to provide a sense of place which:
 - (a) “Responds to the local character of the built environment;
 - (b) Is integrated with adjoining landscapes;
 - (c) Creates distinctive skylines, focal points, and landmarks;
 - (d) Includes variety and surprise within a unified design;
 - (e) Includes streets, squares and other public spaces with a defined sense of enclosure;
 - (f) Includes attractive green spaces and corridors for recreation and biodiversity;
 - (g) Conserves important environmental assets of the site;
 - (h) Pays attention to the detail of forms, massing, textures, colours and landscaping.”
24. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P5/3** states that densities of less than 30 dwellings per hectare will not be acceptable “Local Planning Authorities should seek to maximise the use of land by applying the highest density possible which is compatible with maintaining local character”.
25. Local Plan 2004 **Policy HG10** states that residential developments will be required to contain a mix of units providing accommodation in a range of types, sizes (including 1

and 2 bedroom dwellings) and affordability, making the best use of the site and promoting a sense of community which reflects local needs. It also states that the design and layout of the scheme should be informed by the wider character and context of the local townscape and landscape and schemes should achieve high quality design and distinctiveness, avoiding inflexible standards and promoting energy efficiency.

26. Local Plan: 2004 **Policy TP1** states that the Council will seek to promote more sustainable transport choices and one of the ways this can be achieved is restricting car parking for residential developments to a maximum of an average of 1 ½ spaces per dwelling with a maximum of 2 spaces for 3+ bedroom dwellings in poorly accessible areas.
27. A development brief for the Home Farm site, covering matters such as development aims, design philosophy, scale of development, built form (advocating a series of townscape zones including greenways, village lanes, village streets and hamlets), architectural form and open space was adopted by the Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance in 1998. Whilst design guidance has evolved since this brief was adopted, many of the principles contained within the brief remain relevant.
28. Government's **Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 3**, "Housing" (March 2000) aims to avoid developments which make inefficient use of land (those of less than 30 dwellings per hectare). In terms of village expansion, development should be designed sympathetically and laid out in keeping with the character of the village. Design and layout should be informed by the wider context, having regard to the townscape and landscape of the wider locality.

Consultation

29. **Longstanton Parish Council** recommends refusal. It comments:

"The applicant states that the current application is to increase the number of houses in one part of Phase 2 from 11 to 18 homes. There is currently approval for 153 homes in Phase 2. Increasing the number of houses in each area of Phase 2 piecemeal provides no ability to assess the overall effect upon Phase 2, Home Farm, Longstanton. The Parish Council believes that the applicant should:

Submit a new application, detailing the whole of Phase 2 in the same manner as the initial 153-home application. Only in this way can there be an essential assessment of the area in its totality. No applications for local increases in houses should be approved until an overall plan is submitted. Failure to follow this basic approach is contrary to the general-to-detail approach that has been in place for Home Farm since the beginning. Further, the Parish Council objects to the drastic change in the housing composition (for example, 5 bedroom houses are reduced from 7 homes to zero and 2-and 3-beds are increased from zero to 7. The applicant previously stated that their housing composition was appropriate. By definition, then, this new application provides an inappropriate balance ensuring that the development becomes a bedroom community rather than one that will fully integrate with the schools and other aspects of village life".

30. **The Council's Drainage Officer**

"Please note that under the Council's Land Drainage Bylaws, no buildings, fencing, planting or any other obstructions will be permitted within 5 metres of the top of the bank of the watercourse to the north of the development".

31. **Natural England**
Makes no comments.

32. **Environment Agency** comments:

“Confirmation is required that the surface water drainage scheme has been wholly completed, including balancing facility and works to the watercourse, and adopted in accordance with previously agreed details.

Planning approval should not be forthcoming until the aforementioned detail is forthcoming.”

33. **Definitive Map Officer, Countryside Access Team, Cambridgeshire County Council** comments:

“Public Footpath No.3, Longstanton runs through the sites, as shown on the attached plan, which is taken from our digital version of the Definitive Map. The spine road cuts through the public footpath and the Countryside Access Team requires that the developers apply to divert the footpath from the Definitive line to the pavement of the spine road. It has already been brought to the developers’ attention that the development to the south of these sites has obstructed the legal line of the footpath and therefore a diversion is also essential to enable the sale of the affected properties. I attach a copy of an email sent to the developers regarding this issue. It should be noted that to date we have received no response. The Countryside Access Team requires that a condition be added to the planning permission stating that no part of the development should commence until a suitable diversion has come into effect.

In addition to the above comment it should be noted that the depiction of Public Footpath No.3 to the north east of the spine road on the developers plans appears to be in the correct location and the developers should ensure that it is constructed in this location to ensure that a subsequent diversion is not needed.

During construction the developers should apply for a temporary closure notice to ensure the safety of members of the public...”

34. **Middle Level Commissioners** comment:

“You will be aware from my previous correspondence that the Commissioners, on the Board’s behalf, agreed suitable land drainage/flood defence negotiations with the applications consultant and the Environment Agency to ensure that this development does not detrimentally affect the Board’s drainage district. It has been agreed that:

- (a) The balancing pond that serves this development has been completed to its maximum dimensions and the necessary flow regulation structures installed and operational before work on the Home Farm development commences on site.
- (b) The proposals for 500 houses at Home Farm are not increased.
- (c) Work on the Home Farm development has commenced prior to the completion of the balancing pond and will place the Board’s district at an increased of flooding.

- (d) This planning application must also be submitted to the Environment Agency for comment/guidance in relation to:
- i. Surface water disposal – I understand that the Environment Agency's current policy is that any surface water created by a development should be regulated to the pre-development rate of run-off. The Board will, however, also require details of your client's proposals to ensure that they do not adversely affect the Board's rateable area.
 - ii. The piping and filling of on-site watercourses.
 - iii. Development affecting one of their 'main' rivers.

35. **Anglian Water**

Comments are awaited.

36. **The Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service** asks that adequate provision is made for fire hydrants by way of Section 106 agreement or condition. Access and facilities for the Fire Service should also be provided in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document B5, Section 17.

37. **Local Highways Authority** comments:

"I would refer you to my original comments (dated 16 May 2005) in respect of the Reserved Matters application 2069/04 relating to Phase 2. There were so many highway related issues that need to be addressed to provide an acceptable adoptable layout that I requested a joint meeting to resolve such issues.

Unfortunately, my concerns were not addressed, resulting in a highway infrastructure layout that comprises elements that will cause serious adoption difficulties.

From the statement submitted with the application it appears that the proposals the subject of this application do not affect the previously approved highway layout. Notwithstanding this, you may (for the avoidance of adoption difficulties) wish to suggest to the developer that the issues set out below be addressed at this late stage:

1. The ramp/rumble strip at the junction of the spine road with Road C should commence at the tangent point of the junction radii and extend for approx 2.0m into Road C. The footways adjacent the spine road should continue round the junction radii to terminate a minimum of 2.0m past the ramp/rumble strip.
2. Similarly, the footways adj. the spine road should continue round the radii of the junction of Road B to terminate a minimum of 2.0m past the ramp/rumble strip.
3. As both Road B and Road C appear to be shared surface streets why does there appear to be a footway in front of plots 32, 46 and 47, 27-30 and 48-51?
4. What does the line across the carriageway in front of plot 29 denote?

I would suggest that an emended layout plan, addressing the above, be obtained from the applicant/agent, a copy of which to be forwarded to me when available."

38. **Finance Officer Cambridgeshire County Council**
Comments are awaited.
39. **Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum**
Comments are awaited.
40. **Cambridge Water Company**
Comments are awaited
41. **Chief Environmental Health Officer comments:**
No objections subject to conditions to safeguard the amenities of existing residents from noise disturbance during construction.
42. **Police Architectural Liaison Officer**
"In the case of plot 75 it appears that access through the gates to the private drive is required to inspect the utility meters. Utility meters should be either on the front elevation or as close to the front build line as possible and overlooked to avoid the danger posed by bogus officials.
- The footpath link to the front of plots 78-80 and 67-68 should be lit by means of column mounted white down lighters to BS 5489:1996 Code of practice for outdoor lighting. There should be similar lighting provision to the parking court for plots 49/50 and 81/82 and parking area and LAP to the front of plot 83.
- The parking spaces next to plot 83 should be provided with 0.9m railings to provide protection while maintaining natural surveillance and reinforcing the semi private nature of the space."
43. **The Council's Ecology Officer comments:**
"Layout accepted. Condition required to secure provision of nest boxes or bat box on or in association with 50% of the dwellings (Council Policy as of 28th September 2006). Complies with PPS9."
44. **The Council's Landscape Design Officer comments:**
"The proposal no longer relates directly to the landscape master plan Drawing No.2348/04/P. The proposed changes will need either a revised master plan or notification of changes to the master plan. With the increase in density agreed, there will necessarily be a reduction in the green spaces available. Would prefer to see a few spaces large enough to take a mid range tree rather than many very small spaces with only grass. Detailed planting schemes will be required for each area".
45. **The Council's Environment Operations Manager comments:**
"I am assuming that refuse collection is from the front of each property and that 81-83 will be placing their bins at the edge of the hammerhead. Changes will be required if these assumptions are wrong.
- In order to service plots 67, 68 and 77-80 vehicles access needs to be via a road at least 4.5m wide with 6 metre radii. Refuse collection will not take place from these properties as a vehicle cannot be driven to within 30 metres of each one. This layout needs changing."
46. **County Principal Archaeologist**
"The site has been subject to a programme of archaeological investigation in mitigation of the development. No further fieldwork is considered necessary and we have no objection to the commencement of development in this area".

Representations

47. One letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of The Retreat, Few's Lane, Longstanton.

"We agree with the Longstanton Parish Council that these applications should be refused and a completely new application submitted for the whole site. This development is becoming very piecemeal and numbers will soon be completely out of control and far exceed the original total of 500.

There is great concern within the community at the density, lack of parking spaces and whether or not adequate flood protection measures have been put in place".

48. Ramblers Association (Cambridge Group) comments:

"We wish to register our usual concerns:

- a) That the surface of the footpath should not be unduly disturbed by increased traffic during building work.
- b) That materials etc should [not] be stored/dumped on the RoW.
- c) That vehicles visiting the site should not impede the safe passage of pedestrians.
- d) That any footpath signs are not obscured or removed during building work.
- e) Any diversion of the footpath during construction should be adequately signed, and the surface should be that expected of a footpath.

49. Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes has commented:

"18 dwellings represents at 64% increase in housing stock on the application site (original application called for 11 homes). While appreciating that an appeal against an application for more than 153 homes did conclude that some number more should be considered, there has to date been no application to change the number of homes from 153 to some other number. It was quite proper that there be an initial outline consent for all of Home Farm, and that subsequently each phase submitted a more detailed application for its housing. It is wholly inappropriate, however, for Phase 2 to have its numbers increased in an ad hoc manner, with no indication of what the final number of houses might be. No applications for increases in housing on Phase 2 should be considered without an application that sets out the total number requested for Phase 2. Only then can the District be in a position to evaluate whether or not the numbers and arrangement of homes are consistent with the outline consent, and whether or not they are consistent with other reserve matters applications.

In particular, LRDH is concerned that an increase in homes will increase run-off into Longstanton brook. While the developers of Phase 1 have indicated that their drainage improvements would cater for more than 500 homes, this is far from a specific statement that it would cater for a specific number of homes with no increase to flood risk. Nor is it a statement that the balancing pond sluice gates have been tuned to cater for an increase beyond 500 homes (the developers, in a statement to the District's drainage advisory group, made clear that the gates would require expert tuning). The only way in which a clear statement can be made of the suitability or not

of the drainage system is to have a specific application from the developers for the total number and distribution of homes requested for each phase”.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

50. The key issues for consideration are:
- (a) The impact on residential amenity of the revised layout
 - (b) The visual impact of the scheme on the wider locality
 - (c) Housing mix and density
 - (d) Parking and landscaping

General

51. The applicant is seeking to erect an additional 7 dwellings on this part of the overall Phase 2 Home Farm development, which is being implemented in accordance with the approved 153 dwelling scheme rather than the 196 dwelling scheme allowed at appeal, I note the concerns of the Parish Council and a local resident in relation to piecemeal development. However, Phase 2 is being developed by more than one party making it impractical to take a more coordinated overview approach to the making of an application. In any case the applicants have a right to submit applications for reserved matters on parts of the site and the Council has a duty to consider these on their merits. Provided all of the conditions on the Outline permission can be complied with, including the 500 houses limit, I see no reason why these applications cannot be determined on their merits. A reason for refusal in line with the concerns raised would not therefore be justified. The overview approach to Home Farm is contained within the terms and conditions of the Outline planning permission.
52. This proposal for reserved matters only will not lead to more than 500 houses being erected on the Home Farm development site.

Residential amenity

53. The proposal will not materially affect the amenities of occupiers of existing properties. I consider the layout will provide for an adequate level of amenity for the future occupiers of the dwellings with the exception of the relationship between plots 67 and 77. I have asked the applicants to consider repositioning the house on plot 77 by rotating it clockwise through approximately 60° to overcome the problem. I am expecting revised plans to be submitted shortly. Members will be updated at the meeting.

Visual impact

54. As referred to in paragraphs 4-5 above the dwellings will be lower in height and smaller than those already approved. Much of the increased density has arisen from the subdivision of units to form semi detached or terraced properties from detached dwellings. The house types are consistent with those already approved and the layout of the access roads has only been changed very slightly. I do not consider it necessary to provide enclosed front gardens and I have asked the applicants to amend the plans to omit these. As above Members will be updated at the meeting.
55. The approved Local Area of Play and the public footpath link to the Central Open Space are unaffected. The scheme does not result in loss of approved public open space.

Housing mix and density

56. The increase in density here may be offset by lower densities in future phases eg Phase 3B but in any case 500 homes are permitted on the Home Farm site. This dictates the density unless the whole of the site is not developed. In this regard the density of the developed area will be greater and more in line with the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan and Government targets than permitted. The merits of developing the remainder of the site will have to be considered should this be proposed in the future. With regard to this site I welcome the increase in density and the provision of a greater proportion of smaller dwellings.

Parking and landscaping

57. Each dwelling will have parking available for two cars and the access arrangements remain as already permitted. The revised layout will not prejudice the ability to provide for planting in association with a scheme to be submitted under conditions on the Outline permission.

Other matters

58. The comments of the Policy Architectural Liaison Officer and the Council's Environment Operations Manager have been forwarded to the applicants for them to consider revisions to overcome the issues raised. As stated above Members will be updated at the meeting.
59. Drainage concerns are dealt with in the conditions attached to the Outline permission and in the recent permission for the balancing pond (see above), which has now been constructed. The new layout does not compromise the 5m safeguarding strip for maintenance of the drainage ditch to the north.
60. The appeal scheme for 196 houses, allowed by the Inspector, cannot be built as the permitted scheme for 153 houses has been implemented. However I consider it material to the consideration of these applications that a greater number of dwellings has been permitted by an Inspector within Phase 2 of the overall development. On this particular site within Phase 2 the appeal scheme permitted the erection of 16 dwellings.
61. A condition of the outline planning permission requires the provision of fire hydrants.

Recommendation

62. Delegated powers of approval are sought following the submission of the revisions detailed above and not subject to the need for further consultation, subject to safeguarding conditions that closely follow those attached to the approved scheme for 153 dwellings under planning permission ref. S/2069/04/RM

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

- Reserved Matters Application Files Ref S/2069/04/RM, S/1875/06/RM and S/1877/06/RM
- Outline Planning Permission Decision Notice Ref. S/0682/95/O
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Development Brief for Home Farm, Longstanton 1998
- Applications referred to in the “Planning History” section of this report.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1876/06/RM - LONGSTANTON
Erection of 20 Dwellings and Garages
Land within Phase 2, Home Farm for Kings Oak, Milton Keynes

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Date for Determination: 1st January 2007 (Major Application)

Notes:

These Applications have been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the Parish Council objection does not accord with the officer recommendation.

Site and Proposal

1. The 0.68 ha site forms part of a larger site comprising Phase 2 of the Home Farm development. The Phase 2 site extends to 6.4 hectares. Formerly agricultural land the site is now being developed as part of an overall planning permission for 500 houses.
2. Access is from Over Road which lies to the west. To the east is the High Street and to the north and east an awarded watercourse. A Public Footpath crosses the site from southwest to northeast.
3. This reserved matters application, received on 2nd October 2006 provides details of the siting and design of, the means of access to and landscaping for 20 dwellings as a revision to part of the approved details for 153 dwellings on Phase 2. These proposals increase the number of dwellings on this part of the Phase 2 site from 14 to 20 by predominantly subdivision of units to form semi detached and terrace properties. This has increased the density from approximately 21 dwellings/ha to 29 dwellings/ha although it should be noted that this figure takes into account the application site area which includes the access and internal roads.
4. The development would be comprised of 2 (10%) no. 2-bedroom dwellings, 11 (55%) no. 3-bedroom, 3 (15%) no. 4-bedroom and 4 (20%) 5 bedroom. This compares to the approved 2 (14%) no. 3-bedroom dwellings, 5 (36%) 4-bedroom and 7 (50%) 5-bedroom dwellings.
5. 40% of the dwellings (8) would be 2-storey and 60% (12) 2½ storey. The ridge heights of the proposed dwellings range from 7.8 to 10.5 metres. This compares to the approved 50% (7) 2-storey and 50% (7) 2½ storey with ridge heights ranging from 8m to 9.3m.
6. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement.

Planning History

7. Outline planning permission for comprehensive phased development to provide B1050 Bypass for Longstanton and related road works together with housing (21Ha), a business park (6.3Ha), extension to village recreation ground (2.8Ha), village green including land for local shop and surgery, open space, landscaping and related infrastructure` on land west of Longstanton, including the application site, was granted in October 2000 (**S/0682/95/O**). The Decision Notice was issued following the signing of a legal agreement relating to education contributions and highway works. Condition 16 restricted development to no more than 500 dwellings unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.
8. An application to vary conditions 2 and 3 of **S/0682/95/O**, which relate to the timescales for the submission of details and the commencement of development, was submitted under reference **S/1268/02/F**. This application has been treated as withdrawn.
9. **S/1762/03/RM** - 91 dwellings and ancillary works (Phase 1) - approved 22.12.03.
10. An appeal against a refusal to vary condition 16 of the Outline Planning Consent **S/0682/95/O** to allow the construction of more than 500 dwellings was dismissed by an Inspector's letter dated 29th November 2004.
11. **S/0246/04/RM** - Reserved Matter application for 200 dwellings (Phase 2) - Appeal allowed for 196 dwellings August 2005.
12. **S/0696/04/RM** - Duplicate application for 200 dwellings (Phase 2) - Refused for the following reasons:
 - "1. The proposed density at 31.25 dwellings per hectare, which exceeds the approved density of Phase 1 (29.3 d/h), would be contrary to the development principles of the Adopted Development Brief for Home Farm, would fail, in the absence of an appropriate master plan, to coherently implement the phased provision of 500 dwellings over the whole Home Farm site as required by the Outline Planning Permission, reference **S/0682/95/O** dated October 2000 and would not reflect the character of the existing built environment; consequently the proposal would be contrary to Policies P1/3 - Sustainable Design in Built Development of the Approved Structure Plan 2003 and HG5, HG10 and Longstanton 1 of the approved South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
 2. The design and layout of the proposed development fails to achieve a sufficiently high standard of design and a sense of place as required by Policies P1/3 - Sustainable Design in Built Development of the Structure Plan 2003 and HG10 of the Local Plan 2004 and by the adopted Longstanton Development Brief 1998."
13. **S/0625/04/RM** - Reserved Matters application for the construction of on-site roads and sewers (Phase 2) – Approved April 2005.
14. **S/1846/04/F** - Application for balancing pond and scheme of ditch widening to serve development approved by virtue of outline planning permission **S/0682/95/O** – Approved June 2006.
15. An Appeal to vary Condition 16 of the Outline Planning Consent **S/0682/95/O** to allow the construction of 630 dwellings was withdrawn.

16. **S/2069/04/RM** – Application for 153 dwellings (Phase 2) was approved in May 2005.
17. **S/2415/05/F** – Application for 18 dwellings within Phase 2 has been withdrawn.
18. **S/1086/06/F** – Application to extend the period for submission of reserved matters for Phase 2 for an additional 2 years was approved in August 2006.
19. Approximately 10 revised designs have recently been approved for individual plots to include conservatories.

Planning Policy

20. The site forms part of the 21 hectare area of land allocated for some 500 dwellings on land north of Over Road in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: 2004 **Policy HG5**.
21. The principles of development are encapsulated in **Policy Longstanton 1** of the Local Plan 2004. The supporting text at Paragraph 67.17 states:
"The District Council has granted outline planning permission for residential, employment and recreation uses, which includes the provision of a development related bypass. The bypass between Hatton Road, Over Road and Station Road would provide access to Over or Willingham and onto Fenland without passing through the village. The District Council considers that the provision of the bypass is crucial for the village and therefore allocated a larger area for a housing estate than would otherwise be appropriate. In this instance there is no requirement for affordable housing as set out in **Policy HG7** because of the need to ensure the provision of the bypass and other community facilities such as a village green, shop and surgery".
22. Longstanton is defined as a Group Village in South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: 2004 (**Policy SE4**).
23. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/3** requires all new developments to incorporate high standards of sustainability and design and to provide a sense of place which:
 - (a) "Responds to the local character of the built environment;
 - (b) Is integrated with adjoining landscapes;
 - (c) Creates distinctive skylines, focal points, and landmarks;
 - (d) Includes variety and surprise within a unified design;
 - (e) Includes streets, squares and other public spaces with a defined sense of enclosure;
 - (f) Includes attractive green spaces and corridors for recreation and biodiversity;
 - (g) Conserves important environmental assets of the site;
 - (h) Pays attention to the detail of forms, massing, textures, colours and landscaping."
24. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P5/3** states that densities of less than 30 dwellings per hectare will not be acceptable "Local Planning Authorities should seek to maximise the use of land by applying the highest density possible which is compatible with maintaining local character".
25. Local Plan 2004 **Policy HG10** states that residential developments will be required to contain a mix of units providing accommodation in a range of types, sizes (including 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings) and affordability, making the best use of the site and

promoting a sense of community which reflects local needs. It also states that the design and layout of the scheme should be informed by the wider character and context of the local townscape and landscape and schemes should achieve high quality design and distinctiveness, avoiding inflexible standards and promoting energy efficiency.

26. Local Plan: 2004 **Policy TP1** states that the Council will seek to promote more sustainable transport choices and one of the ways this can be achieved is restricting car parking for residential developments to a maximum of an average of 1 ½ spaces per dwelling with a maximum of 2 spaces for 3+ bedroom dwellings in poorly accessible areas.
27. A development brief for the Home Farm site, covering matters such as development aims, design philosophy, scale of development, built form (advocating a series of townscape zones including greenways, village lanes, village streets and hamlets), architectural form and open space was adopted by the Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance in 1998. Whilst design guidance has evolved since this brief was adopted, many of the principles contained within the brief remain relevant.
28. Government's **Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 3**, "Housing" (March 2000) aims to avoid developments which make inefficient use of land (those of less than 30 dwellings per hectare). In terms of village expansion, development should be designed sympathetically and laid out in keeping with the character of the village. Design and layout should be informed by the wider context, having regard to the townscape and landscape of the wider locality.

Consultation

29. **Longstanton Parish Council** recommends refusal. It comments:
"The applicant states that the current application is to increase the number of homes in one part of Phase 2 from 14 to 20 homes. There is currently approval for 153 homes in Phase 2. Increasing the number of houses in each area of Phase 2 piecemeal provides no ability to assess the overall effect upon Phase 2, Home Farm, Longstanton. The Parish Council believes that the applicant should:

Submit a new application, detailing the whole of Phase 2 in the same manner as the initial 153-home application. Only in this way can there be an essential assessment of the area in its totality. No applications for local increases in houses should be approved until an overall plan is submitted. Failure to follow this basic approach is contrary to the general-to-detail approach that has been in place for Home Farm since the beginning. Further, the Parish Council objects to the drastic change in the housing composition (for example, 5 bedroom houses are reduced from 7 homes to 4 and 3-beds are increased from 2 to 11. The applicant previously stated that their housing composition was appropriate. By definition, then, this new application provides an inappropriate balance ensuring that the development becomes a bedroom community rather than one that will fully integrate with the schools and other aspects of village life".
30. **The Council's Drainage Officer**
"Please note that under the Council's Land Drainage Bylaws, no buildings, fencing, planting or any other obstructions will be permitted within 5 metres of the top of the bank of the watercourse to the north of the development".
31. **Natural England**
Makes no comments.

32. **Environment Agency** comments:

"Confirmation is required that the surface water drainage scheme has been wholly completed, including balancing facility and works to the watercourse, and adopted in accordance with previously agreed details.

Planning approval should not be forthcoming until the aforementioned detail is forthcoming."

33. **Definitive Map Officer, Countryside Access Team, Cambridgeshire County Council** comments:

"Public Footpath No.3, Longstanton runs through the sites, as shown on the attached plan, which is taken from our digital version of the Definitive Map. The spine road cuts through the public footpath and the Countryside Access Team requires that the developers apply to divert the footpath from the Definitive line to the pavement of the spine road. It has already been brought to the developers' attention that the development to the south of these sites has obstructed the legal line of the footpath and therefore a diversion is also essential to enable the sale of the affected properties. I attach a copy of an email sent to the developers regarding this issue. It should be noted that to date we have received no response. The Countryside Access Team requires that a condition be added to the planning permission stating that no part of the development should commence until a suitable diversion has come into effect.

In addition to the above comment it should be noted that the depiction of Public Footpath No.3 to the north east of the spine road on the developers plans appears to be in the correct location and the developers should ensure that it is constructed in this location to ensure that a subsequent diversion is not needed.

During construction the developers should apply for a temporary closure notice to ensure the safety of members of the public..."

34. **Middle Level Commissioners** comment:

"You will be aware from my previous correspondence that the Commissioners, on the Board's behalf, agreed suitable land drainage/flood defence negotiations with the applications consultant and the Environment Agency to ensure that this development does not detrimentally affect the Board's drainage district. It has been agreed that:

- (a) The balancing pond that serves this development has been completed to its maximum dimensions and the necessary flow regulation structures installed and operational before work on the Home Farm development commences on site.
- (b) The proposals for 500 houses at Home Farm are not increased.
 - i. Work on the Home Farm development has commenced prior to the completion of the balancing pond and will place the Board's district at an increased of flooding.
 - ii. This planning application must also be submitted to the Environment Agency for comment/guidance in relation to :
- (c) Surface water disposal – I understand that the Environment Agency's current policy is that any surface water created by a development should be regulated to the pre-development rate of run-off. The Board will, however, also require details of your client's proposals to ensure that they do not adversely affect the Board's rateable area.

- (d) The piping and filling of on-site watercourses.
- (e) Development affecting one of their 'main' rivers.

35. **Anglian Water**

Comments are awaited

36. **The Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service** asks that adequate provision is made for fire hydrants by way of Section 106 agreement or condition. Access and facilities for the Fire Service should also be provided in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document B5, Section 17.

37. **Local Highways Authority** comments:

"I would refer you to my original comments (dated 16th May 2005) in respect of the Reserved Matters application 2069/04 relating to Phase 2. There were so many highway related issues that needed to be addressed to provide an acceptable adoptable layout that I requested a joint meeting to resolve such issues.

Unfortunately, my concerns were not addressed, resulting in a highway infrastructure layout that comprises elements that will cause serious adoption difficulties.

From the statement submitted with the application it appears that the proposals the subject of this application do not affect the previously approved highway layout. Notwithstanding this, you may (for the avoidance of adoption difficulties) wish to suggest to the developer that the issues set out below be addressed at this late stage:

1. The private access road serving plots 42-44 and 64-67 should comprise a common turning area at the end of the road. At the very least the road width should be maintained past the private driveway to plot 44 to enable vehicles reversing from this drive to have suitable manoeuvring space.
2. I assume Road 2 comprises a shared surface street? The overall metalled width of Road 2 should therefore be a min of 5.5m with a 0.5m maintenance strip each side. Such maintenance strip should not be metalled except at the point of vehicular accesses.
3. The 1.8m wide footways adjacent to Road 1 should continue round the radii of the Road 1/Road 2 junction to terminate a min of 2.0m past a ramp/rumble strip to be provided at the interface of the standard carriageway within the bellmouth and the shared surface access way. Such ramp/rumble strip to commence at the tangent point of the radii and extend for some 2.0m.

I would suggest that an amended layout plan, addressing the above, be obtained from the applicant/agent, a copy of which to be forwarded to me when available."

38. **Finance Officer Cambridgeshire County Council**

Comments are awaited.

39. **Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum**

Comments are awaited.

40. **Cambridge Water Company**

Comments are awaited.

41. **Chief Environmental Health Officer comments:**
No objections subject to conditions to safeguard the amenities of existing residents from noise disturbance during construction.
42. **Police Architectural Liaison Officer**
"The parking arrangement for plots 70, 72, 73 and 74 are such that the spaces are rather remote from the dwellings served and not within their natural surveillance. This may result in inappropriate parking within view of car owners' dwellings, with the potential for dispute between residents.

The parking court to the rear of plots 81 and 82 should be provided with column mounted white down lighting. If this is not possible lights operated by dusk to dawn sensors should be fitted to the garages and powered by the dwellings served.

In addition to Roads 1 and 2 the drive to the front of plots 72-75 should be lit by means of column mounted white down lighters to BS 5489:1996 Code of practice for outdoor lighting."
43. **The Council's Ecology Officer comments:**
"Layout accepted. Condition required to secure provision of nest boxes or bat box on or in association with 50% of the dwellings (Council Policy as of 28th September 2006). Complies with PPS9."
44. **The Council's Landscape Design Officer comments:**
"The proposal no longer relates directly to the landscape master plan Drawing No.2348/04/P. The proposed changes will need either a revised master plan or notification of changes to the master plan. With the increase in density agreed, there will necessarily be a reduction in the green spaces available. Would prefer to see a few spaces large enough to take a mid range tree rather than many very small spaces with only grass. Detailed planting schemes will be required for each area"
45. **The Council's Environment Operations Manager comments:**
"Due to the lack of appropriate vehicular access I am assuming that refuse collection is to be made from the front of each property, however it is not clear from the drawing where the refuse storage is for the terraced properties. Please confirm the arrangements.

The Hammerhead in Road 2 is too small. Each leg **must be 11 metres** long to facilitate our collection vehicles.

Plots 64 and 65 are too far away from Road 1, the footpath could be linked to the hammerhead of Road 2 to resolve this problem.

Any surface we are likely to drive over must withstand 26 tonnes gvw."
46. **County Principal Archaeologist**
"The site has been subject to a programme of archaeological investigation in mitigation of the development. No further fieldwork is considered necessary and we have no objection to the commencement of development in this area".

Representations

47. One letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of The Retreat, Few's Lane, Longstanton.

"We agree with the Longstanton Parish Council that these applications should be refused and a completely new application submitted for the whole site. This development is becoming very piecemeal and numbers will soon be completely out of control and far exceed the original total of 500.

There is great concern within the community at the density, lack of parking spaces and whether or not adequate flood protection measures have been put in place".

48. **Ramblers Association (Cambridge Group)** comments:

"We wish to register our usual concerns:

- a) That the surface of the footpath should not be unduly disturbed by increased traffic during building work.
- b) That materials etc should [not] be stored/dumped on the RoW.
- c) That vehicles visiting the site should not impede the safe passage of pedestrians.
- d) That any footpath signs are not obscured or removed during building work.
- e) Any diversion of the footpath during construction should be adequately signed, and the surface should be that expected of a footpath.

49. **Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes has commented:**

"20 dwellings represents at 43% increase in housing stock on the application site (original application called for 14 homes). While appreciating that an appeal against an application for more than 153 homes did conclude that some number more should be considered, there has to date been no application to change the number of homes from 153 to some other number. It was quite proper that there be an initial outline consent for all of Home Farm, and that subsequently each phase submitted a more detailed application for its housing. It is wholly inappropriate, however, for Phase 2 to have its numbers increased in an ad hoc manner, with no indication of what the final number of houses might be. No applications for increases in housing on Phase 2 should be considered without an application that sets out the total number requested for Phase 2. Only then can the District be in a position to evaluate whether or not the numbers and arrangement of homes are consistent with the outline consent, and whether or not they are consistent with other reserve matters applications.

In particular, LRDH is concerned that an increase in homes will increase run-off into Longstanton brook. While the developers of Phase 1 have indicated that their drainage improvements would cater for more than 500 homes, this is far from a specific statement that it would cater for a specific number of homes with no increase to flood risk. Nor is it a statement that the balancing pond sluice gates have been tuned to cater for an increase beyond 500 homes (the developers, in a statement to the District's drainage advisory group, made clear that the gates would require expert tuning). The only way in which a clear statement can be made of the suitability or not of the drainage system is to have a specific application from the developers for the total number and distribution of homes requested for each phase.

Planning Comments - Key Issues

50. The key issues for consideration are:
- a) The impact on residential amenity of the revised layout
 - b) The visual impact of the scheme on the wider locality
 - c) Housing mix and density
 - d) Parking and landscaping

General

51. The applicant is seeking to erect an additional 6 dwellings on this part of the overall Phase 2 Home Farm development, which is being implemented in accordance with the approved 153 dwelling scheme rather than the 196 dwelling scheme allowed at appeal. I note the concerns of the Parish Council and a local resident in relation to piecemeal development. However, Phase 2 is being developed by more than one party making it impractical to take a more coordinated overview approach to the making of an application. In any case the applicants have a right to submit applications for reserved matters on parts of the site and the Council has a duty to consider these on their merits. Provided all of the conditions on the Outline permission can be complied with, including the 500 houses limit, I see no reason why these applications cannot be determined on their merits. A reason for refusal in line with the concerns raised would not therefore be justified. The overview approach to Home Farm is contained within the terms and conditions of the Outline planning permission.
52. This proposal for reserved matters only will not lead to more than 500 houses being erected on the Home Farm development site.

Residential amenity

53. The proposal will not materially affect the amenities of occupiers of existing properties. I consider the layout will provide for an adequate level of amenity for the future occupiers of the dwellings with the exception of the relationship between plots 70 and 71 which is poor. I have asked the applicants to consider replacing this pair of semi detached properties with a single detached dwelling to overcome the problem. I am expecting revised plans to be submitted shortly. Members will be updated at the meeting.

Visual impact

54. Eight of the dwellings are approximately 10.5m tall, just over a metre taller than the tallest approved dwelling on this part of the site. However, dwellings in excess of 10m are approved within Phase 2 (and some in excess of 11m) and I do not consider that in this location well within the overall Home Farm development that this will be out of keeping with the existing character. In fact these dwellings will face the large central area of Public Open Space giving some sense of enclosure to this area. I would prefer them to relate more obviously by being perpendicular to it but I do not consider this can be easily achieved or would justify a reason to refuse the application.
55. The house types are consistent with those already approved and the layout of the access roads has only been changed very slightly. The approved layout on this site did not contain public open space, it being provided elsewhere within Phase 2.

Housing mix and density

56. The increase in density here may be offset by lower densities in future phases eg Phase 3B but in any case 500 homes are permitted on the Home Farm site. This dictates the density unless the whole of the site is not developed. In this regard the density of the developed area will be greater and more in line with the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan and Government targets than permitted. The merits of developing the remainder of the site will have to be considered should this be proposed in the future. With regard to this site I welcome the increase in density and the provision of a greater proportion of smaller dwellings.

Parking and landscaping

57. Each dwelling will have parking available for two cars and the access arrangements remain as already permitted. The revised layout will not prejudice the ability to provide for planting in association with a scheme to be submitted under conditions on the Outline permission.

Other matters

58. The comments of the Policy Architectural Liaison Officer and the Council's Environment Operations Manager have been forwarded to the applicants for them to consider revisions to overcome the issues raised. As stated above Members will be updated at the meeting.
59. Drainage concerns are dealt with in the conditions attached to the Outline permission and in the recent permission for the balancing pond (see above), which has now been constructed. The new layout does not compromise the 5m safeguarding strip for maintenance of the drainage ditch to the north.
60. The appeal scheme for 196 houses, allowed by the Inspector, cannot be built as the permitted scheme for 153 houses has been implemented. However I consider it material to the consideration of these applications that a greater number of dwellings has been permitted by an Inspector within Phase 2 of the overall development. On this particular site within Phase 2 the appeal scheme permitted the erection of 20 dwellings.
61. A condition of the outline planning permission requires the provision of fire hydrants.

Recommendation

62. Delegated powers of approval are sought following the submission of the revisions detailed above and not subject to the need for further consultation, subject to safeguarding conditions that closely follow those attached to the approved scheme for 153 dwellings under planning permission ref. S/2069/04/RM.

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

- Reserved Matters Application Files Ref: S/2069/04/RM and S/1876/06/RM
- Outline Planning Permission Decision Notice Ref. S/0682/95/O
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Development Brief for Home Farm, Longstanton 1998
- Applications referred to in the "Planning History" section of this report.

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1981/06/F – GREAT CHISHILL
Variation of Condition 4 of Planning Permission S/0041/03/F
to Allow Additional Rooflight in East Elevation of Barn B (Retrospective Application),
Barn B, May Street Farm, for Carter Developments Ltd

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 8th December 2006

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because of the objection received from Great and Little Chishill Parish Council which does not accord with the officer recommendation.

Site and Proposal

1. May Street Farm barns are located south of the village and in the countryside. It comprises two barns that have recently been converted to dwellings and a recently constructed building, on the site of a former barn, which forms two dwellings. In addition there is a new building that provides covered parking at the east end of the site.
2. This full application, received on 13th October 2006, seeks retrospective consent for the insertion of a rooflight in the east facing elevation of Barn B, which is at the southern end of the group and is occupied as a single dwelling. The submitted floor plan, which reflects the approved internal layout, shows the rooflight serving a loft area. This area is currently being used as a bedroom. There are already two rooflights in this elevation of Barn B serving a first floor bedroom at the northern end of the building.
3. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement.

Planning History

4. Planning consent was granted in March 2003 for the conversion and use of barns to 4 dwellings (**Ref: S/0041/03/F**). Condition 4 of that consent states “no windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted in any elevation of the converted barns, hereby permitted, unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning authority in that behalf.” The reason for the condition was “to preserve the appearance of the units as agricultural buildings.”
5. A retrospective planning application for the erection of 2 dwellings on the site of the former Barn C (**Ref: S/2118/05/F**) was approved on 22nd August 2006.

Planning Policy

6. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“The County Structure Plan”) restricts development in the countryside to that which can be proven to be essential in a particular rural location.
7. **Policy HG13** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) states that extensions to dwellings in the countryside will be permitted where the proposed development would not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling; the extension does not exceed the height of the original dwelling; the extension does not lead to a 50% increase or more volume or gross internal floor area of the original dwelling; the proposed extension is in scale and character with the existing dwelling and would not materially change its impact on its surroundings. In addition any proposal should accord with the criteria set out in Policy HG12 (neighbour impact etc).

Consultation

8. **Great and Little Parish Council** recommends refusal. It comments that “Great and Little Chishill Parish Council feel strongly that this application for additional windows in the roof line should be refused. This development has been changed over the last few months all to the advantage of the developer and, in our opinion, makes a mockery of the original permission. This Council urges the Planning Authority to firmly reject this retrospective application and any modifications that enhance this scheme from the original permission for 2 bedroom units.”

Representations

9. The owner of 47 May Street (who resides in “Lynchets Farm”, New Road) comments that he was the previous owner of the May Street barns and obtained the original planning permission before the land was sold to the current applicant. He objects to the application on the following grounds:
 - (a) The original planning permission was granted for a 2-bedroom/2 bathroom dwelling. The extra window transforms the barn into a 3-bedroom family home.
 - (b) The additional window is in breach of covenant. This is known by the applicant.
 - (c) The additional window in this barn, if accepted, will set a precedent for more windows to be installed in the other barns at a later date.
 - (d) The applicant has ignored planning rules and regulations on this site from start to finish. It has made a mockery of the system. Surely this arrogance should no longer be tolerated.
10. The occupier of 35 May Street, to the north of the site, objects to the proposal stating that Condition 4 is as relevant now as it was when it was applied. No reason can be seen why the Council would now vary this condition and give permission for this rooflight. As immediate neighbours to the development this rooflight (and the others that will surely follow in the adjacent barn) will violate privacy.
11. The occupier of May Street Farmhouse is concerned that the rooflight appeared within 7 days of planning permission being granted and when Condition 3 stated that no new openings would be permitted. To grant planning permission now makes a

mockery of the planning system and would set a precedent. The rooflight should be removed.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

12. Although the approved drawings for Barn B relate to a two-bedroom dwelling, with the area served by the additional rooflight being shown as a loft area, the building is now occupied as a three-bedroom dwelling, with the loft area being used as a third bedroom. There is no planning condition attached to the original planning consent that precludes the alterations to the internal layout of the building following completion, however planning consent is required for any additional openings.
13. Whilst Condition 4 of the original consent for this site precludes the insertion of additional openings without the prior permission of the Local Planning Authority it cannot be taken to infer that planning permission would not be granted upon submission of an appropriate planning application. The condition was imposed “to preserve the appearance of the units as agricultural buildings.” In assessing this retrospective application Members need to consider whether the insertion of an additional rooflight in Barn B materially prejudices the aims of this condition. Although it did not form part of the reason for the condition Members should also consider any impact on residential amenity.
14. In terms of the appearance of the building I do not consider that the introduction of a third rooflight, of the same size as the two existing, in the east facing roof slope materially alters the character of the building as an agricultural building, beyond that already consented. As the rooflight faces into the site I do not consider that the additional rooflight materially changes the impact of the building in the countryside.
15. The case officer has visited the site and been into the building to look out of the additional rooflight. The rooflight primarily looks out onto the shared internal courtyard of the May Street Farm barns scheme. Whilst oblique views can be obtained of 35 May Street if an effort is made to look in that direction I do not consider that it results in any material loss of amenity that would justify the refusal of planning consents, due to the distances involved (in excess of 40m from the rooflight to the dwelling at 35 May Street) and existing planting that screens views of the garden.
16. Any planning applications for further openings in these buildings must be considered on merit.
17. Although I cannot condone the submission of a retrospective planning application having considered the proposal in the preceding paragraphs against the relevant criteria I am of the view that it is acceptable.

Recommendation

18. That the application be approved.

No conditions

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: P1/2** (Environmental Restrictions of Development)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: HG13** (Extensions to Dwellings 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:
 - Residential amenity including 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 Refs: S/1981/06/F; S/0041/03/F; S/2118/05/F

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/2009/06/F - MILTON
Proposal at 5 Pearson Close
For a Single Storey Front Extension and Two-Storey Rear Extension
For Mr C Carter

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 14th December 2006

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination following referral from Chairman's Delegation Meeting on 15th November 2006.

Members will visit this site on Monday 4th December 2006

Site and Proposal

1. The site in question is a 190 square metre plot of land, which comprises of a semi-detached dwelling adjoined to No.4 Pearson Close. The Close is a small cul-de-sac with number 5 being located at the end of the turning head. There are several examples of single storey extensions in Pearson's Close, with Nos. 4 and 5 having both front and rear extensions. The adjacent property to No.5 at No.6 is at a right angle to the site situated in the corner with a right of way over part of the driveway of No.5. This neighbouring property is set forward of No.5 by approximately 8.5m but faces the side elevation (Gable End) of No.5. The front elevation of No.6 is approximately 7.5m to the east from the common boundary with No.5 and has a first floor bedroom and ground floor lounge window facing the gable end of the dwelling. The site has several Leylandii trees at the rear along the northern boundary, which would not be affected by the proposed development.
2. No. 5 has an integral garage as well as a hard surfaced front driveway. The proposed plans show the provision of 3 car parking spaces, which would be achievable on site. To the rear of the site adjacent to the existing single storey rear extension is a decking area with a timber-covered roofing. Whilst it is recognised that there is a right of way over part of the driveway of No.5 to allow access to the adjacent dwelling at No.6 it is clear that the applicant is in complete ownership of the site as it is outlined in red on the proposed plans.
3. The application, received on 19th October 2006 as amended on 13th November, proposes the squaring off of the existing front porch to provide a study/ WC, as well as a two-storey rear extension. The ground floor element of the rear extension would provide a dining room, whilst the first floor element would provide an extension with en-suit bathroom to the existing bedroom. Due to the extensions front and back, the development proposes the insertion of three high level windows to the eastern elevation at ground floor to provide light to the lounge and dining room. These windows would be 1.8m at sill height. Two of them would be within an elevation of

the existing dwelling and therefore could be carried out as Permitted Development under the Town and Country General Permitted Development Order 1995.

4. The proposed front single storey extension would project approximately 2.5m from the existing building line effectively squaring of the front elevation with an approximate width of 2.2m. The two-storey rear extension would project approximately 2.9m from the rear main elevation and would be approximately 6.1m high to the ridge. The extension would be approximately 3.7m in width and would be set approximately 3m from the common boundary with the adjoining property at No.4. The first floor window within the existing side elevation would serve the en-suite bathroom and would be obscure glazed, however as this window is within an existing elevation it can be inserted as Permitted Development under the Town and Country General Permitted Development Order 1995.

Planning History

5. No relevant history of planning applications in relation to No.5 Pearson Close.

Planning Policy

6. **Policy HG12** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 states that planning permission for the extension and alteration of dwellings will not be permitted where:
 - a) The proposal would harm seriously the amenities of neighbours through undue loss of light or privacy, being unduly overbearing in terms of mass, or would adversely affect the surrounding properties by virtue of its design, layout, location or materials;
 - b) There would be an unacceptable visual impact upon the street scene;
 - c) There would be an unacceptable loss of off street parking or garden space within the curtilage;
 - d) Boundary treatment would provide an unacceptable standard of privacy or visual amenity;
 - e) The design and use of materials would not be in keeping with local characteristics.
7. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that a high quality of design will be required for all new developments.

Consultations

8. **Milton Parish Council** – Recommends Refusal on the following grounds:
 - “(a) Over development of the site;
 - (b) Overbearing and loss of light for the neighbours;
 - (c) Overlooking neighbours;
 - (d) Loss of car parking spaces and resulting problems of safety;
 - (e) We support the neighbours objections.”

Representations

9. The owner of No.14 Shirley Close objects to the proposal on the grounds that the development is far too big for the site and the surrounding area and that there are

Leylandii trees on the site that completely block out the sunlight from the garden of No. 14.

10. The owner of No.8 Pearson Close objects to the proposal in respect to the impact the proposed development could have for car parking in the surrounding area. The writer adds:

“Our objection is that the extension planned at the front of 5 Pearson Close will remove space that is currently regularly used for parking car and refuse bins, and that this will, if past patterns of vehicle traffic relating to the property continue, place additional burden on street parking, which is already the cause of regular inconvenience to nearby residents.”

11. The owner of No.6 Pearson Close (Mr Upton) objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- “(a) There are several inaccuracies in the application documents which suggest that the application is invalid, these inaccuracies are as follows:
- i. The red line indicating site boundaries is incorrect, as Mr Upton claims ownership of part of the shared vehicular access;
 - ii. The agents have stated that 5 Pearson Close has never been extended, this is not the case;
 - iii. Mr Upton claims that from his own site measurements the plans do not represent an accurate record of the existing property.
- (b) With reference to item 2 of Local Plan Policy HG12, Mr Upton (Owner of No.6) would suffer from the loss of amenity in terms of his privacy due to the proposed high level windows within the eastern elevation. Despite a sill height of 1.8m it will be possible to view into the first floor window of No.6 from the ground floor.
- (c) Obscured glass may be conditioned, but a habitable room to habitable room distance of 7.3m can not be acceptable in terms of privacy.
- (d) As you will be aware a minimum 20m distance is the rule of thumb in new estate layout with a 10m minimum between a flank wall and a habitable room.
- (e) Light from inside the house in the evenings and sound pollution will be a problem, for these reasons alone the proposal does not comply with Policy HG12 and should be refused.
- (f) It is true that these windows could be put into the flank wall under permitted development, but I would stress that the need to have these windows at all is resultant from the proposal's poor layout and design. Whilst not having any power over permitted development rights the LPA should not approve the proposal which would create such a deleterious situation.
- (g) The resultant mass of the first floor rear extension will also have a detrimental affect on Mr Upton's amenity. The existing relationship between the two buildings is less than ideal and again I suggest it would be unacceptable to any LPA if the estate that is Pearson Close was seeking planning approval today, not least as it does not comply with the principles set out in the BRE's "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight – A good practice guide".
- (h) The unfortunate orientation of 6 Pearson Close with the main western elevation fronting and shaded by the gable of 5 Pearson Close means that the western elevation of 6 Pearson Close already receives no direct sunlight only diffuse light. To worsen this situation by increasing the mass of 5 Pearson Close and

resultant shading to both house and garden can not be acceptable and in my opinion is another reason for refusal.

- (i) Pearson Close was designed with an intended and distinct character and because certain properties have suffered from less than good extensions over the years does not excuse the way for yet another.
- (j) The proposal would result in an unbalanced and incoherent street scene.
- (k) No provision has been made for refuse container storage, again bins left in view for the whole week do nothing for the perception of the neighbourhood.
- (l) Item 3 of Policy HG12 refers to parking and I understand that further details of parking are to be requested by the Local Planning Authority.
- (m) When two cars are parked outside No.5, Mr Upton's access to his own parking spaces is denied.
- (n) In conclusion this application should be refused as it does not comply with Policy HG12 of the Local Plan and because the application forms are incorrect.
- (o) Should the application be approved then it should be referred to the planning committee with a site visit requested."

12. Owner of No.7 Pearson Close objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- "(a) There are a number of cars already parked on this small driveway, which only easily accommodates two cars;
- (b) At evenings and weekends we have counted eight cars in front of this house parked across the pathway and into the hammerhead which is a turning circle in front of our house;
- (c) We feel that the proposed front extension to No.5 Pearson Close will take up one of the car parking spaces on the drive. The two wheelie bins, which are presently parked under the front window, will have to be parked in front of the extension as there will not be a wide enough access at the side of the house to manoeuvre them from the rear, this taking up more driveway space;
- (d) We have often found it difficult in reversing off the left hand side of our driveway because of the numerous cars parked on the road and we feel this proposed extension will exacerbate the situation."

13. Owner of No.9 Pearson Close objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- "(a) The occupant claims that there will be three parking spaces at the property, this claim is optimistic and can only be achieved with careful alignment of the vehicles, with limited access to the front door of the property;
- (b) The occupants own a car, van and quadbike so there is currently no parking availability for co-habitues and guests;
- (c) Also parking three cars, however careful, in the front driveway would block access to half of the driveway of No.6;
- (d) Another reason for our objection is that the current occupant already blocks the turning access to our road thus causing difficulty for us to manoeuvre from our drive and would obstruct emergency vehicle access to nos.5,6,7,8 and 9;
- (e) It is our view that if the occupant of No.5 is permitted to extend his property at the front he will restrict his parking availability to one car thus exacerbating the problems which already exist."

14. Owner of No.4 Pearson Close objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- “
- (a) When we bought the house both properties had a kitchen extension to the rear, it is our belief that a double storey extension to the rear would result in overdevelopment of the property, both gardens are only 30ft x 25ft;
 - (b) Due to our small garden and it being north facing we need all the light possible, this planning proposal will cause shadowing in our garden during the morning hours;
 - (c) A double storey extension would give Mr Carter (Owner of No.5) almost total views into our garden and would offer us little privacy;
 - (d) Where the fence separates the two properties, our garden area near the kitchen is often damp due to lack of light, if the proposed extension is given permission to be built this area will become wet;
 - (e) Deterioration to our kitchen roof, a slight amount of moss forms on it at present but due to extensive growth;
 - (f) The planning application has been falsified as it states there are no trees on the property, in fact there are three Leylandii trees approximately twenty feet high and about eighteen feet from the end of the proposed extension. As a soak away has to be a certain distance and depth from the property, surely this would be impossible without damaging the trees roots and making the trees unstable, it also states that no trees are to be felled;
 - (g) Also stated on the planning application form is that there has not been an extension to 5 Pearson Close, in fact there have been two extensions, one to the kitchen and a front porch;
 - (h) On the planning application it states there is room for three cars, the extension to the front would mean that the third car may protrude onto the pathway, this will then cause a safety hazard for the children who play in the Close;
 - (i) Some of the other houses, especially the semi-detached, have had extensions, however all of these extensions have been single storey at the rear and have kept in line with the other houses in the Close;
 - (j) At the moment the car parking situation at 5 Pearson Close is appalling, often resulting in cars three deep and doubled parked, occasionally four deep, across the pathway and into the roadway, which is a turning circle for all in Pearson Close;
 - (k) However, on a positive note we have no objection to a single storey extension to the rear of the property.”

Planning Comments – Key Issues

Inaccuracies

15. The amended plan and supporting information received and stamped on the 13th November 2006 have addressed the inaccuracies of the original application forms and proposed drawings. The new plan (Drg No.1254-001-CB46YS) now shows the Leylandii trees upon the northern boundary as well as notes the previous extensions to the dwelling. The dimensions on this drawing now appear to be correct and whilst the agent admits these mistakes it is stated that these were not meant to mislead but were simply down to human error. This supporting information is deemed

acceptable and would appear to clarify the inaccuracies that were raised through neighbour representations.

16. The red line showing the ownership of the site has not been revised as it is stated that this is what the applicant believes to be within his ownership. It would appear that there is a right of way to No.6 across part of the driveway of No.5. However this is a civil matter and not a material planning consideration.

Car Parking

17. The revised site plan shows the provision of three car parking spaces on site as stated within the application forms. These spaces consist of one garage space and two spaces upon the front driveway. This accords with Local Plan requirements for a maximum of 2 off street parking spaces. This plan clearly shows that three spaces can be achieved at the dimensions of 2.4m wide by 4.8m deep. These spaces will all be contained within the curtilage of the site and would not impact upon the public highway or turning head of the cul-de-sac.
18. Representations from neighbouring properties make reference to poor parking standards within the street due to off street car parking. Whilst this may be the case this is not a material planning consideration as this application clearly satisfies the maximum requirement for car parking standards and would adhere to Policy HG12 in that respect.

Street Scene

19. The proposed single storey front extension has been amended so that it does not project past the existing building line of the porch. It would therefore square off the existing front elevation and not impede parking provision upon the driveway. The adjoined dwelling at No.4 has a garage extension which projects forward of the building line, which is very prominent within the street scene. The proposed extension is considered limited in scale and would not cause any visual harm to the street scene as it would follow the line and design of the existing porch extension. In relation to the storage of refuse bins, this specific dwelling was not designed to accommodate wheelie bins. The bins could easily be accommodated within the existing garage or, through the use of the side access, they could be stored within the rear garden. It would be unreasonable to condition such storage and it would be impossible to enforce such an issue. Whilst it may not be desirable to store wheelie bins in view of the street scene it would not warrant a refusal of planning permission.

Overdevelopment

20. The proposed two storey rear extension would be the same depth as the previously built single storey rear extension. Currently this area is decked in timber with a covered perspec roof with timber beams. The footprint of the proposed extension would be no larger than this existing decked area. The garden is of an adequate size and I do not consider that the proposed extension would be an overdevelopment of the site as it would not deplete the existing amenity space of the site to an unacceptable standard (5m deep by 8m wide). There are several mature Leylandii trees along the northern boundary of the site, which would not be affected by the proposed extension. The site is not within a conservation area and the trees could be felled without consent. The trees are not particularly attractive specimens and do not offer any particular visual merit.

Privacy

21. It is recognised that the insertion of the three high level groundfloor windows within the eastern elevation are a result of the re-working of the internal layout and poor design in order to allow light into the lounge. However two of these windows would be within the existing elevation of the dwelling. It is recognised that the windows do make up part of this application and their requirement is a direct result of the proposed extensions. Notwithstanding this the ground floor windows are 1.8m at sill height, and as such would not result in a material loss of privacy upon the neighbour at No.6.
22. The neighbour suggests that from these ground floor windows it would be possible to look up at the first floor bedroom window of No.6. The front elevation of No.6 is approximately 7.3m away and as such it may be possible to look up at this elevation. In my opinion such an eventuality would be unlikely and not easily achievable. However, installation of obscured glass would overcome this objection. The first floor window would serve the ensuite bathroom to the main bedroom and as shown on the plans would be obscured glazed to safeguard the privacy of the adjacent neighbour.
23. The two-storey rear extension would contain a window within the northern elevation which would mimic the same relationship as the existing windows within the rear elevation of the dwelling. The 2.9m projection of the extension would in my opinion make the possibility of overlooking to the adjoining dwelling at No.4 more difficult than the existing situation. Nevertheless a condition will be included to ensure that no further windows can be inserted within the side elevations of the first floor element of this extension to ensure that no material loss of privacy occurs.

Neighbour Amenity

24. It is recognised that the existing layout of both Nos. 5 and 6 is not ideal. A line drawn from the rear of the first floor rear extension to the centre of the first floor bedroom window of the adjoining property at No.4 provides an approximate angle of 44 degrees. This would be deemed acceptable by the BRE's "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight – A good practice guide". Therefore, whilst the proposal would result in a degree of overshadowing to the roof of the ground floor extension of No.4, I do not consider it would result in a material loss of light to either the first floor habitable room or to the rear garden.
25. The relationship with the adjacent dwelling at No.6 is slightly different, and under the BRE's "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight – A good practice guide" there is no definitive model that can be applied to accurately determine the impact of the extension in relation to loss of light or overshadowing. However it would appear that the proposed two-storey extension would not intrude into a 45 degree horizontal angle from the centre of the first floor bedroom window of No.6. This would suggest that the only shadowing and loss of light to No.6 would occur within an arc directly in front of the dwelling but with no significant/substantial loss of light to either the ground floor living room window or first floor bedroom window. Furthermore the area which is recognised as commonly used as the occupiers immediate amenity area would also not fall within this arc. Therefore it is my opinion that whilst there would be a degree of light lost to the occupier of No.6 that it would not be significant to warrant a refusal of planning permission.
26. The proposed rear extension would be clearly visible from No.6 from both within the dwelling and within the garden. Considering the limited projection of the first floor element of the extension and that No.6 is sited approximately 5m south of the existing rear building line of No.5, I do not consider the extension would be unduly

overbearing in terms of its mass. Within the representation from the owner of No.6 it is illustrated that the dwelling receives light in the morning from the west which is blocked at midday by the property it self and then further afternoon light is partially blocked by both Nos. 4 and 5 with the sun setting just past that of No.5. Therefore the loss of light in question would be at late afternoon to early evening, which, when reviewed in light of the arc of the angle from the extension to the centre of the habitable rooms of No.6, suggests that the loss of light would not be significant enough to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

Recommendation

27. Approve as amended by drawing 1254-001-CB46YS stamped 13th November 2006, 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. No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used for the external walls and roof of the development, hereby permitted, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (Reason - To ensure that visually the development accords with neighbouring buildings.)
 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 and Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order), no further windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be inserted in the first floor western and eastern elevations of the two-storey rear extension, hereby permitted, unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf. (Reason - To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of the adjoining properties.)
 4. The first floor window serving the ensuite bathroom in the eastern elevation of the existing building and the three high level windows at ground floor level in the eastern elevation of the existing building and the extension, hereby permitted, shall be permanently fitted and thereafter maintained with obscured glass. (Reason - To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of the adjoining property.)
 5. The garage shall not be used as additional living accommodation (and no trade or business shall be carried on therefrom). (Reason - To ensure continued provision of off-street parking space.)

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:**
P1/3 (Sustainable design in built development)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
HG12 (Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings within Frameworks)

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

- Residential amenity
- Parking
- 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 application file S/2009/06/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/2034/06/F - GRAVELEY**Workshop/Staff Welfare Building at Hillcrest Farm, Toseland Road for Intervet UK Ltd****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 15th December 2006**

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because, if approved, the development would be a Departure from the Development Plan.

Departure Application**Site and Proposal**

1. The site lies within the rural area adjoining the south-west of the village. It comprises a group of single-storey buildings and a portable unit to the rear of the two-storey office that fronts Toseland Road. The applicant company is focused on research and development of veterinary products in the UK and abroad.
2. The full application, dated 3rd September 2006, proposes the demolition of outbuildings and the erection of a single-storey unit providing a welfare room and meeting room for on-site staff, together with a small general store and small workshop for occasional maintenance of small items of farm equipment. The unit will have dimensions of 7.0m x 17.3m x 3.1m high, which is approximately equivalent to the area of buildings to be removed. The external materials are to be facing brick to match the frontage office, dark-stained boarding to the gables, and dark grey fibre cement slates. Parking for an additional five vehicles will be made available adjacent to the building.

Planning History

3. Planning permission for a two-storey welfare building on the same site was refused planning permission on 17th May 2006 because it would have given rise to harm to the visual amenities of the area by virtue of its height and scale (**S/0592/06/F**). Planning permission was given for the erection of a single storey workshop/welfare building on the eastern side of Toseland Road on 12 May 2004 (**S/0361/04/F**). Temporary planning permission was given for two portacabins to be used as staff rest room and office in February 2002 (**S/0052/02/F**). This consent will expire on 31 December 2006.

Planning Policy

4. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:
P1/2: Environmental Restrictions on Development
P1/3: Sustainable Design in Built Environment
P2/6: Rural Economy
P7/4: Landscape

5. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
EM4: Research Establishments
EM7: Expansion of Existing Firms
EN1: Landscape Character Areas
EN3: Landscaping and Design Standards for New Development within the Countryside
EN5: Landscaping of New Development
ES6: Noise and Pollution

Consultations

6. **Graveley Parish Council** – comments awaited. These will be reported at the meeting if received.
7. **Chief Environmental Health Manager** – No objection in principle, but has recommended a construction-hours condition and informatives in order to control noise disturbance during demolition/ construction, and for details of mechanical extraction to be submitted for consideration.
8. **Highways Authority** – The Highway Authority has no comments on the proposal.
9. **Environment Agency** has no objection subject to comments, which can be included as informatives on the Decision Notice if the application is approved.

Representations

10. None received. The statutory consultation period expires on 4th December 2006.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

11. The site occupies a site that can be viewed from Toseland Road. However, as the height and floor area are equivalent to the buildings to be removed from the site, and the external materials are to be sympathetic to the main office which adjoins, I do not consider that any serious harm to the appearance of the countryside will result from the development.
12. The proposal is an alternative to that granted on a different site on the farm under reference S/0361/04/F, which will remain extant until 12th May 2009. In order to preserve the openness of the countryside, I recommend that a condition be attached to any consent issued to require the applicant to enter into a S106 legal obligation to prevent the future implementation of this planning permission. The applicant has agreed to this requirement in principle.
13. Having regard to the extant permission and the scale and nature of the proposal, I do not consider that the application need be referred to the Secretary of State as one which would significantly prejudice the implementation of the Development Plan's policies and proposals.

Recommendation

14. Approval 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 for the provision of pollution control to the water environment to be submitted for approval (Reason – To prevent pollution of the water environment);
5. Withdrawal of permitted change of use rights (Reason – To prevent the establishment of an inappropriate use in the countryside);
6. Restriction of hours of use of power operated machinery during demolition/ construction (Reason – To prevent noise disturbance to occupiers of adjoining residential occupiers);
7. Details of power driven plant or equipment including mechanical ventilation to be submitted and approved (Reason – To prevent noise disturbance to occupiers of adjoining residential occupiers);
8. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a binding undertaking prepared in accordance with the requirements of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 shall have been entered into which requires the rescinding of planning permission reference S/0361/04/F at Hillcrest Farm, Toseland Road, Graveley. Reason- To prevent the proliferation of development and to safeguard the appearance of the countryside to the south-east of Graveley.

Informatives

Environment Agency surface water disposal informatives, and as recommended by the Chief Environmental Health Officer.

Reasons for Approval

1. Although the proposal is contrary to policies in the Development Plan restricting new development within the countryside, it is considered that there are material considerations in this case which warrant a departure from the provisions of this plan. The proposal allows for the expansion of an existing operation which has been located on this site, within the countryside for approximately 20 years. The function and appearance of the building is appropriate in the countryside, it will not adversely affect the visual amenities of the countryside or landscape character area, it will replace existing buildings already on the site and, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement, will replace an extant consent for a workshop and welfare building.

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/2034/06/F; S/0592/06/F; S/0361/04/F; S/0052/02/F.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/2085/06/F - SAWSTON
Bungalow at Land Adjacent 9 Dale Way for Mr & Mrs Hogger**Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 23rd December 2006****Notes:**

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the Officer recommendation is contrary to the recommendation of the Parish Council.

Site and Proposal

1. This 0.04 hectare application site is located at the end of a cul-de-sac and comprises a triangular shaped parcel of land situated within the curtilage of No.9 Dale Way, a semi-detached red brick two storey dwelling. To the west of the site is a two storey dwelling whilst to the north and east are the rear gardens of properties fronting Babraham Road and Sunderlands Avenue respectively.
2. On the opposite corner to the west of the site is a hipped roof bungalow sited at No.6a Dale Way. Planning permission granted on appeal, exists for the erection of a bungalow on this site but the dwelling has not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and is presently unauthorised (reference S/1192/01/F).
3. The application, submitted on 27th October 2006 and amended on 23rd November 2006, proposes the erection of a 3-bedroom hipped roof brick and tile bungalow on the site. The dwelling would be just under 5 metres high and would be set approximately 14 metres back from the frontage of the plot. The density equates to 25 dwellings per hectare.

Planning History

4. **S/1260/06/O** – Outline permission granted (22nd August 2006) for the erection of a bungalow on this site, with all matters reserved for further consideration.
5. **S/0469/06/O** – Outline application for a two storey house refused (28th April 2006) due to the impact upon the amenities of Nos. 8 and/or 9 Dale Way and to the impact upon the character of the area.

Planning Policy

6. Sawston is designated within the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 as a Rural Growth Settlement where **Policy SE2** states residential development will be permitted providing, amongst other matters, the development would be sensitive to the character of the village and the amenities of neighbours.
7. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 stresses the need for a high standard of design and a sense of place which corresponds to the local character of the built environment.

Consultation

8. **Sawston Parish Council** objects to the application for the following reasons:
 - a. Overdevelopment of site
 - b. Shared access problems

Representations

9. None at the time of preparing this report. The statutory consultation period expires on 30th November 2006.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

10. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:
 - a. Impact upon character and appearance of the area;
 - b. Residential amenity;
 - c. Highway safety.

Impact upon character of area

11. Dale Way is occupied predominantly by two-storey semi-detached dwellings. However, there is a hipped roof bungalow within the garden of No.6 Dale Way and the erection of a bungalow on the proposed application site (the opposite corner at the end of the cul-de-sac) would be in keeping with the character of the immediate area and provide some symmetry within the street scene. Outline consent has been granted for the erection of a bungalow on this basis.
12. As stated previously, there is a bungalow at No.6a Dale Way that has not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans. Members may recall that, at the April 2005 Committee meeting, an application to regularise this dwelling was refused as it was considered that the bungalow had been constructed too close to the north-eastern boundary resulting in a cramped form of development. Enforcement action was authorised to secure the removal of the elements of that dwelling considered to be harmful. This included a single storey extension that came to within 0.5 metres of the north-eastern boundary of the site, thereby ensuring that no part of the dwelling would be sited within 2 metres of any boundary of the site. These works have not been carried out to date.
13. The proposed bungalow would be positioned approximately 14 metres into the site and would have gaps of between 2 and 4.5 metres on either side thereby providing a sense of space around the building. I am satisfied that it would not appear unduly cramped in the street scene and that the form of development would accord with that required by the enforcement notice (rather than constructed) at No.6a Dale Way.

Residential amenity

14. The proposed bungalow has been sited so as not to intrude into a 45 degree line taken from patio doors sited in the rear elevation of No.9 Dale Way. As such, I am satisfied that it would neither intrude into the outlook from this dwelling nor cut out an undue amount of light to these windows and garden area. The dwelling is also set well away from No.8 Dale Way and would not seriously harm the light to and outlook from this property.

Highway safety

15. The proposed bungalow would be sited on land that presently appears to be used by No.9a Dale Way for parking. There is sufficient space within the proposed plot and within the remaining curtilage of No.9 Dale Way to accommodate two cars on each plot as demonstrated within the amended site layout plan and any consent should be conditioned upon the provision of these parking spaces.

Recommendation

16. Subject to the submission of a parking plan showing the provision of two off-street parking spaces for both the existing and proposed dwellings, approval:
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. Sc5b – Surface water drainage (Rc5b);
 7. Sc5c – Foul sewage disposal (Rc5c);
 8. During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays), unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions (Reason – To minimise noise disturbance to adjoining residents)
 9. The dwelling, hereby permitted, shall not be occupied until off-street car parking and means of vehicular access to 9 Dale Way and the dwelling hereby permitted have been constructed in accordance with the approved plans (drawing no. EDG/06/115/4b date stamped 23rd November 2006). The car parking spaces shall be retained for parking purposes thereafter.

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:**
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:
 - Visual impact on the locality;
 - Highway safety/access

General

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

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning Files Ref: S/2085/06/F, S/1260/06/O, S/0469/06/O and S/1192/01/F

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee 6th December 2006
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1502/06/LB & S/1503/06/F - BABRAHAM
Internal and External Alterations to Barn and Cartsheds and Conversion to 6 Guest Bedrooms for The George Inn at the Black Barns, High Street

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 19th September 2006

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the Officer recommendation does not accord with the recommendation of the Parish Council.

Members will visit the site on 4th December 2006

Conservation Area

Site and Proposal

1. The 0.016 ha application site is located on the south-east side of High Street, within the village framework for Babraham and within the Conservation Area. The application relate to a Grade II Listed 16th Century, four bay, timber framed and weatherboarded barn with a corrugated iron roof. Attached to the barn is a range of single storey open-fronted cartsheds, also weatherboarded, and with a pantiled roof. The barn has two large openings in the north-east and south-east elevations but few openings elsewhere.
2. Located to the north-east of the site is the car park for The George Inn, a Grade II listed building. This is bounded to the north-west and south-west by Chalk Farmhouse, also a Grade II Listed Building and to the south-east by open land.
3. The applications, registered on 25 July 2006 seek consent for internal and external alterations and conversion of The Black Barn and cartsheds to provide 6 guest bedrooms for The George Inn. The roof of the barn would be replaced with a slate roof. Vehicular access would be gained from the existing access from High Street that serves the dwellings to the rear of the site.
4. Additional information date stamped 4th September states that the applicant owns the driveway up to Chalk Farmhouse and the owners of Chalk Farmhouse have the right of way over this driveway. It proposes a circular one-way system from the driveway and archway adjacent to the barn to the proposed car park and exit via Honeysuckle Lane. Amended plans date stamped 25th September showing the land/driveway up to Chalk Farmhouse is owned by the applicant and alterations to fenestration and details of the buildings. A letter dated 23rd October 2006 confirms that the Transport Report prepared by Hannah Reed and letters dated 27th July and 29th August 2006 are withdrawn from consideration as part of the application. Revised traffic mitigation measures would be provided on site: a one way system will encourage guests'

vehicles to enter the site via the archway and exit via Honeysuckle Lane with the help of appropriate signage, mirrors and traffic calming measures (speed bumps).

5. The original application is accompanied by a supporting planning statement, a structural survey, a transport report (now withdrawn) and a barn and bat survey.

Planning History

6. Recent applications **S/0494/06/LB** and **S/0495/06/F** for the conversion of the barn and cartsheds were withdrawn.

Planning Policy

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

7. **Policy P1/3** "Sustainable Design in Built Development" of the Structure Plan 2003 requires a high standard of design and sustainable for all new development which, amongst other criteria, responds to the local character of the built environment.
8. **Policy P7/6** "Historic Built Environment" of the Structure Plan 2003 states that Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004

9. **Policy RT10** "Development for Holiday Accommodation" of the Local Plan 2004 sets out the requirements for conversion of buildings to holiday accommodation considering issues of condition of the building, impact upon the character of the area and any surrounding buildings, and impact on character and amenity of the locality.
10. **Policy RT12** "Tourist Accommodation within Frameworks" of the Local Plan 2004 states that the District Council supports proposals for the conversion to guest houses within the defined frameworks of the village.
11. **Policy EN13** "Protected Species" of the Local Plan 2004 sets out the requirements for development affecting protected species.
12. **Policy EN14** "Protected Species in Farm Buildings" of the Local Plan 2004 encourages developers to retain, enhance or provide roost sites for bats or barn owls in the conversion of farm buildings.
13. **Policy EN26** "The Conversion of Listed Buildings to New Uses" of the Local Plan 2004 sets out the requirements for the conversion of listed buildings to new uses.
14. **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.
15. **Policy EN30** "Development in Conservation Areas" of the Local Plan 2004 sets out the requirements for development within Conservation Areas.
16. **Policy CS5** "Flood Protection" sets out requirements for development liable to flooding.

Consultation

17. **Babraham Parish Council** recommends for refusal and states:

“Do not object to any internal alterations to this building and would like to see this building used, but think this is inappropriate. Car parking is problematic and access to the suggested car parking is very narrow and dangerous, less rooms and access to the apartments through room 3 would then allow parking in front of the pub. This though would cause extra parking problems in the village because the pub car park is already too small”.

The Parish Council raises objections to the amendment (the applicant’s agent letter dated 23rd October 2006) in relation to the revised traffic mitigation measures and states that “The Parish Council continues strongly to object to the muddled and unenforceable traffic management measures proposed by the applicants.”

18. **The Conservation and Design Manager** supports the application.

“Given the location of the building and its close proximity to Chalk Farmhouse and The George Inn, a commercial or office use is probably not appropriate and there is no objection to the proposed change of use to bedrooms for The George Inn. The proposal will ensure the repair of the building and result in a viable use, which will retain its character and appearance without the necessity for extensive alteration.

The proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Buildings and will preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

In principle there is no objection to the proposals but the following amendments are required:

- a) Replace the new small window on the north-west elevation with a three-light high-level window under the eaves and fitted between the existing studs.
- b) Recess the glazing and the boarding on the south-west of the cartsheds behind the existing timber posts and extend the glazing to the ground.
- c) Retain the character of the north-east gable of the barn by expressing the opening as a pair of doors with vertical boarding and separate framed lights at the top.
- d) Simplify the large glazed opening on the south-west elevation by omitting the transoms on either side of the door.
- e) Replace the proposed ceiling above rooms 1, 2 and 3 with a sloping ceiling over the corridor and either a sloping or flat ceiling over the shower rooms.
- f) Include details of the ventilation and soil and vent pipes in order that the impact of the proposals on the exterior wall of the north-east elevation.

With regard to the parking, details of the materials and the demarcation of the parking bays are required; tarmac is not acceptable”.

Further comments are awaited to confirm that the withdrawal of the Transport Report overcomes concerns regarding the impact upon the Listed Building of the originally proposed traffic mitigation measures.

19. **Local Highway Authority** has no objection/ comment to make on the proposal as presented.

20. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** raises no objections in principle although does express concerns about potential noise disturbance to residents during the demolition and construction period. As such, it is recommended that conditions restricting hours of use of power operated machinery be applied to any planning consent and requiring details of method for construction of any driven pile foundations and preventing burning of waste on site. Condition to conduct an investigation regarding potential land contamination is required. It is also recommended that informatives be included on the decision notice if approved.
21. **Ecology Officer** has considered the submitted barn and bat survey and requests conditions and informatives to be attached to any consent, in regard to timing of works to avoid the nesting season, to ensure a scheme of nest box provision and to provide details of measures for bat mitigation.
22. **Environment Agency** states that the application site falls within "Floodzone 1" of the Flood Risk Standing Advice matrix and the Agency has no comment.
23. **The Trees and Landscape Officer** would not wish to see the "visual buffer" of the cherry trees between No 31 and the public house lost. Any works in the vicinity of these trees should use "no-dig" construction. They are afforded protection by virtue of their location in the Conservation Area.

Representations

24. Occupiers at Nos 27, 28 and 31 Brick Row object to the circular one-way system applied to the proposed guest rooms. Their concerns relate to the intensification of vehicular movement on Honeysuckle Lane and the highway safety to children, pedestrians and delivery vehicles. The proposed development would set a precedent for development on land at the rear of The George Inn.
25. Occupiers at No 29 Brick Row supports the barn conversion but questions the circular one-way traffic system that would affect highway safety and cause noise and disturbance to existing residential properties.
26. Occupier at Fidelis Flat, High Street objects to the proposal and states that the archway has poor vehicle-pedestrian visibility and the proposed use would cause dangers to the elderly and children. The proposed parking plan will be insufficient for cars to turn around and there is a deep ditch at the side of the driveway that would prevent cars turning. Cars from the guest rooms would then park along the driveway.
27. Occupiers at No 30 Brick Row supports the conversion of the Black Barn but objects to the revised traffic mitigation measures. Honeysuckle Lane, which is used as the rear parking access for Brick Row residents, is extremely tight and the visibility is poor in both directions. Appropriate signage and mirrors would compromise what is already only just acceptable for the current usage. The revised mitigation measures with a one-way system at its entrance via the archway and a two-way access at its exit at Honeysuckle Lane would have huge implications on day to day activity for residents at Brick Row. The traffic activity of the proposed guest rooms should be confined to the Black Barn creating a turning circle within the courtyards and using mirrors and signage.
28. Occupier at Chalk Farmhouse objects to the proposed development:
 - a) Narrow access to the application site which is currently unsafe for drivers, pedestrians, particularly children;

- b) The existing archway serves at least 9 vehicles in associated with the occupants of 3 houses and 2 flats;
 - c) Chalk Farmhouse has 4 cars and the office premises at Chalk Farmhouse have 5 cars. Including visitors, there is a minimum of 18 vehicle movements through the archway access. Additional vehicle movement from the proposed guest rooms would increase the possibility of accident and injury;
 - d) The proposal would have an adverse impact on loss of privacy to the adjacent offices and would cause noise disturbance and security issues;
 - e) The revised traffic mitigation measures to encourage guests to leave the proposed guest rooms via Honeysuckle Lane would be dangerous as they would not expect vehicles to exit from Chalk Farmhouse or any oncoming vehicles driving through the archway to High Street;
 - f) The increased vehicle traffic in Honeysuckle Lane, would harm road safety, especially children, cyclists and pedestrians;
 - g) The archway in both directions is completely blind and would cause dangers to road users and the appropriate signage encouraging vehicles to enter one way and leave another does not help the situation; and
 - h) The proposed mitigation system is unenforceable and the solution to the problem is to have the entrance at the front of the building, near the entrance to the George.
29. The Director of Operations at ACE Study Tours supports the application given that there is a shortage of guest accommodation in the area without travelling into Cambridge or Saffron Walden. The proposal would offer a small number of rooms without a detrimental effect on the local community and traffic through the village.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

30. The main issues to consider in the determination of this application are:
- a. Whether a new use for the barn is necessary and whether a residential use is most appropriate.
 - b. The impact on the character and appearance of the Listed Building and the setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings.
 - c. The impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
 - d. The use of the archway access and Honeysuckle Lane as entrance and exit for the guests' vehicles.
 - e. The impacts on the adjacent office premises at Chalk Farmhouse.

Whether a new use for the barn is necessary and whether a residential use is most appropriate

31. Given the location and relationship of the listed public house, it is clear from the information submitted with the application that an agricultural use for the barn is no longer viable. Given the listed status and historic importance of the barn, it is considered essential to establish a viable new use for the building in order to ensure its retention as a contributor to the historic character of the area. The use of the barn for employment or commercial purposes presents both highway safety issues and

potentially a detrimental impact upon the amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties. In the past the owners have tried to find a new use for the barn but the only interest has been for a temporary storage use, which would not generate sufficient revenue to secure the long-term future of the barn.

32. Officers, therefore consider that a residential use, is the only viable way of securing the retention of the building. It is, therefore, necessary to consider whether the long-term preservation of the building can be achieved without compromising its fabric, character or setting, or the setting of the adjacent listed buildings.

The impact on the character and appearance of the Listed Building and the setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings

33. The Conservation and Design Manager supports the application, as amended, and considers the proposal would not harm the special character and appearance of the building or the setting of the adjacent listed buildings, subject to careful consideration of materials and joinery details. Externally, the existing openings would be utilised and new openings would be minimal, thereby reducing the impact on the character and appearance of the building and minimising the loss of historic fabric. Internally the alterations, which include the insertion of partition walls would be reversible and there would be no significant loss of historic fabric.

The impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

34. The proposals are considered to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The use of the archway access and Honeysuckle Lane as entrance and exit for guests' vehicles.

35. The barn and cartsheds are to the southwest of The George Inn pub. The roof of the barn runs across the archway and links to the roof of the granary of Chalk Farmhouse. The cartsheds are to the south-east of the barn with bays facing the amenity area, the driveway leading to dwellings at Honeysuckle Lane, and the office premises at Chalk Farmhouse. The site is accessed via the archway access or via Honeysuckle Lane around the back of the pub. The access fronting the barn (including the grass verge at the side of the barn) is 3.7m wide and 4.5m wide at the junction leading to the entrance/exit of the pub. Visibility splays are limited from the archway access. The access fronting the barn is also used by the occupiers of Chalk Farmhouse and the office premises at Chalk Farmhouse.
36. The original submission included a transport report with traffic mitigation measures. The proposed measures included widening the existing access to the barn involving the loss of the grass verges on both sides of the drive and the replacement of the verge adjacent to the barn with a footway surfaced with coloured bit-mac, edged by a low rise kerb. In addition, it was also proposed to add a surface feature of rippled concrete or similar and built out slightly on the area to the west of the arch with cobbles. The Conservation Manager considered that, given that the scale of the traffic movements will be relatively low, the proposed traffic mitigation measures were unnecessary and inappropriate. Any alterations to upgrade or widen the existing driveway would have a significant detrimental impact on the setting of the listed barn and on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
37. Although Honeysuckle Lane has good visibility facing High Street, the width of the access entrance only measures 6.5m for a distance of 4m and the rest of this internal road is 3m wide running to the rear of the pub and leading to the archway adjacent to the barn. Honeysuckle Lane serves 14 dwellings, No 34, Brydges house, Whorwood

House, Blake House, Stanley House, Fidelis (2 flats), Fortis (2 flats), and Nos 27-31 High Street (car parking areas are at the rear of the gardens). It is considered that this lane is substandard as a shared access to the residents. The applicant has confirmed that it owns Honeysuckle Lane and the strip of amenity area adjacent to the car parking of The George Inn. The option of widening the entrance/exit of Honeysuckle Lane adjacent No 31 Brick Road in order to meet the highway requirement to formalise Honeysuckle Lane as a shared access serving the existing dwellings and the proposed guest rooms has been considered. As there is a row of cherry trees along Honeysuckle Lane that form a significant part of the landscape in the area, I do not support the removal of the cherry trees in order to widen the access.

38. As indicated above, traffic mitigation measures to widen the existing access to the barn and an alternative option to widen Honeysuckle Lane as a shared access have been explored; however, they are unacceptable due to the impacts on the historic built environment.
39. I note the objections raised by the residents and the Parish Council relating to highway safety and the intensification of the use of the existing archway and Honeysuckle Lane by additional vehicle movements associated with the proposed guest rooms. However, in view of the lack of objection from the Local Highway Authority and the existing and likely continued low speed of traffic using the archway and Honeysuckle Lane, on balance, I support the application as amended (to withdraw the originally proposed transport mitigation measures to widen the existing driveway to the barn) and to not require the widening of Honeysuckle Lane at its junction with High Street to ensure that the proposal does not detract from the setting of the listed barn and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The impacts on the adjacent office premises at Chalk Farmhouse

40. The office premises at Chalk Farmhouse have 5 windows facing the concrete driveway and the proposed car parking area of the guest rooms. The distance between the cartsheds and the offices is approximately 12m. Given that the existing windows at the office are not serving domestic use, it is considered that the loss of privacy and disturbance does not warrant a refusal.
41. The minimum distance between the edge of the proposed car parking spaces and the office premises is 5.5m which is considered to be just adequate for vehicle manoeuvring.

Recommendation

42. Approval of both application as amended by drawings number RC_A100, RC_A101, RC_A201 and RC_A202 date stamped 25 September 2006 and letter dated 23rd October 2006

Proposed conditions

S/1502/06/LB

1. The works to which this consent relates shall be started not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this decision notice.
(Reason - To ensure the consideration of any future application for works will not be prejudiced by planning and listed building consents that have not been acted upon).
2. The proposed works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plans and specification of works noted thereon, except where modified by the conditions of this consent.

(Reason – To ensure compliance with the approved plans).

3. Before work commences, arrangements shall be made by the applicant to enable the Local Planning Authority (normally the Council's Conservation Officer) to meet the owner or agent and the contractor on site to discuss the conditions of this Consent and the manner of works.
(Reason – For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure the proper control of works).
4. Precise details of the proposed windows and doors to a scale not less than 1:20 shall be submitted for the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority and the work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason – To ensure the use of details appropriate to this listed building).
5. The proposed weatherboarding and all external joinery shall be stained black to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason – To ensure a traditional finish to the external joinery and weatherboards).
6. Any works of repair and replacement, which are agreed on site with the Local Planning Authority, shall precisely match the original to the Local Planning Authority's satisfaction.
(Reason – To ensure that such works are in keeping with the character and appearance of this listed building).
7. Before work commences on site, precise details of the following items shall be submitted for the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - a. The position and details of soil vent pipes, mechanical extracts and flues.
 - b. Details of floor finishes
 - c. Details of the material and method of insulation for the walls and roof.
(Reason – To ensure detailing appropriate to this listed building).
8. The barn roof shall be covered in natural quarried slate to the written approval of the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason – For the avoidance of doubt).
9. No member nor part member of the timber frame nor roof timber shall be removed without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason – To protect the fabric of these listed buildings).
10. All mortars, plasters and render shall be lime rich to specifications submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason – To ensure the use of the appropriate mix of traditional lime plasters and mortars).

S/1503/06/F

1. Standard Condition A – Reason A
2. No power operated machinery shall be operated on the site, during the course of construction, before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00hours 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 – RC 26
3. No demolition, removal of vegetation or development shall be carried out on site between the 1st March and 31st August inclusive in any year, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and a scheme of mitigation is implemented. (Reason - To avoid causing harm to nesting birds that have been

identified as using habitats both within the buildings and the surrounding vegetation to comply with Local Plan 2004, Policy EN13: protected species.)

4. No development shall take place until details of the provisions to be made, and the timing of the works, for nesting birds, particularly barn owls, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason - Local Plan 2004, Policy EN14 encourages the provision of features for protected species within farm buildings. Planning Policy Statement 9, Key Principals ii and v also support the inclusion of appropriate biodiversity features within new developments.)
5. No development shall take place until full details of measures for bat mitigation and conservation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These measures should include:
 - (a) Timing of the works in order to minimise the risk of disturbing hibernating bats (as highlighted in the Barn Owl and Bat Survey by C. Vine, February 2006.
 - (b) Inspection of existing buildings on site within one month prior to their demolition or alteration to determine presence or absence of roosting or hibernating bats,
 - (c) No building containing bats shall be demolished or altered until the bats have been safely excluded using such measures as have been previously submitted to and approved by the Council;
 - (d) Provision prior to demolition or alteration of existing buildings and the commencement of development, of a new bat roost / hibernacula constructed to a design and in a location previously approved by the Council;
 - (e) A statement outlining the advice taken by the applicant from a professional ecologist experienced in working with bats.
The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timing of the works, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority. (Reason – for ecology purposes).

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. Bats are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Habitats Regulations, 1994. This protection covers both the bats themselves and the places that they use for shelter. They can only be disturbed, or their places of shelter interfered with, under a licence issued by Defra. Further information on bats can be found at www.english-nature.org.uk
3. Nesting birds receive protection under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. As such it is an offence to damage or destroy any nest that is in use or is being built; or to take or destroy eggs.
4. The applicant's attention is drawn to the 'General surface water drainage information' issued by the Environment Agency in relation to surface water drainage (<http://www.pipernetworking.com/floodrisk/operational5.html>).

Reasons for Approval

S/1502/06/LB

1. The proposed works would not adversely affect the special character or appearance of the building.
2. The proposed works would not result in any significant loss or harm to the historic fabric.
3. The proposed works would not have an adverse impact on the setting and appearance of the historic building.

S/1503/06/F

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:**
RT10 – Development for Holiday Accommodation
RT12 – Tourist Accommodation within Frameworks
EN13 – Protected Species
EN14 – Protected Species in Farm Buildings
EN26 – The Conversion of Listed Buildings to New Uses
EN28 – Development within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building
EN30 – Development in Conservation Areas
CS5 – Flood Protection
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
 - Privacy and security
 - Noise and disturbance
 - The impact on the character and appearance of the Listed Building and the setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings
 - The impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

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
- Listed Building Files Reference: S/1502/06/LB and S/0494/06/LB
- Planning Files Reference: S/0495/06/F and S/1503/06/F

Contact Officer: Barbara Clarke - Conservation Assistant
Telephone: 01954 713310
Emily Ip – Planning Assistant
Telephone: 01954 713250

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee 6th December 2006
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1902/06/F – HINXTON
**Conversion of Farm Buildings into 6 Dwellings and Erection of Garage Block,
Fences and Gates at Barns at Lordship Farm, Mill Lane
for Lordship Farm Developments Ltd**

Recommendation: Delegated approval/refusal

Date for Determination: 27th November 2006

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee as approval of a departure application is recommended

Conservation Area

Departure Application

Site and Proposal

1. The application relates to a group of agricultural buildings constructed from brick, flint, clunch, render, boarding, corrugated sheeting and pantiles to the east of Lordship Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building. The 0.855 ha site is served by existing accesses onto Mill Lane to the north and High Street to the east. Fields extend to the south. There are residential properties fronting Mill Lane and High Street to the north and east respectively. Work has started on site to convert the buildings to dwellings. The work carried out to date is consistent with the extant permission (S/1801/04/F) and the revised scheme now proposed.
2. This full application, registered on the 2nd October 2006, proposes to convert the existing buildings on the site into 6 dwellings (5no. 5-bedroom and 1no. 6-bedroom). Two buildings that previously stood on the site, an open sided barn and a monopitch roofed flint, clunch and asbestos building, have been demolished. A new building to provide garaging and stores for two of the proposed units in approximately the same position and approximately the same size as the demolished monopitch roofed flint, clunch and asbestos building is proposed. Three of the dwellings would be served from the existing access onto Mill Lane with the remaining three being served by the widening of the existing access onto High Street. Two covered parking spaces are proposed for each unit. The application is accompanied by a Geoenvironmental Assessment Report.

Relevant Planning History

3. A parallel listed building application for the proposed works has been submitted under reference **S/1901/06/LB**.

4. Planning permission and listed building consent for the conversion of farm buildings to 6 dwellings at Barns at Lordship Farm were granted under references **S/1801/04/F** and **S/2191/04/LB**.
5. Earlier planning and listed building applications to convert the buildings into 7 dwellings were withdrawn (**S/0848/04/LB** & **S/0849/04/F**).
6. The District Council confirmed that prior approval for a general purpose agricultural storage building for the Wellcome Trust on land to the north of 131 High Street was not required (**S/2387/02/PNA**).
7. Planning permission was granted for a holiday use of a listed barn adjacent to the site under references **S/0773/93/F** and **S/0774/93/LB** and subsequently renewed in 1998 (**S/1719/98/F** and **S/1836/98/LB**) and 2003 (**S/1952/03/F** and **S/2165/03/LB**).

Planning Policy

8. The site is within the countryside as defined in the Local Plan 2004 and within the Conservation Area. The buildings are curtilage listed.
9. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/2** states that development in the countryside will be resisted unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
10. Local Plan 2004 **Policy SE8** states that residential development outside village frameworks will not be permitted.
11. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P7/6** states that Local Planning Authorities will protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
12. Local Plan 2004 **Policy EN26** relates to the conversion of listed buildings to new uses and states that, in judging applications for the change of use of listed buildings, the District Council will consider whether or not: the existing use can continue with reasonable utility or life expectancy; all other options for less damaging uses have been explored; the proposed use can take place without the necessity of extensive alterations or extensions which would be harmful to the fabric, character or setting of the building; the proposal would harm the setting and amenity of adjacent buildings.
13. Local Plan 2004 **Policy EN28** states that the District Council will refuse applications which dominate a listed building; damage the setting, well-being or attractiveness of a listed building; or would harm the visual relationship between a listed building and its formal or natural landscape surroundings.
14. Local Plan 2004 **Policy EN30** states that the District Council will refuse permission for schemes within conservation areas which do not specify local materials and details and which do not fit in comfortably into their context.
15. **Policy HG/8** of the Local Development Framework Development Control Policies Submission Draft January 2006 relates to the conversion of buildings in the countryside for residential use and states that:

1. Planning permission for conversion of rural buildings for residential use will not generally be permitted. Planning permission will only exceptionally be granted where it can be demonstrated, having regard to market demand or planning considerations: firstly it is inappropriate for any suitable employment use; and secondly it is inappropriate for employment with residential conversion as a subordinate part of a scheme for business re-use.
2. Any conversion must meet the following criteria: The buildings are structurally sound; The buildings are not of a makeshift nature and have not been allowed to fall into such a state of dereliction and disrepair that any reconstruction would require planning permission as a new building; The buildings are capable of re-use without materially changing their existing character or impact upon the surrounding countryside; The form, bulk and general design of the buildings are in keeping with their surroundings; Perform well against sustainability issues.
3. Any increase in floor area will not be permitted except where it is necessary for the benefit of the design, or in order to better integrate the development with its surroundings. Future extensions of such buildings will not be permitted. Incidental uses such as car parking and storage should be accommodated within any group of buildings, or on well related land where landscaping can reduce the visual impact of the new site.
4. Development must be in scale with the rural location. Residential uses must be located close to local services and facilities, and in an accessible location with a choice of means of travel, including non-motorised modes. The cumulative impact of the conversion of a number of buildings on adjoining sites or the local area will also be considered.
5. Residential conversion permitted as a subordinate part of a scheme for business re-use, will be secured by planning condition or agreement to ensure the occupation of the dwelling remains directly related to the operation of the enterprise. The dwelling part of the unit must be interdependently linked with the commercial part. A live-work unit should have a minimum of 40m² of definable functional workspace in addition to the residential element. Internal uses may be horizontally or vertically split. The workspace must be flexible, and capable of accommodating a range of employment uses.

Consultation

16. **Hinxton Parish Council** makes no recommendation and has not expressed comments.
17. **Conservation Manager** states that the scheme is similar to the approved scheme S/1801/04/F and in principle there are no objections to the proposals. However there are concerns about the number and style of the additional openings and the changes in some of the external materials. The number of additional windows and rooflights and the regular appearance of the windows would result in a more domestic appearance and detract from the character and appearance of these former agricultural buildings. A number of other details need to be revised including the glazed screens in Units 1, 2, and 6.

18. With regard to the materials, Unit 1 is constructed from clay bat and is in poor condition following a collapse earlier this year. It is unlikely that the existing material can be salvaged and reused but as this unit forms the boundary with Mill Lane, is sited adjacent to the entrance and is in a prominent location, it is important that the appearance of the building (i.e. rendered walls with pantiled roofs) is retained. It is therefore suggested that the weatherboarding is omitted and, if the clay bat cannot be reused, it is replaced with rendered blockwork.
19. No objection to the proposed garage block, which is traditional in scale, form and materials.
20. No objection to the layout of the access, parking and turning areas, the proposed hard landscaping material or the design of the fences and gates.
21. Recommendation - Approval subject to amendments to omit the rooflights, reduce the number of openings, revise the style of fenestration and glazed screens and change the walling materials on Unit 1.
22. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** recommends conditions relating to: the times during the conversion period when power operated machinery shall not be used unless in accordance with agreed noise restrictions; driven pile foundation; and, having regard to the submitted Geoenvironmental Assessment Report, decommissioning and removal of the above and below ground tanks, notification of any areas of discoloured and/or odorous soil found during conversion and sampling of imported topsoil.
23. At the time of application S/1801/04/F, the **Ecology Officer** visited the site and found no strong evidence of bats but, although he did not consider that it was reasonable to insist upon a full bat survey, he recommended that an informative is attached to any approval in relation to the protected status of bats.
24. At the time of application S/1801/04/F, **Local Highway Authority** considered the existing and resulting levels of use of Mill Lane, and visibility from the existing access onto Mill Lane, and confirmed that the existing access onto Mill Lane is adequate to serve the 3 dwellings proposed to be served from this access. It also confirmed that, provided the first 10m from the High Street was widened to a minimum of 4.5m to allow two vehicles to pass, the existing access onto High Street was also adequate to serve the remaining 3 dwellings as proposed.
25. At the time of application S/1801/04/F, **County Archaeology** stated that, following a detailed consideration of the proposal against its records, it considers it unlikely that advancement of the scheme would result in sufficient ground disturbance to warrant any archaeological works.
26. At the time of application S/1801/04/F, **Cambs Fire & Rescue Service** stated that additional water supplies for firefighting were not required

Representations

27. The Cambridge Preservation Society states that the site is in close proximity to its Hinxton Mill and makes the following comments: in the case of unit 2, the Society regrets that provision has not been made for the retention in some

form of the cast-iron windows; and the outer wall of Unit 1 should have its outer wall reconstructed in the original material i.e. sun-dried clay lump with a coating of limewash.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

28. The key issues in relation to the proposal are:
- a. Whether there are any material considerations to set aside the presumption set out in Local Plan Policy SE8 against residential development in the countryside;
 - b. The affect of the development on the character and historic interest of these curtilage listed buildings, the setting of listed buildings at Lordship Farm and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
 - c. Impact on amenity of neighbours; and
 - d. Highway/access matters
29. The buildings are curtilage listed and are of historical interest. Members may recall that, at the time of application S/1801/04/F, it was demonstrated that the buildings no longer met current standards and were no longer required for agricultural purposes. The possibility of using the buildings for employment purposes and incorporating studios/work units into each of the units were also explored at that time, but both options were considered inappropriate due to the resulting harm on the character, appearance and setting of the buildings. An employment use would require significant widening of the access onto High Street and the removal of a large section of the important frontage wall along the west side of High Street in order to provide adequate visibility in view of the number of vehicular movements likely to be generated. It was also demonstrated that a holiday let use of the buildings would not be viable. The buildings are adjacent to the village framework and the proposal is considered to comply with LDF Policy HG/8. Notwithstanding the presumption set out in Local Plan Policy SE8 against residential development in the countryside, the principle of converting the buildings to residential purposes was considered appropriate at the time of application S/1804/04/F in order to secure a suitable new use for these curtilage listed buildings and thereby secure their future, and I consider that this remains the case.
30. The scheme subject of this application differs from the one approved under reference S/1801/04/F in two main ways: revisions to the internal layout of the units and their fenestration, including the insertion of additional openings, are proposed; and a new building to provide garaging and stores for two of the proposed units is proposed in approximately the same position and of approximately the same size as the monopitch roofed flint, clunch and asbestos building that previously stood on the site and which was to provide garaging and storage for one of the units as part of the previous scheme. As submitted, due to the number of additional windows and rooflights and the regular appearance of the windows in the converted buildings, the proposal would result in a more domestic appearance and would thereby detract from the character and appearance of these former agricultural buildings. The Conservation Manager also considers that a number of other details also need to be revised, including the glazed screens in Units 1, 2, and 6. He has contacted the agent with a view to obtaining amendments to address his concerns. The erection of a new garage block, which is traditional in scale, form and materials and would complement the buildings to be converted, is considered to be acceptable.

31. Subject to confirmation of the sill height above first floor finished floor level of Unit 2's Bed 4 and Bed 5 windows – which was clarified as being 1600mm at the time of the previous application (S/1801/04/F) in order to avoid overlooking of properties on the opposite side of Mill Lane – I am satisfied that the development would not seriously harm the amenity of neighbours.
32. As is the case for the scheme approved under reference S/1801/04/F, 3 of the units would be served off Mill Lane and 3 off an improved access onto High Street. Two covered parking spaces are proposed for each unit.
33. Application S/1801/04/F was subject to a S.106 Agreement covering the provision of land off Duxford Road for affordable housing or the payment of a commuted sum in lieu of the provision of affordable housing on-site. The provision of the land off Duxford Road was a possibility at that time as the Wellcome Trust, the applicant at that time, also owned the land off Duxford Road. The Wellcome Trust is no longer the applicant or owner of the application site. Any permission should therefore be subject to a S.106 Agreement requiring the payment of a commuted sum.
34. The previous permission was accompanied by a Structural Appraisal of the buildings which detailed the repair works required to each building. No such information has been submitted as part of this application. Given the proposed changes and the collapse of part of the building to be converted into Unit 1 since that appraisal, it is considered that any permission should be subject to a condition requiring the agreement of a schedule of proposed works detailing all those elements of the buildings involved in the conversion to be repaired, replaced, renewed, rebuilt or newly constructed. This would enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the extent of rebuilding.
35. If amended along the lines recommended by the Conservation Manager, I do not consider that the proposal would seriously prejudice the implementation of the development plan. I do not therefore consider that it would be necessary to refer the application to the Secretary of State should Members be minded to support it subject to the receipt of amended plans to address the concerns of the Conservation Manager.

Recommendation

36. Delegated approval, subject to the prior signing of a S.106 Agreement requiring the payment of a commuted sum in lieu of the provision of affordable housing on-site, if amended plans addressing the comments of the Conservation Manager are received and subject to clarification of the sill height of Unit 2's Bed 4 and Bed 5 windows / delegated refusal if amended plans addressing the comments of the Conservation Manager are not received on the grounds that the proposed additional openings are unnecessary and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of these curtilage listed buildings.

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 Development Control Policies Submission Draft January 2006

- Planning file refs: S/1902/06/F, S/1901/06/LB, S/1801/04/F, S/2191/04/LB, S/0849/04/F, S/0848/04/LB, S/2165/03/LB, S/1952/03/F, S/2387/02/PNA, S/1836/98/LB, S/1719/98/F, S/0774/93/LB and S/0773/93/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1839/06/F – GREAT SHELFORD
Erection of a Single Storey Building to Accommodate the
Cambridge Cancer Help Centre at Scotsdale Garden Centre, 120 Cambridge Road
for D Rayner

Recommendation: Refusal

Date for Determination: 20th November 2006

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination at Councillor Nightingale's request, he considers there to be a disagreement over the siting in the green belt and location of green belt.

Members will visit this site on Monday 4th December 2006.

Departure Application**Site and Proposal**

1. The application relates to 52m x 28m area of land comprising part of the grassed/landscaped area at the front of the garden centre, part of the rear garden of the dwelling at No.132 Cambridge Road and the overgrown area to the rear of the cycle shop at No.134. There are currently a number of storage sheds in the garden of No.132. There are a number of trees within and adjoining the site including an area of trees alongside the car park. The site is bounded by the garden centre car park to the northeast, the remainder of the grassed/landscaped area at the front of the garden centre including 'The Trustline Garden' to the southeast and southwest and the rear garden of No.136 Cambridge Road to the northwest.
2. This full application, registered on the 25th September 2006 and amended by letter dated 8th November 2006, proposes the erection of a 2.6m high to eaves, 6.5m high building to provide 3no. therapy rooms, a relaxation area, a social/meeting place and office to be used by the Cambridge Cancer Help Centre. The building design is based on two linked pyramid roof elements, one measuring 14.4m x 14.4m and the other measuring 15m x 15m. The building would be faced with rendered blockwork or pre-formed insulated panels with colour features and would have a copper sheathed roof with glazing panels and solar panels. It is proposed that the garden centre car park would be used by those visiting the centre. Part of the area of trees alongside the car park would be removed. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement and an Automatic Traffic count for the Garden Centre, June 2004.

Planning History

3. There have been a number of applications for development at the Garden Centre. Of particular note is the 5 year temporary planning permission for the ornamental display garden and erection of log cabin on the part of the grassed/landscaped area at the front of the garden centre to the southeast of the application site which was granted in October 2005 under planning reference **S/1529/05/F**.

Planning Policy

4. Approximately half of the proposed building would be within the village framework and half in the countryside and Green Belt.
5. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/2** states that development in the countryside will be resisted unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
6. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P9/2a** states that within the Green Belt, new development, including change of use, will be limited to that required for agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport, cemeteries, or other uses appropriate to a rural area.
7. Local Plan 2004 **Policy GB2** states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.
8. Local Plan 2004 **Policy EN3** states that, in those cases where new development is permitted in the countryside, the Council will require that (a) the scale, design and layout of the scheme (b) the materials used within it, and (c) the landscaping works are all appropriate to the particular 'Landscape Character Area', and reinforce local distinctiveness wherever possible.
9. The **Great Shelford Village Design Statement 2004**, adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance, refers to the importance of preserving glimpses of the countryside from inside the village. Paragraph 4.1 of the Landscape section states: "The sense of enclosure makes the glimpses of countryside from inside the village of great importance. Much of the rural and agricultural landscape is hidden by buildings. So the gaps between them and those places where fields abut the road, are very important. They keep the link between village and surrounding countryside." Additionally, paragraph 8.2 of the Character Areas section states, in describing the character of Cambridge Road, that the generous verges and trees give a valued green aspect to the road, as do the views between development into the rural setting beyond to east and west. The open space at the front of Scotsdales is identified in the map accompanying the design statement as an important viewpoint.

Consultations

10. **Great Shelford Parish Council** makes no recommendation stating:

"We have no objection to the siting of a building to be used as a meeting and therapy centre for cancer sufferers and their relatives on the Scotsdales site in general. We are appreciative of the contribution made by Mr Rayner to ensure the continued existence of such a centre which is obviously greatly valued by its users as evidenced by the many supporting letters the Parish Council has received

We can understand why the applicant has chosen the proposed site in that it partly lies within the village envelope and partly in the green belt and may not face the same planning hurdles as a site located entirely within the green belt (such as the southern corner of the site).

We do have some concerns about the location. It has been identified as an important viewpoint in the Village Design Statement where visual links with the landscape should be preserved. The Parish Council opposed the siting of the cabin for those reasons but was happy with a time limited permission as the cabin was for charitable purposes. The proposed building will be permanent and we have to be satisfied the siting and design will not have an adverse impact on the green belt.

Design

We are not satisfied the design is of sufficient quality for this important location in terms of size, detail, materials and sustainability. Maggie's Cancer Centres have been designed by renowned architects to create a feeling of wellbeing in the patients. One is due to be built in Cambridge. Whilst not wishing to delay the centre at Scotsdales it would seem to be a worthwhile scheme in which local architects may wish to be involved to create a landmark building which has all the attributes of the Maggie Centres.

Siting

The building although partly obscured by trees would be somewhat intrusive. Could it be moved further NE so it would impact less on the open frontage to Scotsdales?

Parking

No additional provision has been made for parking. This is probably acceptable for the 15 extra cars a day but if the centre was used for conferences at the weekend this could create parking problems".

11. **Trees & Landscape Officer** Has no objections.
12. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** recommends that any permission is subject to a condition relating to the times when power operated machinery shall not be operated during the construction period except in accordance with agreed noise restrictions.

Representations

13. A letter from the Cambridge Cancer Help Centre states that: the Centre has the policy of providing a venue for other local groups who give help and support to those in the community affected by serious illness including a self help group for people who have suffered strokes at a young age, the multiple myeloma group and a local ME group; a new facility at Scotsdale would enable them to extend their opening hours and provide a meeting place for other community groups; the existing church hall is no longer adequate in its size and layout to accommodate the number of complementary therapy sessions it now seeks to provide; and the tranquillity of the Scotsdale site, the ample parking and location not far out of Cambridge with easy access to major route ways to the county and the nearby Trumpington Park & Ride are of particular importance.
14. In addition, 42 letters of support have been received. Most compliment the support and assistance provided to patients and their carers, family and friends at the Centre rather than necessarily suggesting that this site is appropriate although the following points have been made with respect to the suitability of the Scotsdale site:

- (a) The tranquil setting, atmosphere and surroundings;
- (b) Ample parking;
- (c) Its convenient location being not far out of Cambridge and close to the Trumpington Park & Ride Site;
- (d) The opportunity to have a permanent, purpose-built building;
- (e) The Centre has been searching, without success to date, for alternative accommodation for three years;
- (f) The building would be built on what is a rather 'brown' fragment of the Green Belt and would not infringe the integrity of the Green Belt, and the true purpose of the Green Belt is to promote and enhance the well-being of the local community which is precisely what the new building would achieve; and
- (g) The design of the building is pleasing.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

15. The key issues in relation to this application are: whether the applicant has advanced any very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the countryside and Green Belt; the impact of the development on the openness and rural character of the Green Belt and countryside; and parking provision.
16. The Cambridge Cancer Help Centre currently operates out of a church hall at 1A Stockwell Street, Cambridge but needs to find alternative accommodation as the landlord, the Mill Road Baptist Church, proposes to redevelop the site, but also because the existing church hall is no longer adequate in its size and layout to accommodate the number of complementary therapy sessions it now seeks to provide. Information submitted as part of the application shows that since October 2003 they have been looking, without success to date, for alternative accommodation. It states that numerous properties have been considered including the 21 properties described in the list submitted as part of the application.
17. Officers recognise the invaluable support and assistance provided to those with cancer and their carers, family and friends provided at the Cambridge Cancer Help Centre. However, as approximately half of the proposed building is outside the village framework and within the countryside and Green Belt, the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The circumstances advanced to justify such development is that since October 2003 the centre have been looking, without success to date, for alternative accommodation. Given the importance of protecting the Green Belt and as the proposed use does not require a countryside location, I do not consider that this amounts to the very special circumstances required to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As well as therefore being, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt by virtue of constituting inappropriate development, by virtue of its siting, size and height, the proposed building and the loss of trees alongside the car park would also detract from the openness and rural character of the Green Belt. The development would also encroach into the open space at the front of Scotsdale which the Village Design Statement identifies as an important viewpoint into the rural setting beyond which gives a valued green aspect to the road.
18. The use of Scotsdale's car park by visitors to the centre, and thereby not requiring any additional parking with the consequent impact on the character of the area, is considered to be acceptable.
19. The houses most directly affected by the development, Nos. 132 and 136 Cambridge Road, are owned by the applicant. At its closest, the proposed building would be

some 18.5 metres from the rear of the dwelling at no. 132. The development is not considered to seriously harm the amenity of any neighbours.

20. With regard to the Parish Council's comments about parking for conferences, the applicant has confirmed by letter that the 'conference area' shown on the plans would be a social/meeting place and not a conference area.
21. If a scheme wholly within the framework and which therefore would not encroach into the open space at the front of Scotsdale and which could be shown not to seriously harm any neighbours was proposed, I would happily support it. This is likely to involve a resited, smaller and particularly lower building than proposed. However, as the proposal involves new build and the loss of trees within the Green Belt and encroachment into the open space at the front of Scotsdale, this application is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

22. Refusal (as amended by letter dated 8th November 2006 which clarifies that the 'conference area' shown on the plans would be a social/meeting place and not a conference area)
 1. The Local Planning Authority recognises the invaluable support and assistance provided to those with cancer and their carers, family and friends provided at the Cambridge Cancer Help Centre. However, as approximately half of the proposed building is outside the village framework and within the countryside and Green Belt, the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposed use does not require a countryside location and no very special circumstances have been demonstrated to justify such development in the Green Belt. As well as therefore being, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt by virtue of constituting inappropriate development, by virtue of its siting, size and height, the proposed building and the loss of trees alongside the car park would also detract from the openness and rural character of the Green Belt and countryside.
 2. The proposal is therefore contrary to: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 Policy P9/2a which states that within the Green Belt, new development, including change of use, will be limited to that required for agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport, cemeteries, or other uses appropriate to a rural area; South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 Policy GB2 which states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated; Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 Policy P1/2 which states that development in the countryside will be resisted unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location; and the Great Shelford Village Design Statement 2004 which identifies the open space at the front of Scotsdale as an important viewpoint into the rural setting beyond which gives a valued green aspect to the road.

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/1839/06/F and S/1529/05/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/2061/06/F – GREAT SHELFORD**Bungalow and Vehicular Access – Land Adjacent to 1 Davey Crescent for Mr Newman****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 20th December 2006****Notes:**

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the Officer recommendation is likely to be contrary to the Parish Council recommendation.

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is a 0.036 hectare plot of land sited on the east side of Cambridge Road adjacent to its junction with Davey Crescent. The site forms part of the garden area of No.1 Davey Crescent, a two storey semi detached house located to the east whilst, to the north, are bungalows and a garage block sited within Bridge Close.
2. The full application, submitted on 25th October 2006, seeks to erect a 2-bedroom bungalow on the site. The bungalow would incorporate a pyramid style roof and stand a total of 4.8 metres high. It would face Cambridge Road onto which it is proposed to create a new vehicular access. The density of the development equates to 27.8 dwellings/hectare.

Planning History

3. Members may recall that an application for a bungalow and new vehicular access on this site was refused after consideration at the Committee meeting in September 2006 for the following reasons (ref: S/1443/06/F):
 - a. The proposed development only makes provision for one off-street parking space and includes a very constrained manoeuvring/turning area. As the proposal does not provide adequate space for two cars to park and turn within the site it would be likely to result in vehicles either parking within the turning space or on-street, and to result in vehicles reversing onto Cambridge Road, both of which would be detrimental to highway safety close to the junction of this 'A' class road and Davey Crescent.
 - b. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed development would result in No.1 Davey Crescent relinquishing any opportunity to ever have on-site parking. The application makes no provision to provide off-street parking for No.1 Davey Crescent and could therefore compound existing on-street parking problems within Davey Crescent, near to its junction with Cambridge Road, with consequent highway safety problems.

Planning Policy

4. Great Shelford is designated within the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 as a Rural Growth Settlement where **Policy SE2** states residential development will be permitted providing, amongst other matters, the development would be sensitive to the character of the village and the amenities of neighbours.
5. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 stresses the need for a high standard of design and a sense of place which corresponds to the local character of the built environment.

Consultation

6. The comments of **Great Shelford Parish Council** will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting. The Parish Council objected to the previous application on the grounds of overdevelopment, the design of the bungalow being out of keeping with the character of the area, and the new access being detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety.
7. The comments of the **Local Highways Authority** will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.
8. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** raised no objections in principle in respect of the previous application, although did express concerns 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

9. A letter has been received from the occupiers of No.1 Davey Crescent who fully support the application. No comments have been received from Nos. 2 and 6 Bridge Close who did express concerns about the previous application on the following grounds:
 - a. Loss of light to No.2 Bridge Close's kitchen window;
 - b. Obstruction of right of way to adjacent garage block serving Nos. 2, 4 and 6 Bridge Close;
 - c. Loss of light to windows in south elevation of adjacent garage block;
 - d. Any vehicular access should be taken from the main road and not from Davey Crescent.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

10. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:
 - a. Impact upon character and appearance of the area;
 - b. Residential amenity;
 - c. Highway safety

Visual impact

11. In the previous application, the Parish Council raised concerns about the impact of the development upon the character of the area but, when considered at Committee, the application was deemed to be acceptable in this respect. The design of the

bungalow is the same as that previously proposed but it has been sited closer to the north-western boundary of the site in order to provide more space for parking and turning on the south-eastern side of the dwelling.

12. The site lies between a two storey house to the east, a flat-roofed garage block to the north-west and a bungalow to the north. Whilst the bungalow would be sited closer to Cambridge Road than the properties within Bridge Close, it would not come forward of a line drawn between the adjacent corners of No.1 Davey Crescent and the garage block and, given the small scale of the bungalow, would not be an unduly intrusive feature in the street scene.

Residential amenity

13. The proposed bungalow incorporates a pyramid style roof, ensuring that the roof is hipped away from the adjoining properties at No.1 Davey Crescent and No.2 Bridge Close. I am satisfied that the bungalow would not result in an undue loss of light to the No.2 Bridge Close's kitchen area which is served by windows in its front (south-west) and side (south-east) elevations. I also consider the proposed bungalow, in being angled away from No.1 Davey Crescent, would not result in an undue loss of light/outlook to this property.
14. The bungalow, being sited within 3 metres of the south-east elevation of the adjacent garage block serving Nos. 2, 4 and 6 Bridge Close, would undoubtedly cut out light to windows in this elevation. However, given that this building is used for garage/storage purposes rather than as habitable accommodation, a refusal on the grounds of loss of light to these windows could not be substantiated.
15. The current application proposes the provision of parking and turning on the south-east side of the dwelling, adjacent to the side elevation of No.1 Davey Crescent within which there are a number of windows including the sole window to the kitchen. The occupiers of this property are fully supportive of the application and I am satisfied that they would not suffer undue noise and disturbance from the parking/turning area.

Highway safety

16. The previous application was refused solely on highway safety grounds and this is therefore the principal issue to consider as part of this application. The previous scheme only included realistic parking for one vehicle and no practical turning space, and also made no provision for off-street parking for No.1 Davey Crescent.
17. The current application proposes to site two parking spaces and a turning area on the south-east side of the property, whilst the proposed new vehicular access would be positioned in the centre of the plot rather than towards its western end as previously proposed. The application also proposes to create 1 off-street parking space within the front garden of the existing dwelling. I am awaiting the comments of the Local Highways Authority in respect of whether the current application overcomes the reasons for refusal of the previous application.

Other issues

18. The proposed bungalow is sited sufficiently far from the side elevation of the adjacent garage block serving Nos. 2, 4 and 6 Bridge Close to avoid obstructing access to this garage for maintenance purposes (this concern was raised in respect of the previous application). Whilst this is strictly not a material planning consideration, the applicants should be made aware of this requirement as it would prevent the erection

of any means of boundary treatment along the adjacent section of the north-western boundary.

Recommendation

19. Providing no objections are received from the Local Highways Authority, approval:
1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason -A);
 2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5a);
 4. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
 4. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
 5. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment (Rc60);
 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 with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions (Reason – To minimise noise disturbance to adjoining residents)
- + any conditions required by the Local Highways Authority

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:** 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;
 - Visual impact on the locality;
 - Highway safety.

General

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

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

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning File Ref: S/2061/06/F and S/1443/06/F.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1857/06/F - WILLINGHAM**4 Gypsy Mobile Homes, 4 Transit Caravans and 3 Toilet Blocks
(Renewal of Planning Permission) at Fox's Meadow, Priest Lane for Mr B Coates.****Recommendation: Temporary Approval****Date for Determination: 23rd November 2006**

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the recommendation of Willingham Parish Council does not accord with the officer recommendation.

Site and Proposal

1. Priest Lane is an area of generally flat agricultural Fen land with few hedges beyond the eastern fringe of Willingham. From its junction with Church Street and Rockmill End to the west, Priest Lane has a width of 5 metres for a distance of some 150 metres. Thereafter it narrows to single-track width with one passing space close to the site. The application site itself is a rectangular plot measuring 50 by, on average, 60 metres.
2. At the time of the site inspection by the case officer, the site contained 3 mobile homes and 4 caravans, and toilet blocks. There are various stables and hay store buildings adjoining to the south of the site. The site has a tidy appearance and is bounded on all sides with mature hedging and fencing.
3. The application, received 28th September 2006, proposes use of land for the siting of 4 mobile homes, 3 toilet blocks and 4 transit caravans. The applicant is applying for a new planning permission to be granted that is not limited for a temporary period nor that is tied to him personally by condition. A supporting statement indicates that Mr Coates offers space on the site for temporary periods to his daughter and son-in-law, his grandson, and his two nephews, all of whom are road workers. The applicant (who is aged in his sixties) would like to be sure that, in the event of his demise, his daughter would be able to continue to offer the family accommodation on this land. He states that the previous owner, Mr S Chapman, lived on the site in a mobile home in the late 1980's. He then applied for planning permission for a working skip yard, which was granted. Since buying the site, Mr Coates states that it has improved in all aspects.

Planning History

4. Temporary planning permission was granted on a personal basis to Mr Coates for this development on 4th February 2003 (**S/2416/02/F**). Condition 1 of the consent requires the mobile homes, transit caravans and toilet blocks to be removed from the site on or before 31st December 2006. The applicant and his relatives were described as a gypsy family well known in Willingham who had historically provided local farms and fruit growers with seasonal labour. The family consisted of Bill Coates, his wife,

mother and father-in-law, daughter, sister-in-law and her two sons. Willingham Parish Council, by consultation response dated 6th January 2003, recommended approval of this application, subject to it being for a temporary period and made personal to the applicant.

5. Previously, planning permission was granted by Cambridgeshire County Council for a waste transfer station (**S/0674/98/F**). The permission was granted in 1999 for a three-year period.

Planning Policy

6. The relevant Development Plan comprises the approved Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
7. **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.
8. **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.
9. **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.
10. **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.
11. **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.
12. **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:
 - (a) The site is reasonably located for schools, shops and other local services.
 - (b) The site would have minimal impact on the amenities of existing local residents and adjoining land uses; concentration of sites will be avoided.
 - (c) 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.
 - (d) The site can be satisfactorily assimilated into its surroundings by existing or proposed landscaping; an approved landscaping scheme will be required.
 - (e) The use of the site would not give rise to unacceptable parking, highway access or service provision problems.

- (f) The site would not adversely affect any buildings of historic or archaeological importance, or sites of wildlife or nature conservation value.
 - (g) 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.
 - (h) The site has adequate infrastructural connections to local services including water supply.
 - (i) The use would not detract from convenient, safe and enjoyable use of a public right of way.
13. Also relevant is **Circular 01/2006 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.
14. 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.
15. 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

16. Consultants CDN Planning began working on this project in April 2006. The first draft Issues and Options 1 was available for public consultation until 24 November 2006. 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.

Consultation

17. **Willingham Parish Council:** Willingham Parish Council recommends refusal. The Parish Council states:

“Willingham Parish Council is conscious of the efforts being made by SCDC to improve relationships and facilities for the traveller population, and is happy to co-operate with this initiative.

Unfortunately, WPC finds itself already having to cater for a hugely disproportionate number of traveller families in relation to the settled population, the ratio in Willingham being one of the highest of both approved and illegal sites. The levels are such that the infrastructure within the village is struggling to cope.

On this basis, WPC has reluctantly found it impossible to sanction any more sites irrespective of individual merit. WPC believes that this issue will only be resolved when SCDC finds a way of spreading the load, setting realistic targets and taking action to remove illegal sites. Until this action is taken WPC must be consistent, and has no choice other than to reject all mobile home applications.”

18. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – “The applicant should be able to demonstrate how it is proposed to comply with the conditions associated with permanent residential sites. He is interested to know how it is proposed to maintain a separation distance of 6 metres from any other caravan”.
19. **Travellers Liaison Officer** – To date, the Travellers Officer has only limited knowledge of the applicant, however he notes that the site is always very neat and tidy.
20. **Environment Agency** - The site lies within the Old West Drainage Board's area and the Board's byelaws apply. The Agency has made comments for the applicant's attention, as in the consultation under S/2416/02/F. No objections are raised.
21. **Old West Internal Drainage Board** – No objection in principle. The Board wishes the applicant's attention to be drawn to the requirement to keep the frontage ditch clean and free-flowing.
22. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** – Additional supplies for fire fighting are not required.

Representations

23. Six letters of **support** have been submitted with the application from local farmers and businesses, including Councillor Ray Manning. The writers pay testament to Mr Coates' good character and the tidiness of the site in his ownership.
24. The Occupier, 2 Mulberry Close, Cambridge - The writer has shared ownership of the adjoining land at 14, Priests Lane. He is in support for the proposal provided that the application is for a continuation of the existing facilities on the site, but not for additional vans. Mr Coates has proved to be a reasonable neighbour.
25. The Occupier, 8 Priest Lane, Willingham – The writer considers that it would be detrimental to allow further expansion in view of the past problems in the Council traveller site in Meadow Road and in view that no problems have occurred in this small family unit at Fox's Meadow.
26. The Occupier, 15 Priest Lane, Willingham – Objection. Priest Lane is not suitable for existing, let alone increased traffic. Before the existing camp, there were about 10 vehicles a day. Now there are upwards of 200 cars/ vans day and night. The Lane is frequently used by the elderly and dog walkers, which is increasingly becoming more

difficult with speeding vehicles. There has been general pollution of the environment with rubbish thrown from vehicles. It would seem that the Planning Authority has a complete disregard for the properties in Cottenham and wishes to include that in Willingham as well.

27. The Occupier, 16 Priest Lane, Willingham - If this application is granted would there be more applications to follow? This new application would give more traffic in Priest Lane.
28. The Occupier, 25 Wilford Furlong, Willingham – No objection provided that the permission is limited to Mr Coates and his immediate family; that the permission is for another three-year period only; the consent should not be capable of being taken up by another future owner; that passing spaces should be provided due to increase of speeding traffic.

Equal Opportunities Implications

29. In line with general and specific statutory duties under the Race Relations Act 1976 and Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, the Council operates a Race Equality Scheme (RES). This was last revised and agreed by the Council in July 2006, with an update of the 2005 - 2008 action plan.
 - (a) The Council is committed to treating everyone fairly and justly, whatever their race or background.
 - (b) The Scheme gives priority to actions relating to Travellers as the biggest ethnic minority in the district (around 1.0% of the district's population).
 - (c) Planning is identified as being amongst the services most relevant to promoting race equality.
 - (d) The lead Cabinet Member for Race Equality, Councillor Edwards, is establishing an RES Member Working Group. This will highlight to the Cabinet and GTDPD Member Reference Group findings and recommendations from ODPM Circular 1/2006 and the Commission for Race Equality's "Common Ground" report, which may be appropriate to the Council's strategic approach to Traveller issues and the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

30. The majority of responses to the application have been favourable and the concerns which have been expressed, including those of the Parish Council, have not been specific to the operation of this site.
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. Officers have met with the Parish Council to discuss their general concerns and it was agreed that the Council would look at obtaining "hotspot" pre-emptive injunctions in Willingham to minimise additional sites in advance of the Development Plan Document.
32. I recommend the restriction of the permission to Mr Coates personally be lifted, as I consider that a limitation to occupation by genuine gypsies and travellers only would

be more in accordance with the objectives of Government policy and SCLP Policy HG23.

Recommendation

1. The use hereby permitted shall be discontinued and the mobile homes, transit caravans and toilet blocks hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition on or before 31st December 2009 in accordance with a scheme of work submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - In order that the impact of the use of the site on the countryside can be assessed).
2. This permission does not authorise use of the land as a caravan site by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers as defined in Paragraph 15 of ODPM Circular No.01/2006 'Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites'.
(Reason - Occupation by other persons would not amount special circumstances for permitting development in this location.)
3. The residential use hereby permitted shall be restricted to the stationing of no more than eight caravans at any time (of which no more than four may be static caravans or mobile homes).
(Reason - To minimise the impact of the development on the surrounding area.)

Informatives

Comments of Old West Internal Drainage Board - the applicant's attention is drawn to the requirement to keep the frontage ditch clean and free flowing.

Comments of the Environment Agency.

Comments of 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)
P5/4 (Meeting Locally Identified Housing Needs)
P7/4 (Landscape)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
SE8 (Village Frameworks)
EN1 (Landscape Character Areas)
HG23 (Gypsies and Travelling Show people)
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
 - Impact upon the facilities and services in adjacent settlements

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 01/2006
- Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment 2006
- Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document.
- Planning Files ref: S/1857/06/F; S/2416/02/F

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/2102/06/CC - WILLINGHAM**Variation of Condition 2 of Planning Permission S/1437/89 to allow
Alternative Layout and Alternative Number of Pitches at Site
Willingham Travellers Site, Meadow Road for Cambridgeshire County Council****Recommendation: No Objection****Date for Response: 10th December 2006**

This Consultation has been reported to the Planning Committee for consideration because of current concerns being expressed by Willingham Parish Council towards traveller-related proposals in its Parish.

Site and Proposal

1. This is an application for deemed planning permission that has been submitted by Cambridgeshire County Council to itself for determination under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations. The comments of this Council are sought as a consultee.
2. The proposal relates to part of a site with extant deemed planning permission for a 15-pitch long-stay travellers site. The site, which is now vacant and in a state of dereliction, is located approximately 1 kilometre to the east of the village along Meadow Road. This is a single-track metalled road with occasional passing spaces.
3. The entrance to the site is at present sealed off by a 1.5m-high earth bund. Engineering works are proposed to open up this entrance area of the site, covering an area of 70 m x 30m approximately, so as to provide space for one gypsy caravan to be accommodated. Bunding is to be re-sited along the boundaries of this area, and additional landscaping planted. The dilapidated single-storey buildings on the remainder of the traveller's site are to be demolished in the interests of public safety. Vehicular access is to be retained to the grazing area to the south for agricultural vehicles.
4. The facility is to be operated as an Emergency Stopping Place, as described in the statement at [Appendix 1](#).
5. The County Council has stated that, if the family need elapses and they are not occupying the local byways, then a decision as to re-instating the bunds will be made between the Local Authorities and the local residents and parishioners nearer the time when the situation can be assessed. If the site is not to be used, it will be fully protected with bunds as they are presently, i.e. blocking use of the entire area.

Personal Circumstances

6. Although the County Council is seeking a consent that runs with the land, the proposal has come forward in response to the needs of a particular travelling family.

The family in question would be recognised under the Race Relations (Amended) Act 2000 as being of Gypsy Traveller status. The family may also be referred to as Romany Gypsy in ethnic monitoring processes. Visiting family members are frequently present at but do not live on site.

7. This is a transient family in which members do travel seasonally. They are finding that they have fewer and fewer unauthorised locations to resort to during term time in the local area.
8. The head of the family has worked for local parishioners during the 1960s. He has been in the area all his child and adult life. His parents had been residing in the area for 35 years before the current head of the family was born. Local Authorities and other Traveller families know the family to be local. The family is both local, and has local roots going back generations. Their history is well known.

Planning History

9. Deemed planning permission was granted by the County Council on 12th January 1990 for the establishment of a 15-pitch long-stay travellers site (**S/1437/89**). The permission included amenity blocks, wardens office and sewage treatment plant. Condition 2 of the consent required the submission for approval of a variety of detailed matters, including the location of the 15 pitches. Consent for these matters was issued subsequently.

Planning Policy

10. The relevant Development Plan comprises the approved Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
11. **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.
12. **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.
13. **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.
14. **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.
15. **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.
16. **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.
17. Also relevant is **Circular 01/2006 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.
18. 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.
- Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document**
19. Consultants CDN Planning began working on this project in April 2006. The first draft Issues and Options 1 was available for public consultation until 24 November 2006. 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

20. Consultations for this application are being carried out by the County Planning Authority. In response to other planning applications, Willingham Parish Council has indicated its concern about all traveller-related proposals in its Parish at the present time.

Representations

21. Any representations are required to be sent to the County Planning Authority.

Planning Comments

22. The previous use of the site for the accommodation of gypsies ceased some time ago. However the use has not been abandoned in planning legal terms and it could be resumed under planning permission S/1437/89 at any time without planning permission until such time as another superseded that planning permission. Taking this into account, I believe the Council cannot reasonably object to the use of part of the site for residential purposes by Travellers.
23. The site has a degree of screening on its external boundaries, but this could be strengthened. The formation of additional earth bunding will also add to the screening of the site. I consider that, subject to additional landscape planting, the details of the proposed engineering works and changes to the planting on the front of the site are acceptable.

Recommendation

24. That no objections be raised to the proposal, subject to additional landscape planting being carried out.

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 01/2006
- Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment 2006
- Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document.
- Planning Files ref: S/2102/06/CC, S/1473/89.

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

APPENDIX 1

S/2102/06/CC

Design X Access Statement

My Ref: 061024 W.ESP supp_av095

Your Ref:

Date: 24th October 2006

Case ask for: Jess Miller

Direct Dial No: (01223) 717423

Fax No:

E-mail: Jessica.miller@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

S 2 1 0 2 0 6 CC

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL GROUP
APPLICATION VALIDATED

06 NOV 2006

ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT
CAMBS COUNTY COUNCIL

Andrew Rowson

Property and Asset

Box RES 1321

Shire Hall

Cambridge

CB3 0AP

DX 137870 CAMBRIDGE

Cambs County Council
RECEIVED
30 OCT 2006
County Development Minerals
& Waste Group
Office of Environment & Community Services

Form CM/cc/1 (June 2006) Application Form
Section 11 Supporting Statement
Willingham Emergency Stopping Place

The Emergency Stopping Place (ESP) is being proposed simply in order to relieve the local rights of way and verges from unauthorised encampments, whilst the District are not yet able themselves to offer an alternative. The ESP is being designed with a local family in mind and is not intended to provide for any more Travellers than are already in the area. The intended effect is that local residents experience fewer encampments, and that this Traveller family can reside somewhere legitimately and in partnership with the authorities for a temporary period.

The ESP area would be occupied on a temporary basis, according to existing local need and appropriateness, and not set out a minimum or maximum stay. Therefore, the time frames for encampments on the ESP are likely to be similar to those of encampments already on the byways, i.e. anything from 2 weeks to a couple of months at a time. If the family there keep the area well and residents are happy for them to stay longer, this can be arranged.

The one-family site will be managed as an unauthorised encampment is managed, and will be managed by the County Council in partnership with the District and in close consultation with local residents. [This is a completely separate arrangement from the previous use of the area as a residential site for 15 families, managed by South Cambridgeshire District Council, many years ago. County have no plans to re-open the site on that basis.]

If the encampment causes disproportionate disruption, then the County would remove the Travellers' permission for the stay and treat their encampment like any other unauthorised encampment on county land. Notice to vacate can be served within 24hrs. Failure to vacate by the date stated in the notice would lead to possession proceedings being brought in the County Court in accordance with the Council's current practices and procedures. The length of the possession proceedings will differ and range from being a matter of 5 days - 14 days + depending on County Court availability. The site would then be fully protected when not in use. The site already has a valid planning permission as a Traveller's site and this is its established use. This planning application would reduce the site from a layout for 15 pitches to a layout for 1 pitch and for 1 family.

Signed *J Miller* 24/10/06

SOUTH CAMBS COUNTY COUNCIL
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
31 OCT 2006
Jessica Miller
Traveller Liaison Manager
Cambridgeshire County Council
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
SECTION

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee6th December 2006**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/1889/06/F - OVER**Chalet Bungalow and Garage, Land Rear of 54 The Lanes
for Mr K Woodham and Ms M Peck****Recommendation: Approval****Date for Determination: 28th November 2006****Notes:**

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because of a Parish Council Objection, which does not accord with the officer recommendation.

Site and Proposal

1. Webster's Way is a cul-de-sac development of some 27 dwellings (including Asplin's Close), mostly two-storey terraced and semi-detached houses. The application site, a plot of 18m wide by 20.8m deep on its south side and 31.7m deep on its north side, is on the north east side of Webster's Way, and comprises approximately half of the rear garden of 54 The Lanes. To the south of the site the rear gardens of 56 and 58 also back on to Webster's Way. There is a footway along this side of the road, with a narrow grass strip and a few well-spaced trees between the footway and rear boundary fences. To the north is the rear garden of 52 The Lanes, which backs onto the pedestrian access to the rear of 1-6 Webster's Way. These properties in The Lanes are single storey.
2. This full application, received 3rd October 2006, proposes the development of the site for a single, 1 ½ storey four bedroom dwelling, with access from Webster's Way.
3. The density equates to 23 dwellings/hectare.

Planning History

4. **S/2099/03/O** – Planning permission granted for a dwelling. Conditions required the submission of a reserved matters application to address details of siting, design and external appearance and site landscaping; and that the dwelling be single storey only “to reduce its visual impact on surrounding properties and also to ensure there is no loss of privacy”
5. **S/0133/84/O** – Planning permission refused for a bungalow and garage for the following reasons:
 - “1. The erection of a bungalow on the site would result in a piecemeal form of development relating badly to the existing development in Webster's Way and setting an undesirable precedent for the adjoining land to the south-east.

2. The proposal, if approved, would adversely affect the amenities of 52 and 56 The Lanes through loss of privacy to the rear gardens of the properties.”

Planning Policy

6. **Policy P5/5** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (“The County Structure Plan”) permits small-scale housing developments in villages only where appropriate, taking into account, inter alia, the character of the village and its setting.
7. **Policy SE3** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) identifies Over as a Limited Rural Growth Settlement where residential development up to a maximum scheme size of 30 dwellings will be permitted on unallocated land within village frameworks 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 (Loss of employment sites in villages). Development should provide an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and affordability and should achieve a minimum density of 30 dph unless there are strong design grounds for not doing so.
8. **Policy HG11** of the Local Plan states that development to the rear of existing properties will only be permitted where the development would not: (1) result in overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing of existing residential properties; (2) result in noise and disturbance to existing residential properties through the use of its access; (3) result in highway dangers through the use of its access; or (4) be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.

Consultation

9. **Over Parish Council** recommends refusal and comments “This has not addressed our concerns with the original application. We still feel this is an overdevelopment of the site with inappropriate access onto the property – this road already has specific access issues for both refuse and emergency vehicles.”
10. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – raises concerns with regards to noise during construction and its impact on nearby residents. He has suggested conditions to be attached to any approval to control the use of power operated machinery and the method of construction for driven pile foundations. He has also suggested an informative regarding the use of bonfires and the burning of waste materials on site during construction.

Representations

11. The owners/occupiers of 56 and 58 The Lanes and 1 Asplins Close have objected to the application for the following reasons:
 - (a) Loss of privacy, dormer to bedroom 2 in south-west elevation would overlook rear garden of 1 Asplins Close;
 - (b) Several upstairs windows will overlook 56 The Lanes and other properties;
 - (c) Outline consent was for a bungalow – chalet bungalow is essentially a 2 storey house by another name, 20ft (6.4m) tall;
 - (d) Design out of character with the area;

- (e) Over development – site too small to accommodate a four bedroom house;
- (f) Impact on road safety – Webster's Way is relatively busy and on-street parking already occurs. Concern that over-time this site would lead to more on-street parking. Road is very narrow and a thoroughfare for Primary School children;
- (g) Intrudes into the gardens of the Bungalows in The Lanes;
- (h) Loss of garden habitat – valuable for birds.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

12. The principle of developing this site for a new residential unit has previously been established by the grant of outline planning permission for a single dwelling under application reference S/2099/03/O. It has, therefore, been previously accepted that the retention of the site in its present form is not essential to the character of the village, nor that single storey development of the site would be out of character with the pattern of development in the area nor that the development would relate poorly to the existing Webster's Way environment. The property would front Webster's Way, as do the houses 30m further along the road. The site, as existing, is garden land and therefore constitutes a brownfield site within the village framework.
13. The outline consent for a dwelling on this site was originally conditioned to require the dwelling to be single storey only, to ensure that the amenities of neighbouring dwellings were protected.
14. In terms of residential amenity, the property would have a back-to-back distance of 29m with the existing dwelling at 54 The Lanes, and would measure 6.4m to its ridge. By virtue of the height of the proposed dwelling, and its position and distance from the existing dwellings in The Lane, I am satisfied that it would not result in any undue overbearing impact or loss of light to the surrounding dwellings. Whilst it is marginally taller than the existing bungalows in The Lane, it appears as a relatively modest structure, with a predominantly low eaves height and with the bulk of the dwelling set approximately 2m off both side boundaries
15. Dormer windows at first floor have been positioned so that those serving bedrooms 2 and 3 face over the dwelling's own parking/turning area and the road in Webster's Way. The window in bedroom 2, which has been objected to by the occupier of 1 Asplin's Close, would be facing Webster's Way, at a distance of approximately 19m from the boundary serving that dwelling. As such, no significant loss of privacy would result from this opening. The only side facing openings at first floor are windows serving bedroom 4 and a bathroom, but these are positioned off both side boundaries and would only be afforded views of the bottom of the gardens of the dwellings located either side of the site. As such, I am satisfied that there would be no serious loss of privacy arising from these windows.
16. In terms of highway safety, on-site parking provision has been made for 2 cars within the garage, with a further standing area in front of this, which meets the Council's parking standards. Referring again to the earlier outline application, the principle of the traffic generation from an additional single dwelling has been accepted as not adversely impacting on the safety of highway users. Furthermore, Webster's Way, whilst a potential pedestrian route for school children, is not a vehicular traffic through route. As such, the reversing of vehicles into the highway is not uncommon in the vicinity and is not considered to be detrimental to highway safety.

Recommendation

17. Approve, with 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. 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);
 7. During the period of construction no power operated machinery shall be operated on the premises before 08.00 hours on weekdays and 08.00 hours on Saturdays nor after 18.00 hours on weekdays and 13.00 hours on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays) unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with any agreed noise restrictions. (Reason - In order to minimise the effects of the development to nearby residents or occupiers);

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)
P5/5 (Homes in Rural Areas)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:**
SE3 (List of Limited Rural Growth Settlements)
HG11 (Backland Development)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including noise disturbance and overlooking issues
 - Highway safety
 - Visual impact on the locality

General Informatives

1. Should driven pile foundations be proposed, then before works commence, a statement of the method for construction of these foundations shall be submitted 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.

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/1889/06/F, S/2099/03/O, S/0133/84/O

Contact Officer: Michael Osbourn – Assistant Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713379

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee 6th December 2006
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

CAMBOURNE PHASE 6 UPPER CAMBOURNE DEVELOPMENT BRIEFING DOCUMENT**Purpose**

1. To seek delegated powers to approve or refuse the Cambourne Phase 6 Upper Cambourne Development Briefing Document (“the Brief”) for Development Control purposes as part of the Cambourne Design Guide.

Background

2. The draft Brief has been prepared by the Cambourne Developers’ masterplanners, Randall Thorp, and has been discussed and amended following Planning Officers’ advice. It is intended to guide the continuity of development into Upper Cambourne in accordance with the Outline planning permission for 3,300 dwellings. However, in view of the advanced status of the Local Development Framework (LDF), it also needs to be compatible with progress towards the future growth of Cambourne making efficient use of land. It will be accompanied by a Housing Schedule which gives the potential dwelling numbers for parcels in this Phase, and sets them in alternative scenarios for future housing. These could vary depending on the eventual requirement for affordable housing emerging from the examination of the Development Control Policies of the LDF.
3. The Brief covers the first three private house builder sites, UC 01, 02 and 03, a developer-led affordable housing parcel UC 04, and housing association sites UC 05 and 06. The land comprises 10.05 hectares of land to the north and south of Lancaster Way (the new spine road to The Vine primary school). It is separated from Great Cambourne by the sports fields, the cricket pitch under construction and the land south of Eastgate comprising Jeavons Wood, the eventual golf course and Great Common Wood. The main existing features are the east/west hedgerow adjacent to the “concrete road”, and the hedgerow which leads northwards from it.

Local Development Framework

4. **Core Strategy** – sets the scene within the context of the Community Strategy aims of active, safe and healthy communities, building successful new communities, good access to services, quality homes for all, and a high quality environment. The Core Strategy asserts the Cornerstone of Sustainability and states Strategic Objectives including (g) To ensure development addresses sustainability issues, including climate change mitigation and adaptation issues, maximising recycling and reuse of resources, and reduce waste and pollution, and (i) To ensure that any new development results in appropriate provision for the protection and enhancement of native biodiversity. Opportunities for increased access to the countryside and enjoyment of biodiversity should be viewed as integral requirements of new development.
5. Cambourne is identified in **Policy ST/4 Rural Centres** as a rural centre; since these “comprise the most sustainable villages in South Cambridgeshire there is no strategic constraint on the amount of development of land for housing that can come forward

within the village frameworks, provided that the proposals are in accordance with the policies in the Plan.”

6. The Core Strategy also has appended Targets in Table 2: Core and Local Output Indicators include at pages 45 and 46 the Council’s objectives for Housing Mix. Whilst these will not be adopted before the Inspector’s ruling on the LDF Development Control Policies, they are a good indication of the local needs which must be addressed.
5. **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (Local Plan):**
Cambourne 1 – Development in accordance with Cambourne Masterplan
Cambourne 2 – Development in accordance with Cambourne Design Guide
6. **SE2** – Rural Growth Settlements – Development should provide an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and affordability and should achieve a minimum density of 30 dph unless there are strong design grounds for not doing so.
7. **SE7** – Development in accordance with Cambourne Masterplan and Design Guide.
8. **HG10** – housing mix to include a range of types and sizes, including 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings, making the best use of the site and promoting a sense of community which reflects local needs. The design and layout 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.
9. **TP1** – Promotion of sustainable transport choices, restriction of car parking to the maximum levels in appendix 7/1.
10. **EN5** – retention of natural features, new planting appropriate to the character of development, its landscape setting and the biodiversity of the locality.
11. The approved **Cambourne Master Plan** identifies this area for housing. The **Cambourne Design Guide** describes the character of Upper Cambourne as the quietest and most secluded of the villages being “self-contained at the end of the village road with no further connection except for buses ”The Design Guide emphasis is on the rural character, both in materials used and the structural tree framework and spacious layout.
12. The **Cambourne Highway Design Guide** picks up the above theme, and describes the spine road having a wide corridor up to the Green, the section up to the Green to be very green, with trees planted as a “remnant avenue”, and the paths and buildings set back from the carriageway, generous front gardens with medium/tall enclosures mainly hedges. Features to capitalise on are the entrance to the village and the proposed pond at the south end of the village green.
13. **South Cambridgeshire Design Guide Draft supplementary planning document 2005** – at section 2.4 emphasises sustainability by resource efficiency, inclusiveness, biodiversity, and local facilities. Further advice on resource efficiency is given at section 3.5 Housing Design. Part 3 deals with larger development sites and picks out some of the elements of urban design which help to create distinctive and usable places; particularly helpful in Phase 6 will be the use of “landmarks” and waymarkers” which would emphasise, for example, the arrival of the spine road at the village green, and a few of the more important corner buildings at junctions.

Considerations

14. The number of houses intended for this phase, at 425, is close to the Housing Schedule approved in April 2000 (453), but the land area is reduced, so the density characteristics of this Phase would be higher than the original design intentions of the Masterplan at that time. This is in response to government guidance on urban design and density which has changed since the original Masterplan was approved, and for this Phase, it concentrates the higher number of dwellings around the spine roads which could become public transport routes. The Brief describes the changes to the Master Plan which resulted from the A428 works, and the school location (the updated version was approved by Planning Committee on 7th November). It sets out the context of the existing road and established hedgerows. The opportunity is now taken to create a central greenway alongside the east-west hedge. Sensitive wildlife areas within Great Common Wood are to be protected. The rearrangement of land parcels resulting from those changes has also facilitated the allocation of all affordable housing sites with direct access to a spine road, thus avoiding the “landlocking” of sites awaiting private housing developments.
15. The movement network is set out, to facilitate the most direct spine road link via Back Lane towards the village green and the primary school, and a further spine road serving the northern portion of Phase 6, linking back southwards as greenway to the village green. This would cross the east-west greenway at a point where the existing hedge is already breached or dead. The secondary and non-vehicular route network is set out so that individual parcels can be linked together, and a comprehensive cycle and footpath network links back to the settlement centre. It would be preferable if the link between parcels north and south of the greenway is non-vehicular, to prevent conflict with cars and disruption of the wildlife corridor. Amendment of the Brief is sought.
16. The Brief shows diagrammatically that this Phase would have the highest “density character” within Upper Cambourne, being the area adjacent to the converging spine roads. Within Phase 6 small areas adjacent to the woodland edges and the greenway are indicated as medium density; it is difficult to envisage how the character differentiation is to be expressed over areas containing few house plots. The requirement is, however, illustrated by the identification of important views and vistas from housing to open spaces, such that emphasis placed on these gaps in the built fabric would create a less dense feel to such places.
17. Within the parcels, junctions on the road network have been identified as “nodes”, at which open spaces would create points of interest. The rationale given for these spaces is “to add interest to the street scene, to highlight nodes and to create natural meeting places. In addition to these uses the open spaces may also contain areas suitable for LAPs”. Such an approach must be used with caution to avoid play spaces dominated by traffic and parking. The Brief refers to the requirements of the approved Play Strategy. Local Areas for Play (LAPs) are required for each parcel. There will also be Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs) at the cricket field and on the Village Green, and a Space for Imaginative Play (SIP) where existing east/west and north/south hedgerows meet (although it is not clear whether land is set aside for this within this Brief area).
18. The Brief does not make any reference to the policies of the emerging LDF and district-wide design guidance. The importance of energy and water efficiency cannot be overemphasised, and must be included in this guidance for developers, to direct their submission of reserved matters applications at the outset.

Consultations

19.
 - a. Cambourne Parish Council – supports the briefing plan in general, but would ask for the following to be considered:
 - that the plans are checked to ensure accuracy of site features.
 - that in relation to section 4.0 Open Spaces, the extent of hard surfacing be reviewed as softer treatment would be more appropriate to differentiate between highway, parking and community area.
 - b. Highways Agency – it would appear that the application will not have a detrimental effect on the A428 at this location; therefore the Agency would not wish to comment further on the document.
 - c. Cambridgeshire County Council Road Adoption section for Highway authority –
 - page 15: A secondary vehicular route connecting the Northern and Southern Spine Roads through Plots UC01 and UC02 is proposed. This is shown as crossing the East/West Greenway, without showing the resulting gap in the existing hedge. The importance of this hedge and the adjacent non-vehicular route is stressed elsewhere in the document, but both of these will be detrimentally affected by the significant vehicular through-route.
 - Page 17: A number of hard urban spaces are located on the UC01 and UC02 through-route, as detailed above. Page 23 suggests that these should be designed to be pedestrian friendly, and might even be “Homezones”. It is debatable whether such pedestrian areas should be located on a potentially heavily trafficked route.
 - Page 21: It is indicated that the boundaries of Plots UC01 and UC02 border the East/West Greenway. The UC01/UC02 through-route would be constructed by the Plot developers within their title, however one of them would have to construct the section of road crossing the Greenway, which is the property of others. This situation has occurred in Great Cambourne and is currently the subject of legal negotiations, which, it is hoped, will eventually be concluded. It would be better to avoid these legal complications, if possible.
 - d. County Archaeology – reply awaited.
 - e. County Footpaths – Comment on public footpaths outside this Phase. The advice will be used to inform the future masterplanning and briefing processes.
 - f. SCDC Environmental Health – the noise implications of the roads and Bourn Airfield should be taken into account at application stage.
 - g. SCDC Environmental Operations Manager – requests looking at the vehicular access to properties. The Council policy for refuse collection requires that each property have storage facilities and collection points, and that a vehicle should be able to drive within 30 metres of each collection point; this is not achieved in previous Cambourne phases due to terraces without roads and first floor links that are too low for collection vehicles. In addition the County Highways road layout standard is not sufficient for collection vehicles when it comes to turning heads. Please ensure that legs of turning heads are each 11 metres long and not 6 metres as County approve.
 - h. SCDC Ecologist – reply awaited.
 - i. SCDC Landscape and Urban Design – advised during drafting process.
 - j. Environment Agency – no objection in principle, subject to future controls.

- k. Circle Anglia, Anglian Water, Natural England, Police Architectural Liaison Officer, British Horse Society, and The Ramblers' Association replies awaited.

Effect on Annual Priorities and Corporate Objectives

13. Affordable Homes	Facilitating the development of affordable housing Parcels UC 04/05 and 06
Customer Service	Providing consistent and transparent planning advice
Northstowe and other growth areas	Facilitating the continuing growth of Cambourne
Quality, Accessible Services	Facilitating accessible layouts for service and transport providers.
Village Life	Safeguarding the separate character of Upper Cambourne
Sustainability	The LDF Core Strategy and SCDC Design Guide must be acknowledged and expressed.
Partnership	Cooperation with the Cambourne Developer to deliver appropriate development.

Conclusions/Summary

14. The Brief does not make any reference to the policies of the emerging LDF and district-wide design guidance. It must address and embrace the principles of sustainability in respect of climate change mitigation, maximising recycling and reuse of resources, and reduction of waste and pollution as set out in the Local Development Framework Core Strategy ST/g. The SCDC Design Guide advises working towards EcoHomes "Excellent" rating or equivalent, and ultimately carbon neutral homes. These issues are being worked on for incorporation into an amended Brief. The importance of energy and water efficiency cannot be overemphasised, and must be included in this guidance for developers, to direct their submission of reserved matters applications at the outset.
15. In other respects the Brief is a helpful framework for the movement network, the preservation and creation of green spaces and vistas, and the general density character of this Phase. It is therefore requested that, subject to the inclusion of sustainability advice, and the amendment recommended in paragraph 8 above, delegated powers to approve or refuse the Brief be granted to the Head of Planning Services.

Recommendation

16. Delegated powers be given for approval or refusal of the Cambourne Phase 6 Upper Cambourne Development Briefing Document subject to progress on amendment and the incorporation of advice on the sustainability policies in the Local Plan and the LDF Core Strategy.

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

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
 Local Development Framework Submission Draft January 2006 Core Strategy
 South Cambridgeshire Design Guide Draft supplementary planning document 2005
 Cambourne Master Plan Report
 Cambourne Design Guide
 Cambourne Highway Design Guide

Contact Officer: Pam Thornton – Senior Planning Assistant
 Telephone: (01954) 713099

This page is intentionally left blank