



11 November 2020

**Report to:** South Cambridgeshire District  
Council Planning Committee

**Lead Officer:** Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

---

## **20/02128/HFUL – 9 Halatte Gardens, Great Shelford**

Proposal: Part single, part two storey rear extension and associated works

Applicant: Mr and Mrs Norman

Key material considerations: Character/Heritage Impact  
Residential Amenity  
Tree Impacts  
Other Matters

Date of Member site visit: None

Is it a Departure Application?: No

Decision due by: 16/11/20 (extension of time agreed)

Application brought to Committee because: Referred to Planning Committee by Great Shelford Parish Council and the officer recommendation of approval conflicts with the recommendation of the Parish Council. A meeting was held on the 22<sup>nd</sup> September whereby the application was considered in accordance with the principles set out in the Council's constitution. Given the material considerations raised and representations raised by third parties, combined with the planning history of the site, a referral to Committee was justified on this basis.

Officer Recommendation: Approval

Presenting officer: Tom Gray, Planning Officer

### **Executive Summary**

1. The application site is located within the Great Shelford Development Framework and Conservation Area. A number of mature trees are within and adjacent to the site. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). The dwelling

was erected under planning permission S/1614/03/F and is subject to permitted development restrictions.

2. No objections have been received from the Council's Conservation Officer. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of design and would not result in significant harm upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting.
3. Officers consider that the proposed development would not result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties.
4. No objections have been received from the Council's Trees Officer. Officers consider that the proposed development would not result in unacceptable tree impacts.
5. Officers consider that, subject to conditions, the proposed development accords with national and local planning policies.

### **Relevant planning history**

6. S/1614/03/F – Erection of 9 Dwellings and Garages Following Demolition of Existing Buildings – Approved
7. S/1151/08/F – Alteration to Approved Landscape Scheme (Planning Ref. S/1614/03/F) to Include Open Gravel Drainage Areas (Retrospective Application) – Approved

### **Planning policies**

#### **National Planning Policy**

8. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – February 2019  
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)  
National Design Guide (NDG)

#### **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018**

9. S/1 Vision  
S/2 Objectives of the Local Plan  
S/3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
S/7 Development Frameworks  
HQ/1 Design Principles  
NH/4 Biodiversity  
NH/14 Heritage Assets

#### **South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):**

10. District Design Guide – Adopted March 2010  
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020  
Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD – Adopted January 2009  
Biodiversity – Adopted January 2009  
Trees & Development Sites SPD - Adopted January 2009  
Great Shelford Conservation Appraisal – Adopted 2007

## Consultations

### 11. Great Shelford Parish Council – Objection

Comment submitted date: Fri 07 Aug 2020

- Note was taken of the comments given at the public section of the meeting, correspondence received with respect to this application, previous comments made by SCDC and the various report documents on the portal. The PC noted the reduction in ridge height but still felt that the proposal is overbearing and does not protect the aesthetics of the development in general.
- When Halatte Gardens was first proposed there were a lot of conditions imposed, including from 2 village meetings, such that there should be a cohesion within the whole development. We do not feel that allowing this extension would maintain the principles of such conditions.
- We were made aware that the new side wall will apparently constitute the boundary fence with the existing fence being removed. This makes the extension even more obtrusive to the neighbour. We are also concerned about whether there is a party wall agreement as this will obviously be needed as this is a two storey extension and is only around 1m from the neighbouring property.
- We also notice that the tree officer has required more information on 29th July 2020. In view of the fact that this is a GSPC Conservation Area we strongly recommend that this application is refused. We also ask that, if SCDC are minded to approve this application then we ask for it to be brought before Committee.

Comment submitted date: Thu 16 Jul 2020

- We have just been made aware that the applicant has revised their plans and that decision date is 28th July. As our meeting was last night and the next meeting is 5th August, we ask for a delay on decision until 7th August please so that the PC can discuss this application in full.

Comment submitted date: Tue 07 Jul 2020

- We are very concerned that the Conservation Officer (Sue Smith) has deemed this proposal to 'preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and to further enable it to assimilate into the street scene'. We cannot see how such a large two storey extension that overpowers the neighbouring properties can be acceptable in this situ.
- When Halatte Gardens was proposed great care was taken to ensure that the properties were appropriately spaced and diverse to make this

development a very appealing place to live. This extension is disproportionate to its site and blights the neighbours' properties. Can we ask, as a Parish Council, that this is called in to Committee to allow thorough transparency on your decision.

Comment submitted date: Thu 18 Jun 2020

- We cannot support this proposal. The extension almost doubles the footprint of the property and overdevelops the site. The setting of the property is within a small and well architected site where there are some constraints to ensure the style is consistent whilst having unique properties.
- The proposed structure does not conform to the site constraints in window style and property style.
- The proposed extension makes the property out of proportion to its neighbours and overpowers their properties whilst removing light to their properties.
- The proposal is adjacent to the War Memorial and again impacts on the environment. This is a conservation area and the proposal will dramatically affect both the neighbours and the street scene. We request that you refuse this proposal.

## 12. **Council's Conservation Officer –**

Comment Date: Mon 27 Jul 2020

- The agents have submitted revised plans. There is still some discrepancy over the first floor double doors opening outwards on the plans and I assume they should come into the room.
- The amount of glazing at first floor, in the Master Bedroom, has now been reduced with the area above the fixed light over the double doors now smooth cladding. This has reduced the glazing somewhat. If the fixed light were to become a panel too, this would reduce the potential light pollution more.
- With regard to the impact on the conservation area, as with the original application, the Conservation Team consider that the application preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area. The alterations that have been submitted would help it to assimilate into the streetscene, as was suggested in the comments made by email on the 30<sup>th</sup> June.
- The application meets policy NH/14 and in terms of the NPPF, paragraph 192 would apply.

Comment Date: Tues 30 Jun 2020

- I have been to site today to look at the implications of the proposals for 9 Halatte Gardens. There appears to be an issue with the Proposed Plans which show double doors from the Master Bedroom opening outwards with no balcony or terrace to step out onto. I presume that these should be inward opening with a Juliet balcony for safety?
- The proposed two storey extension is deep and reaches to the ridge, but it does have a roof which has the same pitch as the existing building giving continuity to the design. The materials also replicate what is already there in the building.

- During the summer months there will be limited views of the extension from the High Street, to the rear of the site, due to the large number of mature trees that are at the bottom of the garden. However the rear will be more prominent during the winter months and the large area of glazing for the Master Bedroom – glazed double doors, side lights and a large window above which goes into the apex of the gable end – could become a light beacon, especially when combined with the fully glazed ground floor. The applicants should consider reducing the amount of fenestration above the double doors to the Master Bedroom. They could be replaced with a panel of a different material to give some articulation to what would be blank space.
- As commented previously, the Conservation Team consider that the application preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area, and the proposed alterations as suggested would help it to further assimilate into the streetscene.

Comment Date: Wed 10 Jun 2020

- It is considered that there are no material Conservation issues with this proposal.

### 13. Council's Trees Officer –

Comment Date: Tue 15 Sep 2020

- Summary (15/09/2020): I have no arboricultural or hedgerow objections to this application.
- Tree and hedgerow information: An Arboricultural Report (dated 26 August 2020) has been submitted. This is sufficient for this proposal, trees and site, please list it as an approved document.

Comment Date: Wed 29 Jul 2020

- Summary (29/07/2020): Holding objection.
- Further to my comments published 17th July 2020, I believe the applicant will need to submit either a tree protection plan or an arboricultural impact assessment. Please see 'Controlled development (planning permission) near existing trees' on [www.scams.gov.uk](http://www.scams.gov.uk) for more information. I strongly advise the use of an arboricultural consultant, search at the Chartered Foresters or Arboricultural Association.

Comment Date: Fri 17 Jul 2020

- Summary: I am unable to comment on this application as insufficient tree information has been provided.
- Trees on or adjacent site have: A level of protection through the Conservation Area.
- Tree and hedgerow information: Q1) From which direction are the materials and builders going to access site? Front or back? Q2) Its not clear if the adjacent back garden tree has to be considered in 8 Halatte Gardens. We need the tree species and the girth at 1.5m above ground level.

## **Representations from members of the public**

14. Several representations have been received from eight neighbouring properties and third parties raising objections to the proposed development. Two representations have been received in support of the application. Full redacted versions of these comments can be found on the Council's website. In summary the following concerns have been raised:
- Overbearing impacts upon No.10 Halatte Gardens. 45m<sup>2</sup> of new wall/roof. Significant reduction in light levels and cast additional shadow impacting living spaces. Windows will view directly into our property at No.10. Windows in south-west elevation will result in loss of light/overshadowing (side glass panel in front door and 1<sup>st</sup> floor master bedroom). Overshadow patio area. Additional windows on side elevation will overlook our property, specifically the kitchen living area, master bedroom, patio area and garden.
  - Overlooking to No.18 High Street.
  - Overshadowing upon sitting room window of No.8. Rooflight will act like a light beacon below our bedroom window. Significant loss of light within ground floor of No.8 and overbearing due to the close proximity and scale.
  - No rear extensions on immediate properties on this scale. Extensive glazing will impact the feel of the development. Disproportionate to the existing dwelling (nearly double the size). Not in keeping with character and appearance of the Conservation Area and housing layout. Breaks the rear building line of properties within this development.
  - Large extension will provoke further demand for increased light and further reduction in the tree canopy/removal of trees.
  - Visible and prominent from High street, particularly in winter.
  - Requests imposition of working hours, noise, parking, storage of materials.
  - Materials of render would be at odds to finish of other houses in the estate which use brick. Should condition details of materials, windows and finishes to ensure that unifying design and character of development.
  - Restrictive covenants are in place on all the properties.

## **The site and its surroundings**

15. The application site is located within the Great Shelford Development Framework and Conservation Area. To the north a War Memorial on the junction between High Street and Tunwell Lane. A number of mature trees are within and adjacent to the application site. The site is located with Flood Zone 1 (low risk).

## **The proposal**

16. The application seeks planning permission for a part single, part two storey rear extension and associated works.

# Planning Assessment

## Key Issues

17. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are the impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, residential amenity, tree impacts and other matters.

## Impact upon the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

### Policy Context

18. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
19. Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 focuses on conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
20. Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.
21. Paragraph 192 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
  - a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage
  - b) assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
  - c) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
  - d) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
22. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
23. Paragraph 196 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
24. Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the

setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

25. At a local level, chapter 6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan deals with protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment.
26. Policy NH/14(1a) of the Local Plan states that development proposals will be supported when they sustain and enhance the special character and distinctiveness of the district's historic environment including its villages and countryside and its building traditions and details.
27. Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan requires all new development to make a positive contribution to its local and wider context. Development proposals should, appropriate to their scale and nature, conserve or enhance important natural and historic assets and their setting (criterion 1d).

#### Assessment of the Proposal

28. The application site was subject to planning permission in 2003 for the erection of one of nine dwellings. Parish Council and third party comments concerning the history of the application site are acknowledged. A condition (condition 9) was attached to the original consent (S/1614/03/F) removing permitted development rights (all classes of Part 1 and Class A and C of Class 2) from dwellings within this Halatte Gardens development. The reason stated on the decision notice was to safeguard the character of the area and open frontage layout of the estate.
29. The Officer Committee report (7th January 2003) states that the retention of the central open area is vital to the character of the area and conditions were applied to the consent to prevent the erection of hard surfaces and fencing without planning permission.
30. The previous history of the site is therefore a factor in the assessment of this application.
31. The proposed two storey and single storey extension would be situated to the rear of the existing dwelling. The proposed ridge line of the extension would be lower than the ridge of the existing dwelling and would therefore be subservient. In addition, the proposed two storey and single storey extension would be slightly stepped in from the side elevations of the existing dwelling.
32. Due to the relative position of the proposed extensions, it is not considered that any visual harm would result upon the character and appearance of the area when viewed from the front of the dwelling (Halatte Gardens) and Tunwells Lane.
33. The proposed development would be situated approximately 20 metres from High Street, to the rear of the application site. It is noted that several trees which have a level of statutory protection, albeit deciduous, occupy the boundary with this public road.

34. Comments from the Parish Council and third parties regarding the overall scale of the proposal are acknowledged. Whilst the proposal would consist of a two storey extension, in totality, taking into account the existing ground floor and first floors, the proposed development would result in an approximate 53% increase over the existing external dimensions of the dwelling. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal is proportionate to the existing dwelling.
35. Objections have been received concerning the style of the proposed extension being out of character with other dwellings within the Halatte Gardens development and the Conservation Area. Whilst these are acknowledged, the proposed development is considered to be similar in gable form to neighbouring properties (No.8 and No.10 Halatte Gardens) and in keeping with the materials on the existing dwelling, notably rendered walls, some brickwork, a slate roof and painted timber windows. In addition, whilst a small feature on the proposal, cladding is found elsewhere within the Halatte Gardens development. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would be compatible with its location in terms of materials, design and form.
36. A formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer has been undertaken. No objections from the Conservation Officer on the original scheme were received, though, the amount of glazing and ridge height has since been reduced to assimilate the scheme more into its surroundings. Due to the considerable distance to High Street and the contemporary style of dwellings within the Halatte development, the proposal is considered to be in-keeping with the contemporary nature of this part of the Great Shelford's Conservation Area.
37. The Great Shelford Conservation Area Appraisal (Adopted 2007) is given full weight in the consideration of planning applications. Important views have been identified within this appraisal from the High Street/Tunwells Lane junction, along the High Street to the south west and Tunwells Lane to the south. The nearby War Memorial is identified as a positive undesignated open space.
38. This appraisal recommends that roofs should be modestly pitched in slate or clay pantiles, extensions should adhere to the principles of subordination, so that they do not undermine the architectural interest of the main building, while also seeking to preserve existing trees and hedgerows. It states further that rendered walls should be painted either white or pale pastel shades, while brickwork should generally be gault clay. Modern artificial materials such as uPVC windows and concrete roof tiles should not be used.
39. Taking into account the use of appropriate materials, subservient appearance and its location set back approximately 20 metres from High Street and removed from important views from High Street/Tunwell Lane Junction, there is no conflict with the Great Shelford Conservation Area Appraisal 2007.
40. To ensure that the final details of the development are acceptable to the context of the site and the Conservation Area, it is considered reasonable and necessary to impose conditions for materials in accordance with Policy NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

41. Taking all this into consideration, the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Great Shelford Conservation Area, in accordance with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy NH/14 and HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, and Paragraph 192 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

## **Residential Amenity**

42. The proposal would measure approximately 5.3 metres in depth, projecting from the rear wall of the existing dwelling. The existing dwelling is orientated south-west from the adjacent neighbouring dwelling of No.10 Halatte Gardens.
43. Whilst neighbour comments regarding overshadowing and overbearing impacts are acknowledged and No.10 has a ground floor living room window and first floor bedroom window on the southern side elevation facing No.9, these serve as a secondary windows to both these habitable spaces. Principal windows for both of these rooms are located on the rear elevation of this neighbouring dwelling. Taking this into account and given the position of the existing dwelling of No.9 directly opposite the side wall of No.10, any additional overshadowing impacts to these windows are considered to be restricted to late afternoon sunlight only, and any overbearing impacts are not considered to be significant.
44. The neighbour at No.10 Halatte Gardens also objects on the basis of loss of light to the other side-facing first floor windows and ground floor window. These windows both serve non-habitable rooms. Moreover, given the position of these relative to No.9 Halatte Gardens, any overshadowing is considered to be at an oblique angle and therefore is not significant.
45. Whilst it is acknowledged that some overshadowing of the patio area at No.10 would occur, given the reasonable gap of approximately 5 metres between these two dwellings, the subservient roof form (approximately 7.6 metres in height) with the roof slope angled away from No.10, the orientation of the proposed two storey extension south-east from this neighbouring dwelling and the large amenity space of this neighbouring dwelling, in this instance, any overshadowing upon this neighbouring private amenity area is not considered to be significant.
46. The proposed two storey rear extension would be situated outside of the 45 degree rule of thumb when viewed from the rear elevation ground floor and first floor habitable room windows of No.10 Halatte Gardens. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposal would have any significant overbearing or loss of light impacts upon these neighbouring dwelling's windows.
47. As discussed, the proposed two storey extension would be situated approximately 5 metres from the patio area of No.10 Halatte Gardens. Given the presence of a high brick wall bounding this neighbour's private amenity area and the reasonable distance, it is not considered that any overbearing impacts

upon No.10's private rear amenity space would be significant in this case.

48. In addition to the proposed extensions, two first floor windows are proposed in the side elevation of No.9, facing towards No.10 Halatte Gardens. These serve en-suite facilities and given their position, in order to safeguard the privacy of this adjoining neighbour, it is considered reasonable and necessary to condition these as obscured and fixed shut on any consent granted. In addition, given that any views towards the ground floor window of No.10 from the proposed ground floor side elevation window would be fractionally within the 45 degree rule of thumb, it is considered that this is obscured and fixed shut on any permission granted. These conditions are to safeguard the residential amenity of No.10 Halatte Gardens.
49. Any overlooking to neighbouring dwellings (No.8 and No.10) from the proposed first floor rear facing Juliet balcony and windows would be outside the 45 degree rule of thumb. Given the considerable distance of over 45 metres to neighbours along High Street, no overlooking harm would result upon these.
50. The proposed two storey extension would be situated approximately 5 metres from the adjacent boundary with No.8 Halatte Gardens. Given the reasonable distance and its orientation due north-east from this neighbouring dwelling, it is not considered to result in significant overbearing or loss of light impacts upon the private rear amenity area nor habitable room windows of No.8 Halatte Gardens.
51. The proposed single storey extension measures approximately 3.45 metres in height and would be positioned near to the existing boundary with No.8 Halatte Gardens. Whilst the neighbour comments are acknowledged and the single storey extension would fractionally be within the 45 degree rule of thumb when taken from the closest habitable room window, it is noted that there are several ground floor windows serving the living room of No.8 and therefore any overbearing impacts would not be significant in this instance.
52. Given the north-eastern orientation of the proposed single storey extension, it is not considered that the proposal would result in significant overshadowing impacts upon No.9 Halatte Gardens' habitable rooms nor private rear amenity space.
53. Due to the single storey nature of the extension close to the adjacent boundary with No.8 and taking into account the reasonable size of No.8's private amenity space, it is not considered that the proposal would have significant overbearing impacts upon this neighbouring dwelling.
54. Whilst the neighbour comments regarding the proposed rooflight is acknowledged, this would be positioned at an oblique angle from first floor windows of No.8 Halatte Gardens and therefore it is not considered that this would result in significant light impacts upon this adjacent neighbouring dwelling.
55. The proposed development has been assessed in terms of loss of light, loss of

privacy and overbearing impacts and it is not considered to result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

### **Trees Impacts**

56. Whilst Parish Council and third party comments concerning tree impacts are acknowledged, following an arboricultural assessment and report being submitted and a formal consultation with the Council's Trees Officer, it is considered that no tree works or harm to the existing trees within or adjacent to the site would result.
57. The arboricultural report and assessment is considered sufficient and it is considered reasonable and necessary for this to be conditioned as an approved document on any consent granted to ensure that trees are protected. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

### **Other Matters**

58. Third parties have raised concerns regarding the future reduction in tree canopy or removal of trees. Whilst it is noted that trees are within the site, these are towards the rear of the application site and a reasonable distance away and it is unlikely that overshadowing would lead to the necessity to remove or reduce the tree canopy of trees within the site. In any case, any future removal or reduction in these trees would require a tree works application.
59. Whilst neighbour comments concerning parking and storage of materials are acknowledged, given that there is a shared drive between No.9 and No.10, there is considered sufficient space for contractor parking. In addition, given the fairly large garden space, there is considered acceptable amount of space for the storage of materials. Due to the minor residential nature of the proposed works, hours of work and noise restrictions are not considered necessary or reasonable in this instance.
60. Whilst comments from the Conservation Officer concerning the discrepancy of first-floor rear facing doors is acknowledged, the proposed plans indicate that the doors open outwards with a glass guard internally and therefore the drawings are correct. This has been confirmed by the agent.
61. Whilst there is a War Memorial to the north of the application, this is not a designated heritage asset. No objections from the Council's Conservation Officer concerning the proposal's impact on its setting.
62. Restrictive covenants and the party wall agreements are a civil matter and not within the scope of this application.
63. Due to the current Covid-19 restrictions a site visit by the Planning Committee

Members has not been undertaken.

## **Planning balance and conclusion**

64. For the reasons set out in this report, officers consider the planning application to be acceptable in accordance with relevant national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is considered that planning permission should be granted in this instance.

## **Recommendation**

65. Officers recommend that the Planning Committee approve the application, subject to the following conditions:

## **Conditions**

- a) 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 future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development, which have not been acted upon).
- b) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: L(PL)HG\_L01, L(PL)HG\_03 A, L(PL)HG\_04 B, L(PL)HG\_B01 A, BS 5837 Arboricultural Report (dated 26<sup>th</sup> August 2020)

(Reason – To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).

- c) Apart from any top hung vent, the proposed first floor windows on the north-east side elevation of the dwelling, and proposed ground floor window on the north-east side elevation in the extension, hereby permitted, shall be fitted with obscured glass (meeting as a minimum Pilkington Standard level 3 in obscurity) and shall be permanently fixed shut. The development shall be retained as such thereafter. (Reason – To prevent overlooking of the adjoining properties in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018).
- d) No development above slab level shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension, hereby permitted, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.  
(Reason – To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policy NH/14 and HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018).

## **Background Papers**

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)
- Planning File Reference: S/1614/03/F

## **Report Author:**

Tom Gray – Planning Officer  
Telephone: 07704 018476