

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation 12<sup>th</sup> May 2004  
Control Committee  
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

---

### **S/0165/04/F - LINTON BUNGALOW (REVISED DESIGN) – PLOT 1, LAND OFF GRANTA VALE FOR BENNETT PLC**

#### **Recommendation: Approval**

##### Site and Proposal

1. The application site is a 0.056 hectare (0.14 acre) plot of land located on the west side of Granta Vale, approximately 35 metres south of its junction with the High Street. The land slopes downwards from north to south. Beyond the site to the south, and across Granta Vale to the east, are detached bungalows whilst to the north is a 2 single storey dwelling that fronts onto the High Street (No.142). The plot forms part of a larger site that extends beyond the western boundary and upon which there is an extant planning consent for 5 detached bungalows. 1 of the approved bungalows (Plot 1) occupies the same plot as the present application site.
2. The full application, submitted on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2004, seeks to erect a bungalow on the site. The proposal involves a variation to the previously approved Plot 1 dwelling type. Permitted development rights were removed on this plot and the proposed alterations to the design of the property have therefore had to be submitted as this separate application rather than considered as amendments to the previously approved scheme.
3. The proposed bungalow is a 4-bedroom detached dwelling with a ridge height of 5.2 metres (2.3 metres to eaves). It fronts onto Granta Vale although the attached double garage faces to the rear/west with vehicular access being gained via a shared driveway to the north that serves this plot as well as the remainder of the approved development site. The bungalow is approximately 0.5 metres wider, 0.5 metres deeper and 1 metre closer to the road/frontage of the site than the previously approved dwelling. No increase in either the ridge or eaves heights is proposed. The density of this plot equates to 18 dwellings/hectare.

##### Planning History

4. **S/1017/01/F** – Consent granted for 5 bungalows following the demolition of the existing bungalow at 140 High Street

##### Planning Policy

5. The site lies within the village framework. Linton is identified within **Policy SE2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 as a Rural Growth Settlement. In such locations, the policy states that residential development and redevelopment will be permitted on unallocated land providing:

- 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, local features of landscape or ecological importance, and the amenities of neighbours;
  - The village has the necessary infrastructure capacity.
6. In addition, the policy states that development should provide an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and affordability and should achieve a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare unless there are strong design grounds for not doing so.
7. **Policy P1/3** of the County Structure Plan generally stresses the need for a high standard of design and a sense of place which corresponds to the local character of the built environment.

#### Consultations

8. **Linton Parish Council** objects to the application stating:
- The proposed height of the new dwelling should be no more than 4.5 metres, in line with height of other dwellings on this development;
  - Any permission granted should be conditioned to remove permitted rights of development within the loft space for the future; this is to ensure continuity with planning approval for S/1017/01/F;
  - Councillors are concerned that this dwelling is shown with frontage onto Granta Vale and consider that this will encourage parking outside the property on Granta Vale itself which is a very narrow road;
  - Should parking occur, this will severely restrict access to dwellings opposite which require a turning circle into their own narrow accesses;
  - Councillors consider the aspect of this dwelling should be reversed in order that all frontages are within the development itself.
9. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** raises no objections.

#### Representations

10. Letters of objection have been received from 2 local residents, No.1 Granta Vale and No.132 High Street. The main points raised are:
- The bungalow would obstruct the view of green space and woods from 132 High Street;
  - The proximity of the bungalow to the frontage of the plot would result in a loss of privacy to the occupiers of 1 Granta Vale;
  - The proposal is out of keeping with the character of Granta Vale;

- Any type of access facing Granta Vale could cause congestion off the already narrow road.

### Planning Comments – Key Issues

11. The key issues in the consideration of this application are:
  - Impact upon character of the area;
  - Residential amenity;
  - Parking and highway safety issues
12. The principle of erecting a dwelling on this site has previously been established within the approved 5 bungalow scheme. It is therefore necessary to consider how the details of the proposed bungalow differ to that previously approved and the consequential impact of such changes.
13. The Parish Council has objected to the height of the proposed dwelling, stating that it should be “no more than 4.5 metres high in line with the height of other dwellings on the development.” I would estimate that the existing dwellings within Granta Vale are lower than the bungalow proposed on the site. However, the property that was previously approved on this site was 5.2 metres high, ie, the same height as the dwelling currently proposed. Given that this application does not seek to increase the height of the building and given that the existing consent can still be implemented, it would be unreasonable to require the height of the dwelling to be reduced as requested. The previous consent did require details of finished floor levels to be agreed prior to development commencing in order to ensure that the development would not be obtrusive given the sloping nature of the site. It would be necessary to reapply this condition.
14. I do not consider the proposed slight increase in the depth or width of the dwelling to materially alter its impact upon the street scene and/or the amenities of adjoining residents. The owners of No.1 Granta Vale have objected to the application on the basis that the bungalow would be sited closer to the road and adversely affect their privacies. The front of the new dwelling would be sited just 14 metres away from habitable rooms within the front/west elevation of 1 Granta Vale. However, there is a 2.5 metre high hedge directly along the roadside frontage of No.1 that would prevent any overlooking between opposing windows. Notwithstanding this, the fact that the affected windows face towards the road means that they enjoy low levels of privacy compared to rear/garden facing windows. On this basis, resiting the proposed dwelling 1 metre closer to the Granta Vale frontage of the site would not unduly harm the amenities of No.1 Granta Vale.
15. The Parish Council has objected to the orientation of the dwelling, stating that it should face into the site. The dwelling previously approved on this site fronted onto Granta Vale with habitable windows facing towards the road, as per the current application. As such, it would again be unreasonable to raise any objections to the application on this basis.
16. The parking and highway safety implications of the overall development were considered as part of the previous application, with no objections being raised by the Local Highways Authority. The current application raises no new highway safety issues.

17. Finally, the previously approved application site included a strip of land to the north that was to be landscaped and retained as the garden area to Plot 1. Following the granting of permission, the applicants sought to exclude this land from the site area. This was agreed as a formal amendment subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure the future maintenance of the land as public open space. Should Members be minded to grant consent for the application, it would need to be subject to the same Agreement.

### Recommendations

18. Approval subject to the following conditions:
1. ScA – Time limited permission (RcA);
  2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5aii);
  3. Sc5e – Details of finished floor levels (Rc5e);
  4. Sc51 – Landscaping (Rc51);
  5. Sc52 – Implementation of landscaping (Rc52);
  6. Sc21 – Withdrawal of permitted development rights in respect of Part 1 (Development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse), Classes A, B and E (Rc21a and c....consequent harm to the amenities of neighbours);
  7. Highways Para C2 (Rc10);
  8. The garage, hereby permitted, shall not be used as additional living accommodation (and no trade or business shall be carried on therefrom) (Reason – To ensure the continued provision of off-street parking space in the interests of highway safety and to safeguard the amenities of adjoining occupiers);
  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. (Reason – To protect the occupiers of adjoining properties from noise.)

### Informatives

#### Reasons for Approval

1. The approved 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 proposal conditionally approved is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
  - Residential amenity
  - Highway safety/congestion
  - Visual impact on the locality

3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.

General

1. This permission is subject to a Section 106 Agreement attached to file ref: S/1017/01/F dated 13<sup>th</sup> March 2003

**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
- File refs: S/0165/04/F and S1017/01/F

**Contact Officer:** Andrew Moffat – Area Planning Officer  
Telephone: (01223) 443169