

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

10<sup>th</sup> January 2007

**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

---

### **S/2104/06/F – GREAT SHELFORD**

#### **Residential Development (76 Affordable Units) Including Traffic Signals on Cambridge Road at Land off Cambridge Road for Circle Anglia**

**Recommendation: Delegated Refusal**

**Date for Determination: 29<sup>th</sup> January 2007 (Major Application)**

#### **Notes:**

**This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination within the statutory 13 week period because it proposes affordable housing on an exception site outside a village framework in the Approved Development Plan.**

**Members will visit this site on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> January 2007**

#### **Site and Proposal**

1. The application site is a 1.8 hectare grass field lying outside the Great Shelford village framework and within the Green Belt and countryside. The site is located on the west side of the A1301 Cambridge Road and is bounded to the east by bungalows within Cambridge Road and Walnut Drive and to the north by properties within Westfield Road, including three bungalows built on backland plots that directly adjoin the site. The Great Shelford Rugby Club (comprising floodlit playing fields, a pavilion and associated parking) is located to the west of the site whilst, to the south, are further fields beyond which lie the rear gardens of dwellings sited within Stonehill Road and Cherry Trees. The land rises by approximately 1.5 metres from east to west and by some 0.5 metres from north to south. There is a ditch on the southern boundary of the site. Vehicular access to the site runs between 123 and 125 Cambridge Road and serves the Rugby Club and three residential properties (Nos. 125a, 125b and 125c Cambridge Road).
2. The full application, submitted on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2006, proposes to erect 76 affordable dwellings on the site, with associated parking and public open space, together with the provision of an upgraded access road and new signalled junction. The properties would be a mix of bungalows, and two and three storey properties, and would comprise the following mix:
  - a. 18 x 1 bed flats;
  - b. 12 x 2 bed flats;
  - c. 30 x 2 bed houses;
  - d. 2 x 2 bed bungalows;
  - e. 12 x 3 bed houses; and
  - f. 2 x 4 bed houses.
3. The density of the development equates to 42 dwellings per hectare. A total of 90 parking spaces are proposed (consisting of 64 spaces within car courts and 26 spaces within the curtilages of dwellings) as well as 30 cycle spaces (1 per flat).

The scheme also includes 938m<sup>2</sup> of public open space, to include two areas for children's informal play space (L.A.P) and equipped play space (L.E.A.P).

4. The three storey flats would be located away from existing residential properties at the southern end of the site fronting the access, and the two bungalows would be in the north-western corner adjacent to the bungalow at No.37 Westfield. Focal buildings would be provided at the end of each view into the site and car courts utilised to avoid garages within the street scene. The proposed dwellings would comprise a mix of gable and hipped roofs and utilise a combination of local materials, namely buff and red bricks, white render, and slate and brown tiled roofs. A 3 metre wide planting belt is proposed along the western boundary of the site.
5. The application has been accompanied by a number of statements covering the following issues – planning and sustainability, design and access, ecology, drainage and flood risk, noise, and transport.
6. The planning and sustainability statement explains that the housing needs survey conducted by the Council in 2004 identifies a need for at least 106 properties. 29 units have been approved at a site in Granhams Road but there are no other brownfield sites within the village that could meet all, or part, of the remaining need. As Great Shelford is tightly bounded by the Green Belt, it is argued that any exceptions site would require development on Green Belt land. The application site has been selected as it is considered to perform the best sequentially when compared to a number of other possible exceptions sites considered. The site is available, has an appropriate access that can facilitate junction improvements to serve the development whilst providing benefits to the Rugby Club and wider road network, is compatible with surrounding development, and can be incorporated into the landscape with least impact. Other sites considered, all of which are closer to the centre of Great Shelford than the current application site, are as follows:
  - a. Land between Stonehill Road and the cemetery – discounted as limited scope for access and significant impact on landscape;
  - b. Land adjacent to cemetery, northwest of 11 Cambridge Road – discounted as isolated from existing built development, out of keeping with character and pattern of development in the area, significant impact on landscape, area identified as key viewpoint in the Village Design Guide;
  - c. Land between Granhams Road and Macauley Avenue – Restricted vehicular access;
  - d. Land west of High Street – Difficult to integrate development into the landscape, north of site a key viewpoint;
  - e. Land east of Hinton Way and north of Mingle Lane – Vehicular access would necessitate demolition of a dwelling and Circle Anglia are not in a position to fund such a purchase;
  - f. Moores Meadow – Encroachment into open countryside;
  - g. South west quadrant – Site partly within Conservation Area, includes a number of key viewpoints, adjacent to recreation ground;
  - h. Cabbage Moor – Impact on countryside/Green Belt and out of keeping with character of development in the area, constrained access;
  - i. Land north west of Hinton Way – Key viewpoint, unacceptable encroachment into open countryside.

7. The transport assessment argues that the location of the site and local transport services available are such that future residents would have a choice of travel modes for trips to work, shopping and leisure purposes. The traffic generation of the development has been found to be fully capable of being accommodated without any adverse impact upon the surrounding road network. At present, there is poor visibility from the road and Scotsdales, the garden centre opposite, has high levels of queuing traffic. To allow safe access to the development and garden centre, traffic signals, including a controlled crossing, are proposed along Cambridge Road. The application also proposes to widen the existing Rugby Club access to 5.5 metres and to provide a 1.8 metre wide footway on the northern side of the improved access.
8. The Ecological Assessment states that, following a survey of the site, no habitat types of particular conservation interest were recorded.
9. The Flood Risk Assessment proposes the use of sustainable urban drainage techniques in order to manage run off.
10. Due to the proposed introduction of a signalled junction, an air quality assessment, relating to the impact on properties adjoining the access road and fronting Cambridge Road, is in the process of being carried out. In addition, a noise assessment has been undertaken and no mitigation measures considered necessary.

### **Planning History**

11. There is no recent planning history relating to the application site. In the 1970's, there were a number of applications for residential development on a site comprising the present application site and land to the south, all of which were refused (Refs: **C/0664/72/O**, **C/1749/73/F**, **C/0537/73/O** and **C/1763/73/O**). The outline applications were refused as the site was outside the development area and within the proposed Green Belt. The full application for 145 dwellings was refused for the above reasons as well as the following: density out of keeping with the character of the area, inadequate access/highway safety, and inadequacy of the sewage treatment facilities. Application references C/1749/73/F and C/1763/73/O were subsequently dismissed at appeal, with the Inspector commenting that the development of the site would result in the coalescence of Great Shelford and Trumpington and the loss of part of the proposed Green Belt. The Inspector did not comment further on the highway safety and sewage issues given the in principle objections to the development of the site.

### **Planning Policy**

12. **Policy P1/2** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states that development in the countryside will be resisted unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location.
13. **Policy P1/3** of the Structure Plan states that a high standard of design and sustainability will be required for all new development which minimises the need to travel and reduces car dependency. In addition development is expected to provide a sense of place which responds to the local character of the built environment.
14. **Policy P9/2a** of the Structure Plan limits new development within the Green Belt to that required for agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport, cemeteries or other uses appropriate to a rural area.

15. **Policy GB2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 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 (in part) affordable housing in accordance with the 'exceptions policy' where no suitable sites are available outside the Green Belt, and providing development accords with other policies in the Local Plan.
16. Great Shelford is identified within **Policy SE2** of the Local Plan as a Rural Growth Settlement, where development is expected to be sensitive to the character of the area and to the amenities of neighbours. In addition, regard must be paid to whether the village has the necessary infrastructure capacity.
17. **Policy HG8** of the 2004 Local Plan states that, as an exception to the normal operation of the policies of the Plan, planning permission may be granted for schemes of 100% affordable housing designed to meet identified local housing needs on sites within or adjoining villages providing the following criteria are all met:
  - (i) The proposal includes secure arrangements for ensuring that all the dwellings within the scheme provide affordable housing in perpetuity for those in 'housing need' as defined in Policy HG7;
  - (ii) The number, size, design, mix and tenure of the dwellings are all confined to, and appropriate to, the strict extent of the identified local need;
  - (iii) The site of the proposal is well related to the built-up area of the settlement and the scale of the scheme is appropriate to the size and character of the village;
  - (iv) The development does not damage the character of the village or the rural landscape.

The supporting text to this policy explains that national policy allows for the exceptional release of small sites. It also refers to PPG2 'Green Belts' which states that limited affordable housing may be appropriate within the Green Belt, and states: "However, given the nature of the Cambridge Green Belt, which is relatively small in extent, and the need to avoid prejudicing other strategic and local policies, the District Council will implement this policy with caution. Before planning permission is granted for such development, the District Council will have to be assured that no alternative appropriate sites can be found for the scale and type of development proposed and that the scheme fulfils all the criteria set out in this Council's policies, including those relating to the impact of new development on local surroundings."

18. **Policy HG10** of the Local Plan requires residential developments to contain a mix of units providing accommodation in a range of types and sizes.
19. **Policy CS13** of the Local Plan states that, in considering applications for development that might provide opportunities for crime, the Council will seek to ensure that appropriate consideration has been given to relevant aspects of design and layout to minimise the opportunities for crime and the circumstances where fear of crime would be increased.
20. **Policy HG/3** of the Draft Local Development Framework 2006 states, in part, that, in order to ensure sustainable communities, affordable housing will be distributed through development in small groups or clusters. The supporting text to this policy explains that affordable housing should be integrated with market housing and defines small groups or clusters as typically consisting of 6 to 8 units.
21. In addition, **Policy HG/5** of the LDF, which specifically relates to exceptions sites, requires sites to be well related to facilities and services within the village.

## Consultations

22. Comments from the following consultees have not been received to date. The consultation period does not expire until 19<sup>th</sup> December 2006 and any further comments received will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting:
- a. **Great Shelford Parish Council;**
  - b. **The Local Highways Authority;**
  - c. **The Trees and Landscape Officer;**
  - d. **The Ecology Officer;**
  - e. **The Environment Operations Manager;**
  - f. **Anglian Water.**
23. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** raises no objections in principle but expresses concern on the grounds that problems could arise from noise and suggests that a condition be applied to any planning consent to restrict the hours of use of power operated machinery during the construction period. Due to the proximity of the proposed dwellings to the rugby club, the EHO advises that there is a possibility the Council will receive complaints regarding noise from sporting events. It would therefore be prudent to mitigate noise from the rugby club by adding a condition to any consent requiring the double glazing to have a thickness mis-match of at least 2mm and be separated by a gap of at least 12mm. With regards to the issue of lighting, the EHO has a record of only two instances (August 2003 and February 2004) where residents have raised concerns about floodlighting at the rugby club. It is acknowledged that the proposed dwellings will be closer to the Rugby Club than the majority of dwellings in the vicinity, but it cannot be predicted whether further concerns are likely. If complaints are received in the future, Environmental Health Officers would need to investigate it further to establish whether a statutory nuisance exists in respect of artificial light.
24. **The Housing Development Manager** raises no objections, advising that the mix and type of housing meet the needs for Great Shelford.
25. **The Building Inspector** advises that the conceptual drainage design and comments relevant to the Flood Risk Assessment appear to be acceptable. The soakaway design would need to be subject to on site percolation tests, whilst the drainage details are subject to confirmation of site levels.
26. **The Police Architectural Liaison Officer** advises that, although the layout shows some evidence of natural surveillance and defensible space, there are serious shortcomings that could jeopardise any subsequent application for a Secured by Design award, namely:
- a. Dwellings with on plot parking arrangements are generally preferred. Where communal parking courts are necessary they should be in small courts serving a maximum of 6-8 dwellings and be close to the dwellings served. The parking court for plots 39-49 serves 11 dwellings, for plots 50-64 serves 15 dwellings and for plots 66-76 serves 11 dwellings. The size of the parking courts provides a degree of anonymity for potential offenders, a situation not improved where more than one point of access is available such as through communal entrances in flats or via gates as between plots 41 and 44. Plots 66, 71, 72 and 73 have almost no ability to supervise their own parking spaces, whilst the parking courts for plots 39-49 and 66-76 are adjoining meaning that vehicles parked in some spaces can be used as climbing aids to move from one car park to another or to gain access to the roofs of stores 40-49. Uncontrolled access to parking courts

also increases the vulnerability of dwellings with rear gardens backing onto the courts, notably plots 65-76;

- b. The passage between plots 59 and 62 should be redesigned to remove a potential crime/nuisance generator;
  - c. The stores for plots 35-38 conceal the shared access to the rear gardens of plots 32-34 and provide a gathering area. Plots 32-34 have little natural surveillance over this area;
  - d. To enhance security, dwelling frontages should be open to view. The front doors to the bungalows on plots 27 and 28 are set back on the side elevations within car ports. Plots 8, 9, 22-26, 30-34, 40-43, 50-53, 72 and 73 also have front/communal door entrances in recesses or enclosed porches from 750mm to 1000mm deep. Recesses in front doors over 600mm deep should be avoided;
  - e. Access to the rear gardens of plots 4-9 should be controlled by the provision of lockable gates fitted between plots 4 & 5 and 7 & 8 as close as possible to the front build lines.
27. **The Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** raises no objections subject to adequate provision being made for fire hydrants, to be secured by way of a condition or Section 106 Agreement.
28. **The Environment Agency** advises that the site falls within Cell F11 (Floodzone 1 – Operational development 1-5 hectares) of the Standing Advice matrix. As such, this Council is required to comment upon the proposal in respect of flood risk and surface water drainage.

### **Representations**

29. Over 100 letters of objection have been received to date. These are predominantly from local residents in Great Shelford (over 60 objections) and Shelford Rugby Club supporters (over 20 objections), whilst a number of letters have also been received from people living in other parts of the District and Region. The main points raised are:

### ***Traffic and parking issues***

- a. This development, together with the Addenbrookes access road and planned southern fringe housing developments, would have a major impact on traffic volumes along Cambridge Road and result in an increase in traffic using the already busy lights at the Trumpington Road/Waitrose junction;
- b. The provision of traffic lights will upset the flow of traffic in Cambridge Road;
- c. Traffic/parking problems will spill over into Westfield Road and Stonehill Road, both of which are adversely affected when events/rugby matches are held at the Rugby Club;
- d. The proposal does not include sufficient car parking – less than 1.5 spaces per dwelling;
- e. The County Council's traffic projections are inadequate. In a traffic survey carried out in February 2006, the figure had exceeded the LHA's projections for 2008. The LHA's projections do not take account of planned developments in the city and the southern fringe, including 12,000 houses on the former Monsanto site and 2,500 houses on Clay Farm;

- f. The junction plans have not considered the impact of the huge increase in traffic on match and event days at the rugby club. Parking is a big problem on match and training days on the approach road, in adjoining roads and in the car park;
- g. Nos. 125 and 123 Cambridge Road will have problems turning right out of their properties towards Great Shelford;
- h. People would be reliant on cars as there are no local services and public transport is inadequate. There is no Sunday bus service;

### ***Services/Facilities***

- a. There are presently insufficient spaces in local schools for children in the village and some have to travel outside the immediate area. The local primary school is oversubscribed and the proposal will create even more demand for school places. New schools will be delivered as part of the developments in the southern fringe but these are not likely to be available within the timescale of this proposal;
- b. The houses are intended for low income families who would have a need for local amenities such as shops, health services or schools within walking distance. The village shops are 1.5 miles away;
- c. The health centre and dental practices are fully subscribed;
- d. There are no play areas for children, either on the estate or within walking distance. The nearest recreation ground is nearly 2 miles away. This would put pressure on the rugby club which will become an unofficial play area;

### ***Impact on rugby club and future residents***

- a. The proposal would result in housing sited close to the Rugby Club. This would lead to complaints from future residents on the grounds of noise and light pollution, thereby threatening the future of the rugby club. This is not just a local rugby facility but a major youth sports centre of regional significance. The pavilion is also used to hold a number of events;
- b. If future residents sign an agreement not to object to light/noise pollution from the rugby club, this would not be legally binding;
- c. Rugby club visitors, who currently park in the approach roads and sometimes on the application site itself, would be likely to park in the new development leading to conflict and to obstruction for emergency vehicles;
- d. There would be safety and security implications to the rugby club as a result of the proximity of this housing development;
- e. The rugby club is a non-profit making club. It is presently attractive to people due to its quiet location, well away from houses, and easy parking. These benefits would disappear resulting in less support and sponsorship, thereby threatening the future of the club;
- f. The rugby club has a right of way over the existing access and this has not been considered as part of the proposed access works;

### ***Impact on character of area***

- a. Three storey dwellings would be out of character with surrounding properties, the majority of which are bungalows. The character of this part of Shelford is low density small scale edge of village housing;

- b. Adjoining properties are subject to covenants limiting development to single storey only;
- c. An application for a two storey house at 11a Westfield was refused before permission was given for a bungalow;

***Residential amenity***

- a. The dwellings will overlook neighbours, including No.31 Westfield Road and No.3 Walnut Drive;
- b. The development would result in a loss of sunlight to No.3 Walnut Drive;
- c. There would be noise disturbance to properties in Westfield Road from parking spaces to the rear of plots 14-17;
- d. The access road will lead to a loss of amenity to existing residential properties on either side of the access road;

***Need for the development***

- a. An affordable housing scheme of this size is not required. The Parish Council believes the need to be around 20 units;
- b. The proposal would be contrary to Circular 06/98 (Planning and Affordable Housing) which states that local authorities should encourage the development of mixed and balanced communities in order to avoid areas of social exclusion. Great Shelford already has a large number of smaller cheaper houses but these are evenly distributed throughout the village and a good degree of social cohesion has been achieved;

**(Note:** Circular 06/98 has now cancelled by Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS), Housing).

***Principle in the Green Belt***

- a. The Green Belt has already been considerably eroded in the southern fringe. The limited amount of Green Belt left should be protected;
- a. Sites in the Green Belt may exceptionally be released for small scale low cost housing schemes but this proposal is too large to meet the criteria in PPG2;

***Other***

- a. If approved, this application will set a precedent for the development of the adjoining land to the south;
- b. The addition of traffic lights will increase noise and air pollution due to higher level of stationary traffic;
- b. Previous applications have been refused on the grounds of inadequate sewers. These have not been upgraded since so that argument must still stand;

**Planning Comments – Key Issues**

- 30. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to:

- i. The need for the development;
- ii. Relationship of site to local services/facilities;
- iii. Impact upon the character of the area;
- iv. Impact upon the landscape and Green Belt;
- v. Impact upon residential amenity;
- vi. Impact upon the Rugby Club;
- vii. Highway safety; and
- viii. Impact upon trees.

***The need for the development***

- 31. The site lies outside the Great Shelford village framework and within the countryside and Cambridge Green Belt, where the erection of housing is contrary to general planning policies. This proposal, however, is for a scheme of 100% affordable dwellings which has been put forward in response to a defined local need for low-cost housing and the proposal therefore needs to be considered in terms of the rural exceptions policy for housing (Policy HG8 of the Local Plan).
- 32. The Housing Development Manager has confirmed that this application, in terms of the mix and type of dwellings proposed, meets the defined affordable housing need in Great Shelford, and is therefore supportive of the application.
- 33. In Green Belt locations, planning policies state that affordable housing schemes can only be favourably considered where it can be demonstrated that no alternative non Green Belt sites are available. Great Shelford is entirely surrounded by Green Belt land and, to the best of my knowledge, there are no sizeable brownfield sites available within the village other than the site with extant permission on Granhams Road. Moreover under Local Plan 2004 Policy HG7, affordable housing will only be provided at approximately 30% of the number of dwellings within schemes of more than 10 dwellings on sites within the framework. It is therefore clearly not possible to meet the affordable housing need in Great Shelford without encroaching upon areas of Green Belt land.

***Services/Facilities***

- 34. The site lies at the northern extremity of Great Shelford. Although Great Shelford is a large village with an extremely good range of shops, services and facilities, the majority of these are located in the centre of the village (within the High Street and Woollards Lane), at least 1.5 kilometres to the south of the site. Emerging Policy HG/5 of the LDF requires exceptions sites to be well related to facilities and services within the village. At 1.5 kilometres away, I believe it is highly probable that the majority of residents within this development would drive rather than walk or cycle to the centre of the village. As such, I consider this site to be too isolated from Great Shelford to sustain a development of the scale proposed.
- 35. Policy HG/3 of the LDF requires the distribution of affordable housing throughout development in small groups or clusters typically consisting of 6 to 8 units, whilst the Government's PPS on housing aims to create mixed communities and to enable "small sites to be used specifically for affordable housing in small rural communities that would not normally be used for housing because, for example, they are subject to policies of restraint". The erection of 76 affordable dwellings in one location would be contrary to these aims and should therefore be resisted.
- 36. Within the accompanying planning and sustainability statement, a number of other possible exceptions sites around Great Shelford have been considered and discounted. All of these alternative sites are closer to the centre of the village, and better related to existing services and facilities, than the presently proposed

application site. I have not had an opportunity to consider each of these sites in any detail, although I do agree that the development of any land adjacent to key viewpoints should be strongly discouraged. Nevertheless, I am not convinced that the application adequately demonstrates that the application site is the only location where Great Shelford's affordable housing need can be satisfied. In particular, the site bounded by Hinton Way/Mingle Lane appears to offer some potential.

37. Many local residents have expressed concern about the lack of capacity within local schools and surgeries to cater for the demands of this development. The primary school, in particular, is presently full and I am aware that the County Education Officer, in responses to recent applications for housing in Great Shelford, has requested financial contributions towards the provision of primary school places. I therefore have serious concerns about the infrastructure capacity within the village and the pressure this development would place upon already over-stretched services.

***Impact upon the character of the area, landscape and Green Belt***

38. The application site is surrounded predominantly by bungalows. The proposal includes a mix of bungalows, and two and three storey (up to 11 metre high) properties. Whilst the palette of materials and design of the dwellings is generally in keeping with the character of Great Shelford, it is considered that the erection of three storey dwellings in this location would have a very harmful impact upon the character of the landscape and upon the openness of the Green Belt, and the application is therefore considered to be unacceptable in this respect.
39. With regards to the relationship of the dwellings to each other, the scheme proposes mainly gable ended buff/red brick and slate/tile properties. Six of the plots, however, (plots 14-19 inclusive) incorporate hipped roofs and, whilst reflective of the character of many properties within Cambridge Road and Great Shelford, appear incongruous within the context of this particular development scheme.
40. In my opinion the scale of the development does not comply with Government and Local Plan Green Belt Policies aimed at providing limited affordable housing development on small sites.

***Residential amenity***

41. There are a number of bungalows directly abutting the application site, notably Nos. 11a, 31 and 37 Westfield to the north, and Nos. 125a-c Cambridge Road, and 2 & 3 Walnut Drive to the east. Single storey dwellings are proposed in the north-western corner of the site, adjacent to No.37 Westfield Road, and I am satisfied that the occupiers of No.37 would not suffer undue harm by reason of loss of light/overlooking etc. Nos. 11a and 31 Westfield Road, however, would, in my opinion, be seriously overlooked by the proposed dwellings. The distance between the proposed two storey dwelling on plot 22, which has first floor bedroom windows in its north elevation, and what appears to be a ground floor dining room window in No.31's south elevation, would be just 14 metres. In addition, there is only 15-16 metres between Plot 11's first floor rear bedroom windows and windows serving a bedroom and kitchen within the south elevation of No.11a Westfield Road. Whilst occupiers of the properties to the east would suffer some degree of overlooking, there would be a distance of nearly 30 metres between opposing windows, and I therefore do not consider the impact to be sufficiently harmful to substantiate a refusal of the application on this basis.
42. I am satisfied that occupiers of dwellings in Westfield Road would not suffer undue noise and disturbance from the parking court serving Plots 14 –17. In addition, there

would not be a serious loss of sunlight to No.3 Walnut Drive, which is located some 30 metres away from the two storey dwelling proposed to the west.

#### ***Amenities of future residents/ viability of the Rugby Club***

43. Much concern has been raised within responses received to date about the proximity of the development to the Rugby Club and the likelihood of complaints from future residents about noise, traffic and light pollution from the Rugby Club's activities. The Chief Environmental Health Officer has expressed concern about noise disturbance to future residents but considers that this could be overcome by way of a condition relating to the type of double glazing used.
44. Of greater concern, is the Environmental Health Officer's response regarding future complaints about the floodlighting and the reference to legislation that would enable action to be taken if a statutory nuisance was proven to exist. Given that complaints of this nature could seriously curtail the Rugby Club's activities, support should not be given to the application unless it can be clearly demonstrated that residents would not suffer undue disturbance from the existing floodlighting. My opinion is that any development on this site should be sited much further away from the Rugby Club (notably the car park, floodlit playing fields and the pavilion) with space allowed for a significant belt of planting between the two.

#### ***Highway safety/ Parking Issues***

45. The comments of the Local Highways Authority, in respect of the proposed junction improvements, access works and site layout, have not been received to date and will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.
46. With regards to the issue of parking, the site proposes 76 dwellings and just 90 parking spaces, a ratio of just under 1.2 spaces per dwelling. To comply with this Authority's parking standards, 1.75 spaces per dwelling (namely 1.5 resident spaces and 0.25 visitor spaces per dwelling) should be provided, resulting in a requirement for 133 spaces. The number of car parking spaces provided clearly falls well short of this number and the proposal is therefore likely to result in on-street parking, as well as pressure for parking within the approach road and surrounding roads, such as Stonehill Road and Westfield Road, both of which already have serious on-street parking problems.

#### ***Security Issues***

47. The Police Architectural Liaison Officer has raised many concerns about the layout, particularly in respect of the central area of the development and the size of the parking courts to the rear of plots 39-76. A number of the changes recommended by the PALO, such as the provision of on-plot parking spaces throughout the development, would have serious consequences for the design of the scheme. However, the size of the parking courts, the proximity of adjoining parking courts and the proximity of parking spaces to sheds are all problems that should be designed out of any residential scheme.

#### ***Impact on trees***

48. There are no trees on the application site itself. However, there are a number of protected trees within the front garden of No.125 Cambridge Road, one of which is close to the south-eastern corner of that property and has not been shown within the application. The proposed access works would fall under the canopy of this tree and I am therefore awaiting the comments of the Council's Trees and Landscape Officer in respect of this issue.

## **Conclusion**

49. It is considered that the harm caused by the scale and extent of this particular proposal outweighs the benefits of bringing forward affordable housing, for which a need has been identified in Great Shelford.

## **Recommendation**

50. Delegated powers are sought to refuse the application for the following reasons: (Summarised)
1. The application has not demonstrated to the Authority's satisfaction that Great Shelford's affordable housing needs must be accommodated on this site and that no suitable alternative sites are available, contrary to Policy HG8 of the 2004 Local Plan;
  2. The number of affordable dwellings proposed in one location is contrary to the aims of PPG2 and Policy HG8 of the Local Plan, which seek to protect the Green Belt, and to Policy HG/3 of the LDF which, in order to achieve mixed, balanced and sustainable communities, seek to ensure that affordable housing is delivered in small clusters, typically consisting of 6-8 dwellings;
  3. The site is isolated from and not within easy walking distance of the services and facilities within the village, contrary to Policy P1/3 of the Structure Plan and to the aims of Policy HG/5 of the Draft Local Development Framework 2006;
  4. Lack of infrastructure capacity, particularly within the local primary school, to cater for the demands of the development, contrary to Policy SE2 of the 2004 Local Plan;
  5. The proposed three storey dwellings would be unduly prominent and have a harmful visual impact upon the surrounding landscape and upon the openness of the Green Belt, contrary to Policies P1/3 of the Structure Plan and SE2, GB2 and HG8 of the Local Plan;
  6. The design of the hipped roof dwellings proposed on plots 14-19 inclusive does not relate well to the design of the remaining properties, contrary to Policies P1/3 of the Structure Plan and SE2 and HG8 of the Local Plan;
  7. Overlooking of Nos. 11a and 31 Westfield from Plots 11 and 22 respectively – contrary to Policy SE2 of the 2004 Local Plan;
  8. By virtue of the design and layout of the scheme, particularly the size of the parking courts, the development provides opportunities for crime, contrary to Policy CS13 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004;
  9. The application fails to demonstrate that the amenities of future residents would not be unduly harmed by floodlighting at the existing Rugby Club, and that the development would not be likely to result in complaints from future residents, thereby potentially curtailing future activities at the Rugby Club and ultimately threatening the viability of this important local and regional facility;
  10. The proposed development provides just 90 parking spaces for 76 dwellings, well short of the 133 spaces required by the parking standards set out within Appendix 7/1 of the 2004 Local Plan;

**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/2104/06/F, C/0664/72/O, C/1749/73/F, C/0537/73/O and C/1763/73/O

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