

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

5th March 2008

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Corporate Manager - Planning and Sustainable Communities

**S/1068/07/F & S/1125/07/F - GIRTON
S/1068/07/F - Erection of Dwelling and Garage following
Demolition of Existing Bungalow and
S/1125/07/F - Dwelling and Garage
at 2 and Rear of 2 Pepys Way for Selective Developments**

Recommendation: Approval
Dates for Determination: 27th July and 6th August 2007 respectively

Members will visit the sites on Wednesday 5th March 2008.

Site and Proposals

1. Pepys Way is situated to the north side of the A14 and links Cambridge Road (Girton Road) to the cul-de-sac development of St Vincent's Close and Gifford's Close. The site is within the Girton village framework.
2. Currently on the 0.125 ha site is the bungalow of no. 2 Pepys Way, a cream rendered dwelling with a red brick plinth under a red plain tiled roof. Vehicular access is situated to the east side of the plot. The dwelling has a rear garden some 66 metres in length with several trees and hedges growing within it. The eastern front boundary consists of a 1m high fence, which increases to 2.5m high trees and bushes to the side and rear of the dwelling. Beyond this boundary are the houses of Girton Road.
3. The neighbouring property at no. 4 is red brick detached bungalow, under a red tiled roof. A carport stretches from the east elevation of the bungalow across the driveway, and a garage is situated to the rear of this. The dwelling has two kitchen windows and a side door in its east elevation. The boundary with no. 2 is a wooden panel fence to the front, ranging in height from 0.5m to 2m. The side and rear boundary is also a 2m high wooden panel fence.
4. To the southeast of the site and on the south side of Pepys Way is Girton Surgery. This has a small side car-park, but users regularly park to the side of the road when visiting the premises. The site falls within the catchment for Impington Village College, the local secondary school. This school is operating on or close to capacity and is expected to continue doing so for the foreseeable future due to projected population figures from additional housing within the catchment area.
5. The applications, received 1st June and 11th June 2007, respectively, propose to demolish the bungalow to the front and replace this with a four bedroom dwelling and to erect a new four bedroom dwelling to the rear therefore a net gain of one dwelling. Double garages are also proposed with each dwelling. The design of each dwelling is similar, incorporating first floor accommodation within the roof, lit by dormer windows and rooflights. The eaves height, ridge height and length of a rear projecting wing were reduced by amended plans franked 9th January 2008. Garage ridge heights were also reduced.



Crown Copyright (c) Licence no. 100022500 2008
Ordnance Survey



Reproduced from the 2008 Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's stationary office (c) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Scale 1/1250 Date 20/2/2008

Centre = 542483 E 261676 N

March 08 Planning Committee



Reproduced from the 2008 Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's stationary office (c) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Scale 1/1250 Date 20/2/2008

Centre = 542501 E 261682 N

March 08 Planning Committee

Planning History

6. Planning permission was refused in 2005 on four dwellings following the demolition of the existing bungalow Ref **S/1005/05/F** on four grounds, 1) incongruous development by reason of design, layout, out of keeping with character of area. 2) vehicular access close of boundary with No 4 would cause considerable noise and disturbance 3) lack of car parking 4) piecemeal development resulting in undesirable change to pattern of development. An appeal was dismissed in April 2006 on grounds of cramped form of development, harmful to the character and appearance of the village, over dominance of hard surfaces with little scope for soft landscaping and lack of car parking. The Inspector did not consider that noise and disturbance through use of a vehicular access alongside No. 4 Pepys Way was justified as a reason for refusal nor the piecemeal development.
7. Planning permission was refused in February 2006 for erection of four dwellings following the demolition of the existing bungalow (**S/0012/06/F**). Three grounds for refusal 1) incongruous development by reason of design, layout, out of keeping with character of area. 2) Lack of car parking 3) piecemeal development resulting in undesirable change to pattern of development.

Planning Policy

The Development Plan comprises the approved Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy DPD and Development Control Policies 2007.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:

8. **P1/3 Sustainable Design in Built Development** requires a high standard of design and sustainability for all new development, providing a sense of place appropriate to the location, efficient use of energy and resources and account to be taken of community requirements.

Local Development Framework 2007:

9. **ST/6 Group Village.** Residential development up to 8 dwellings within the village framework will be permitted in Girton.
10. **DP/1 Sustainable Development** only permits development where it is demonstrated that it is consistent with the principles of sustainable development. The policy lists the main considerations in assessing whether development meets this requirement.
11. **DP/2 Design of New Development** requires all new development to be of a high quality design and indicates the specific elements to be achieved where appropriate. It also sets out the requirements for Design and Access Statements.
12. **DP/3 Development Criteria** sets out what all new development should provide, as appropriate to its nature, scale and economic viability and clearly sets out circumstances where development will not be granted on grounds of an unacceptable adverse impact e.g. residential amenity and traffic generation.
13. **DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments** indicates that permission will only be granted for proposals that have made suitable arrangements for provision of infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable, such as public open space.

14. **DP/7 Development Frameworks** redevelopment of unallocated land within development frameworks will be permitted subject to the site not being an essential part of local character, development would be sensitive to the character of the location and amenities of neighbours.
15. **HG/1 Housing Density** - Net densities of at least 30 dwelling per hectare should be achieved unless exceptional local circumstances require a different treatment.
16. **SF/10 Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments.** All residential developments will be required to contribute towards Outdoor Playing Space and Informal Open Space in accordance with the standards in Policy SF/11
17. **TR/2 Car and Cycle Standards. Car and Cycle Parking** should be provided with the maximum and minimum standards respectively to reduce over reliance on the car.

Consultation

A. S/1068/07/F

18. **Girton Parish Council** - refuse. Objects as it will have a detrimental affect on the street scene and traffic congestion will be increased, especially with its close proximity to the Doctor's Surgery. Also over-development of the site. The PC endorses the letter submitted by local residents to the District Council.
19. **County Highways Authority:** The proposed access should allow for two cars to pass. 2m by 2m pedestrian visibility splays must be provided by condition and these must be kept clear of obstruction. Site must also retain turning space within curtilage. The proposal is unlikely to intensify the use to such a degree as to have a significant effect upon the public highway network.
20. **Trees and Landscape Officer:** No objection subject to condition of boundary treatments.

Representations

21. Two letters of objections received. One letter is signed by 11 residents from 10 properties in Girton Road. These letters are summarised as follows:
 - a) Congest 2 Pepys Way with two large properties with limited access for emergency vehicles.
 - b) Not in keeping with the appearance of the area which is full of 1930s and 1940 dwellings.
 - c) Conflicts with government policy on affordable housing.
 - d) Impact on traffic at junction of Girton Road/Pepys Way.
 - e) Creates further disruption for patients, many of them pensioners at the Surgery.
 - f) Destroy wildlife.
 - g) Expose back of garden to prowlers with loss of security.
 - h) Loss of privacy, particularly due to limited space between new houses and Girton Road boundaries.
 - i) Restrict views.
 - j) Overdeveloped.

Amended Consultation 9th January 2008

22. **Girton Parish Council** - refuse. Members deprecated the fact that a contiguous neighbour had not been notified of the application. It was noted that this was refused previously, no vote possible now as no quorate but request that the Parish be informed when application is to be considered by SCDC Planning Committee.
23. **Design Officer** - The reduction in the size of dwelling and garage is an improvement. Whilst the design is considered not good architecture it is not bad enough to refuse.

Representations

24. Two letters of objections received. One letter signed by 30 residents from 16 properties in Girton Road and Pepys Way. These letters reiterate the grounds of objection in paragraph 21 above. One, from the occupiers of 12 Pepys Way, object unless both plots have parking for the appropriate number of cars for the size of dwelling.
25. The other letter accepts that the bungalow at No. 2 Pepys Way may have to be demolished and replaced by another, similar property, an additional property to the rear would render the plot grossly overdeveloped.

B. S/1125/07/F

26. **Girton Parish Council** - refuse. Objects as it will have a detrimental affect on street scene and traffic congestion will be increased, especially with its close proximity to the Doctor's Surgery. Also over-development of the site. The PC endorses the letter submitted by local residents to the District Council.
27. **County Highways Authority:** The proposed access should allow for two cars to pass. 2m by 2m pedestrian visibility splays must be provided by condition and these must be kept clear of obstruction. Site must also retain turning space within curtilage. The proposal is unlikely to intensify the use to such a degree as to have a significant effect upon highway network.
28. **Trees and Landscape Officer:** No objection subject to condition of boundary treatments

Representations

29. Three letters of objections received. One letter signed by 11 residents from 10 properties in Girton Road. These letters are summarised as follows:
 - a) Congest 2 Pepys Way with two large properties with limited access for emergency vehicles.
 - b) Not in keeping with the appearance of the area which is full of 1930s and 1940 dwellings.
 - c) Conflicts with government policy on affordable housing.
 - d) Impact on traffic at junction of Girton Road/Pepys Way.
 - e) Creates further disruption for patients, many of them pensioners at the Surgery.
 - f) Destroy wildlife.
 - g) Expose back of garden to prowlers with loss of security.
 - h) Loss of privacy, particularly due to limited space between new houses and Girton Road boundaries.
 - i) Restrict views.
 - j) Overdeveloped.

30. Residents at No. 1 Pepys Way are concerned about highway safety in the vicinity of the Doctor's Surgery.

Amended Consultation 9th January 2008

31. **Girton Parish Council** - Refuse. Members deprecated the fact that a contiguous neighbour had not been notified of the application. It was noted that this was refused previously, no vote possible now as no quorate but request that the Parish be informed when application is to be considered by SCDC Planning Committee.
32. **Design Officer** - The reduction in the size of dwelling and garage is an improvement. Whilst design is considered not good architecture it is not bad enough to refuse.

Representations

33. Three letters of objections received. One letter signed by 30 residents from 16 properties in Girton Road and Pepys Way. These letters reiterate the grounds of objection in paragraph 29 above. One, from the occupiers of 12 Pepys Way, object unless both plots have parking for the appropriate number of cars for the size of dwelling.
34. The other letter accepts that the bungalow at No. 2 Pepys Way may have to be demolished and replaced by another, similar property, an additional property to the rear would render the plot grossly overdeveloped.
35. In addition to earlier comments, the occupiers of No. 1 Pepys Way consider safety problems would be exacerbated by construction traffic accessing the St Vincents Close development. It would also be wrong to demolish the existing building which is in character with the area. A new building would not fit in.

Planning Comments

36. Since the appeal decision in 2006 the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies have been adopted by the Council. There is a slight change in emphasis in that backland development does not have a specific policy. The development is therefore judged on impact on character of area and whether it preserves or enhances the character of the local area. The resulting development will introduce a development at the rear of 2 Pepys Way which is markedly different to the pattern of development. However being different does not necessarily mean that it does not preserve its character. In this case the development in depth is different to the pattern of development but it is executed in such a way that there is no significant visual harm to the character of the area to warrant a refusal. The Inspector, whilst considering a higher density development of 4 dwellings, was more concerned with the impact on the street scene than the acknowledged different pattern of development. The applicant has addressed the Inspector's concerns regarding the impact on street scene in that the replacement dwelling will be on the same building line as the existing bungalow thus preserving the streetscene with the retention of the front garden. The new dwelling will be larger than the existing bungalow but will not look out of place in the streetscene. The development is not overdeveloped as there is ample space for each site. Indeed at a density of 16 dwellings per hectare, the scheme could be criticised for not making best use of brownfield land. However, a higher density would not preserve the character of the area, which is developed at approximately 13 dph, and would therefore be contrary to Policy DP/2.

Highways

37. Concerns have been raised about the impact on congestion in Pepys Way and the junction with Girton Road and the proximity of the Doctor's Surgery. The Highways Authority has clearly stated that the proposal is unlikely to intensify the use to such a degree as to have a significant effect upon highway network. It is clear that there are no highways objections, particularly as each dwelling would have a minimum of two parking spaces and the Inspector had no objection to the creation of an access at this position.

Residential Amenity

38. The dwellings have been designed to minimise the loss of privacy with the use of roof lights to the rear wing together with floor levels being shown to be 1.68m below these roof lights. The dwelling to the rear has the dormer window facing north so that these main windows are not facing the habitable windows of the properties in Girton Road or Pepys Way. The dwelling itself will be located 37m and 46m from the nearest neighbouring dwellings. The replacement dwelling has also been designed with similar rooflights and floor levels.
39. The Inspector did not consider that the introduction of the drive would result in significant harm to the amenities of the occupier of Number 4 and this was for a development of four dwellings. The impact for two would be significantly less.

Design

40. The design is unusual for this location as the prevailing style of development is 1930/40s detached houses / bungalows. However, the asymmetric roof to the principal wing and the low eaves brings the height down to 7.6 metres ridge (6.5 metres to the rear projecting wing) and eaves ranging in height from 2.4m to 4m. Given that the replacement dwelling will be set back and there is opportunity to enhance the front garden landscaping it will not impact on the street scene in an adverse way.

Affordable Housing

41. The affordable housing policy applies on net gain of two or more dwellings. This site is a net gain of one and therefore the policy does not apply.

Public Open Space

42. The development requires a financial contribution towards public open space. The applicant has agreed to this which will be in the region of around £6000.

Recommendation

43. That the proposals **S/1068/07/F** and **S/1125/07/F**, as amended by letter dated 22nd December 2007, and plans franked 9th January 2008, be approved subject to conditions to include a scheme of public open space in accordance with Policy SF/10 of the LDF.

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

- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2007 and Development Control Policies 2007
- Planning Files S/1005/05/F, S/0012/06/F, S/1068/07/F & S/1125/07/F

Contact Officer: Frances Fry –Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713252