

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

3<sup>rd</sup> December 2008

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

---

### **S/1628/08/F- BARRINGTON**

**New Dwelling at Land Adjacent 17 Orwell Road for Landmark Real Estate**

**Recommendation: Refusal**

**Date for Determination: 14<sup>th</sup> November 2008**

#### **Notes:**

**This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination at the request of the Local Member, Councillor Bird, for the same reasons as that of the Parish Council.**

#### **Site and Proposal**

1. The site comprises 1650m<sup>2</sup>. The front 0.56 ha of the site is occupied by buildings, which are located within the village framework for Barrington; it is outside the Conservation Area by some 85m but west and opposite the nearest Listed Building, No. 14 Orwell Road. To the north west of the site is Orwell Terrace, a row of 8 terraced properties whose rear gardens almost abut the application site, separated only by a small private footpath that is used to access the rear of those properties. This boundary currently comprises single storey outbuildings and mature hedging. To the North and East of the site across Orwell Road are farm buildings and predominately open countryside comprising an Iron Age settlement and Anglo Saxon burial ground. To the south and southeast is open countryside and the garden of No. 17 Hillside.
2. The full planning application, received 19<sup>th</sup> September 2008 proposes demolition of the existing single storey outbuildings and replacement with a new two storey detached dwelling house. The height to the eaves varies from front to back comprising approximately 2.4m at the front and 3.4m and 4.5m at the back. Height to the ridge also varies from front to back measuring between 5.5 and 7.2 metres high. The dwelling has been sited approximately between 13/14 metres from the neighbouring properties to the North West. The house would incorporate four bedrooms and a forward projecting pitched roof 'cart-lodge' to accommodate two cars.
3. The density of the scheme, incorporating No.17 Hillside, equates to 12 dwellings per hectare.

#### **Planning History**

4. **S/1437/07/F** was submitted in July 2007 for the erection of a detached dwelling, and an extension to the existing dwelling at No. 17 Hillside. The proposed extension to No. 17 was seen as acceptable. The proposed dwelling raised concern with officers due to its overbearing impact on the occupiers of Orwell Terrace and the scheme was



Crown Copyright (c) Licence no. 100022500 2008



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 17/11/2008

Centre = 538656 E 249580 N

December 2008 Planning Committee

recommended to Committee for refusal. The new dwelling was subsequently omitted from the application, which was approved as amended.

5. A revised scheme submitted under **S/2416/07/F** was a result of negotiations. This scheme was very similar though slight reductions were made to the ridge heights and distances from the occupiers of Orwell Terrace to help overcome overbearing impact.
6. Despite an officer recommendation for approval based on the alterations to its design the application was referred to March Planning Committee and subsequently refused due to its mass, scale and siting being out of keeping with the spacious character of this part of the village, to having an adverse impact on the occupiers of Orwell Terrace by reason of being overbearing and causing loss of light and inadequate visibility splays harming highway safety.

### **Planning Policy**

7. **Policy ST/6** of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy lists Barrington as a Group Village.
8. **Policy DP/2** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2007 (LDFDCP) addresses the design of new development. It states, in part, that all new development must be of high quality design and should preserve or enhance the character of the local area and be compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale, mass, form, siting, design, proportion, materials, texture and colour in relation to the surrounding area.
9. **Policy DP/3** of the LDFDCP addresses development criteria. It states, in part, that planning permission will not be granted where the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity or village character. All development should provide appropriate access from the highway network.
10. **Policy DP/7** of the LDFDCP permits development and redevelopment of unallocated land and buildings within development frameworks, provided, inter alia, that the site does not form an essential part of the local character, and development would be sensitive to the character of the location, local features of landscape, ecological or historic importance and the amenity of neighbours
11. **Policy HG/1** of the LDFDCP aims to achieve residential net residential densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare unless there are exceptional local circumstances that require a different treatment.
12. **Policy SF/10 'Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments'** states all residential developments will be required to contribute towards Outdoor Playing Space (including children's play space and formal outdoor sports facilities) and Informal Open Space to meet the additional need generated by the development in accordance with the standards in **Policy SF/11**.
13. **Policy SF/11 'Open Space Standards'**. The minimum standard for outdoor play space and informal open space is 2.8 hectares per 1,000 people, comprising:
  - (a) Outdoor Sport - 1.6 hectares per 1,000 people
  - (b) Children's Playspace - 0.8 hectares per 1,000 people
  - (c) Informal Open Space - 0.4 hectares per 1,000 people

## Consultation

14. **Barrington Parish Council** – Recommends refusal. The comments are as follows:

“The Parish Council noted the changes made to the previous application for this site in order to bring forward this new one. The Parish Council consider that this new design for a large house would present as a large mass to the houses in Orwell Terrace, in addition to becoming a large development in comparison with the majority of nearby dwellings. There is insufficient parking and turning area on site for visitors and residents. Although the proposed house has been set back a little further from the road, exit from the premises would be difficult due to poor visibility and the speed and volume of traffic in this 40mph which is well-used by local and HGV traffic both by CEMEX and passing through to avoid Cambridge. The plot is not generous. There is no possibility of screening from Orwell Terrace or the road. Concerns were expressed again for this application about the ability of the sewers to cope with the development and these concerns remain constant in light of cumulative development by the owners of the site of this former working farm. The Parish Council did not support this application”.

**Local Highway Authority** has made the following comments:

15. The applicant shows on drawing number 200809/10 Revision D that they can achieve 2.0m x 70m in a north westerly direction and 2.0m x 57m (this should be 59m as a minimum in MFS) in a south easterly direction which the Highway Authority do not believe to be sufficient inter-vehicle visibility from the proposed development. Within the Access Appraisal it states that Orwell Road is a quiet country road that serves as a link between two villages....’ which is outside the definition of rural lanes contained within Manual for Streets.
16. The Highway Authority wishes to raise an objection to the above planning application in its current format.
17. Notwithstanding this objection, if this Council is minded to approve the application, a condition requiring that the manoeuvring area as shown on the drawings is maintained so that it is free of any obstruction that would prevent a domestic vehicle from being able to manoeuvre with ease so it may enter and leave the property in a forward gear is recommended.
18. The applicant should provide a method statement relating to the process of demolition and construction and any effects this may have on the adopted public highway. In particular reference should be made to control of debris, mud & dust, pedestrian & vehicle movements and the control of contractors parking.
19. **The Environment Agency** commented on the earlier application (S/1437/07/F) for a dwelling. It did not object to the scheme but included informatives and comments regarding drainage on the site. It also recommended that the Councils Engineer should be consulted in respect of local ‘Award Drains’.
20. **Local Authority Drainage Manager** - no comments have been received. (There do not appear to be any nearby awarded watercourses).

## Representations

21. An email has been received from Councillor Bird with reference to the concerns held by Barrington Parish Council. He has referred the application to Planning Committee

as is it felt there are additional reasons, other than highway safety, that need to be addressed at Committee.

22. A letter received from the occupier of No. 2 Orwell Terrace raises the following objections:
- (a) Overshadowing and light
  - (b) Overbearing and impact on privacy
  - (c) Out of keeping
  - (d) Development will set a precedent
23. A letter received from the occupier of No. 4 Orwell Terrace raises objections regarding:
- (a) Overshadowing and loss of light
  - (b) Overbearing
  - (c) Inappropriate density
  - (d) Inappropriate and poor design
  - (e) Alteration of roofline is not sufficient to make a material difference.

#### **Planning Comments – Key Issues**

24. Having regard to the presumption in favour of development within the village framework, the key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:
- (a) Impact upon residential amenity,
  - (b) Impact upon highway safety.
  - (c) Impact on the character of the surrounding area

#### ***Changes since the earlier application***

25. The originally submitted scheme comprised a dwelling of approximately 155.72m<sup>2</sup>. The new scheme comprises 215m<sup>2</sup> including the garage space. The design approach is very different to the earlier scheme in that the architect has tried to keep the ridge and eave heights to a minimum where they face the gardens of Orwell Terrace. The main bulk of the proposed dwelling runs parallel to Orwell Road and the forward projecting element is proposed as an open cart lodge. This has been reduced in length and no longer sits hard against the public footpath. Drawing 200809/09 Revision A shows the existing outline of the outbuildings with that of the proposed and the existing outline of No. 17 Orwell Road.

#### ***Impact on the Neighbouring properties.***

26. The proposed dwelling is to be located very close to the boundary of the neighbouring access way, particularly towards the rear of the property closest to the properties No. 2 and 3 Orwell Terrace.
27. The height of the proposed dwelling varies as the ground levels differ slightly from the front to the rear of the site. The height of the building at the front of the site measures at 5.4 metres to the ridge; the ridge height of the centre element steps up to measures 6.5 metres and to the rear of the property the ridge height measures 7.2 metres. The three different ridge heights help to break up the bulk of the northwest façade.

28. The garden of No. 1 Orwell Terrace wraps around its property and therefore the openness of the garden helps reduce any impact the new dwelling would have on neighbour amenity, particularly with reference to being overbearing and more so now that the height has been reduced and the built form set back into the site. There is no significant loss of light to this garden and therefore the impact of the new development minimal.
29. The gardens of No. 2 and 3 already have various outbuildings located in the application site close to their southeast boundaries. The development is taller than the existing buildings and the scheme, in terms of its scale and massing, is a large improvement to the original application. A large tree in the rear garden of No. 2 screens the development, though there is no protection of this tree if the occupiers/owners wish to remove it in the future.
30. The height of the proposed property even at its tallest point is sufficiently distant (approximately 14 metres) not to cause an adverse loss of sunlight or daylight to the rear of the properties in Orwell Terrace.
31. The windows proposed in the north west elevation are proposed at ground floor only, are high level and thus overlooking to the properties of Orwell Terrace is not considered to be a problem.
32. The changes in this scheme to the original design and the application recently refused have considerably helped to address the overbearing impact of the proposal on its neighbours to an acceptable degree. I am of the view that the architect has successfully taken on board the second reason for refusal in the earlier application.

#### ***Impact on Highway Safety***

33. It has been confirmed that the Local Highway Authority cannot support the scheme, as the correct visibility splays cannot be achieved on site and, therefore, the additional traffic generated by the proposal would represent a danger to Highway Safety. The required visibility splays for the measured 85% speed should be 2.4m x 120m. The splays in each direction fall significantly short.

#### ***Impact on the character of the Area***

34. The design of the proposed house is now very different to the neighbouring property, and this is due to the architect creating a design that positively addresses the impact on the occupiers of Orwell Terrace. The property will stand together with that of No. 17, both of which are different to other properties along this frontage in Orwell Road. The properties at Orwell Terrace are of a completely different style and design altogether and they would predominately hide the new dwelling when approaching from the northwest on the Orwell Road. From the south east the new open cart lodge feature creates a less dominant vista than the earlier schemes and set back from the main road. The varied ridge heights also reflect that of the existing built form.
35. The design approach of the dwelling, though different, would not be completely at odds within the street scene and not unacceptable in design terms. The views across the open countryside are partly restricted by mature hedging and farm buildings and I am of the view that the building proposed is in character with the existing street scene and not harmful to its immediate surroundings. The plot frontage measures approximately 31 metres and the new development replaces an existing footprint of development, albeit slightly taller and in a different form.

## **Conclusion**

36. I am of the view that the changes made to the design have addressed the issues raised earlier about the development being overbearing to the neighbouring occupiers and the design is not unacceptable. However the comments from the Local Highway Authority do not support the scheme and there is a fundamental highway safety concern that still has not been adequately addressed. It is for this reason that I recommend refusal.

## **Recommendation**

### **Refusal**

37. Barrington Road, Orwell does not fall within the parameters set by Manual for Streets in relationship to a quiet rural lane or high street. The required visibility splay for the measured 85% speed should therefore be 2.4m x 120m; and the achievable splays are significantly less than this; therefore the creation of additional traffic under these circumstances would be to the detriment of Highway safety.

**Contact Officer:** Saffron Garner – Senior Planning Assistant  
Telephone: (01954) 713256