

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

4<sup>th</sup> March 2009

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

---

**S/1424/08/RM - PAPWORTH EVERARD**  
**Approval of Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale**  
**For the Erection of 81 Dwellings**  
**(Reserved Matters Pursuant to Outline Planning Permission Ref S/2476/03/O)**  
**Land South of Church Lane and West of Ermine Street South**  
**For Barratt Eastern Counties**

**Recommendation: Delegated Approval**

**Date for Determination: 11<sup>th</sup> November 2008**  
**(Major Application)**

**Notes:**

**This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the recommendation of delegated approval by Officers is likely to conflict with the views from Papworth Everard Parish Council.**

**Site and Proposal**

1. The site forms phase 1 (northern part) of the northern 'half' of a larger site of 21.63 hectare (ha) site that lies on the south western side of the village and is fringed with a ribbon of housing on the eastern Ermine Street boundary. To the south and west is open countryside; Cow Brook forms the south-western boundary with the newly completed bypass beyond.
2. Running north-west/south-east across the centre of the site at its highest point is a plantation of young trees. To the west of the belt, the site slopes sharply down into the valley of Cow Brook. The site is overgrown former agricultural land and there are few trees on site other than the plantation and adjacent to Cow Brook.
3. The reserved matters application received on 12<sup>th</sup> August 2008 proposes to address the siting, design and external appearance of 81 dwellings as well as the landscaping of part of the overall site. The application is supported by a planning and design statement, a landscape and visual impact assessment and landscape strategy, an ecological assessment and a sustainability appraisal. Apart from the layout details and the house type drawings the submitted plans show 3d impressions of views north west along St Peter's Lane towards St Peter's Church, character style types and how these are distributed within the site, massing details, areas for adoption/private/managed, street scenes, adoptable drainage layout and strategic and localised landscape details.
4. The application has been amended 3 times. The first amendment, received 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2008 substituted house types to concord more with those submitted on phase 2 (southern part of the northern 'half') under ref. S/1624/08/RM. The second amendment, received 12<sup>th</sup> November 2008 addressed many of the layout and design issues raised by the Council's appointed Urban Design Consultant (UD Consultant).



The third amendment follows a series of meetings involving the UD Consultant, Conservation Officer, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Local Highway Authority, the applicants and the Case Officer. At the time of preparing this report this amendment is out for consultation. The consultation period expires on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2009.

5. The 81 dwellings comprise 3 one bedroom flats, 2 two bedroom flats, 7 two bed houses, 27 three bedroom houses, 31 four bedroom houses and 11 five bedroom houses. 52% of the dwellings are two storey, 42% are two and a half storey and 6% are three storey.
6. The design approach is essentially traditional interspersed with some more contemporary styles.
7. The application is one of three that revise all of the details of the overall scheme of 365 dwellings. There is no increase in numbers of dwellings across the whole of the wider scheme. The overall density of housing on the overall site is approximately 30 dwellings per ha.
8. The layout of the streets largely follows that already approved which follows the basic principles laid down in the Council's Development Brief with, in relation to the overall site, the residential development confined to the allocated area on the eastern side of the existing plantation. To the west of the plantation is an extensive area of public open space (7.6 ha) sloping down to Cow Brook.
9. The approved overall scheme includes a central landscaped spine road that runs through the housing area linking the northern and southern vehicular access points to Ermine Street South. This proposal retains this.
10. A number of small open spaces are proposed within the residential area including two Local Areas of Play and the central Local Equipped Area of Play.
11. None of the 81 dwellings are to be constructed with solar panels on the roofs as these are to be installed on other dwellings within the wider scheme.

### **Planning History**

12. In 2003 the Council published a residential development brief for the site which was adopted as supplementary planning guidance.
13. In 2005 Outline Planning Permission was granted for residential development on the site, including public open space, vehicular accesses together with the demolition of 3 blocks of semi-detached housing.
14. In 2006 a reserved matters application for 397 dwellings and public open space was submitted and withdrawn later that year.
15. In December 2007 Reserved Matters for 365 dwellings was approved.
16. Since the 2007 approval the overall site has undergone transfers in ownership. This has resulted in the need for the new developers to revise the details of the scheme by the submission of further reserved matters applications.
17. All reserved matters pursuant to the Outline Planning Permission ref. **S/2476/03/O** had to be submitted by 30<sup>th</sup> September 2008. As a result no further such reserved matters applications can now be submitted.

## Planning Policy

18. **Local Plan 2004 Policy Papworth Everard 3(c), Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy 2007 Policy ST/5, Local Development Framework Development Control DPD 2007 Policy, DP/1 – Sustainable Development, DP/2 – Design of New Development, DP/3 – Development Criteria, DP/6 – Construction Methods, HG/1 – Housing Density, HG/2 – Housing Mix, SF/6 – Public Art and New Development, SF/10 – Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space and New Developments, SF/11 – Open Space Standards, NE/1 – Energy Efficiency, NE/3 – Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development, NE/6 – Biodiversity, CH/2 – Archaeological Sites, CH/4 – Development within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building, TR/2 – Car and Cycle Parking Standards.**

## Development Brief

19. The site is subject to a Development Brief commissioned by the Council and adopted as supplementary planning guidance in September 2003.
20. A Statutory Press Notice was published on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2008. A Site Notice was posted on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2008, when all consultees had been consulted.

## Consultations

21. **Papworth Everard Parish Council** comments are awaited in relation to the recent amendments. It's previously recommended refusal - comments are attached as Appendix 1.
22. **The Council's Chief Building Control Officer** comments are awaited.
23. **Environment Agency** comments in relation to the most recent amendments are awaited. In relation to the wider scheme it previously confirmed that outstanding surface water drainage details may be dealt with, prior to commencement of development, under Condition 17 of the outline approval and has no objections.
24. **Local Highway Authority** comments in relation to the most recent amendments are awaited. It has previously commented in relation to the overall scheme:

Given the size and nature of the development the Highway Authority will seek to adopt those roads and paths etc. that serve a highway function.

The applicant should show on the submitted drawings the proposed widths of the carriageways (5.5 minimum), footways (2m minimum), areas of shared use (7m minimum), including specifically the initial access route into the site at 'Summer Hill Drive'.

The applicant should show the vehicle to vehicle visibility splays at the entrance to the site onto Ermine Street, these should be 2.4m x 70m in both directions.

Visibility splays should be fully dimensioned, these must accord with the proposed design speed for the road. The required dimensions can be found in table 7.1 in Manual for Streets.

The remaining comments relate to conditions to control visibility and informatives to indicate that any tree planting within areas of proposed adopted public highway will require a licence under Section 142 of the Highways Act and that the granting of a

planning permission does not constitute a permission or licence to a developer to carry out any works within the public highway.

25. **Conservation Manager** comments in relation to the proposal as originally submitted:

“No schedule of materials appears to have been given in the supporting documentation, design statements etc.

The site lies in a ‘best landscape area’. Due to the undulating nature of the topography, walls and roofscapes will all be prominent in the landscape.

DC Policies DPD Policy DP/1(p), Policy DP/2(j) and other policies make specific reference for the need to ensure siting, layout, design and materials of new development conserves and, where possible, enhances landscape.

The development affects the setting of the LB’s 4 & 6 Church Lane (grade IIs).

In the SCDC Design Guide, Papworth falls within the western Claylands Character Area, characterised by:

- (a) Buildings generally one and a half or two storeys, domestic in scale.
- (b) A variety of wall material used include plastered timber frame, warm red brick, occasional yellow, farm buildings typically in weatherboarding or flint
- (c) Roof materials include plain clay tiles, pantiles, long straw thatch and (from 1850’s) ‘Welsh Slate’.
- (d) Typical timber frame (18<sup>th</sup> century or earlier) details include high pitched roofs, casement or horizontal sliding sash windows, drip boards set into gable ends or over windows, 4-6 panelled, or plank doors and chimneys set laterally on the roof ridge.
- (e) Typical 18<sup>th</sup> century houses have 4 or 6 panelled front doors, gauged brick arches over windows and doors, distinctive corners.
- (f) Typical 19<sup>th</sup> century houses have sawtooth dentil courses, 4 or 12 pane vertical sash windows, 4 panelled front doors, contrasting brick dressings, decorative polychromatic brick work, chimneys sited at gables
- (g) The Design Guide looks to new development to “...reflect the form, scale and proportions of the existing vernacular buildings in the area, picking up the traditional building styles, materials, colours and textures...”

*Other Developments in Papworth*

Other development in the village, notably the South Park Drive housing scheme (Hopkins Homes) clearly does respond to the above policy backdrop. The houses are clearly proportioned to 19<sup>th</sup> century forms and incorporate (mainly 19<sup>th</sup> century) details including brick plinths, carved stepped bargeboards, narrow light casement and sash windows, chimneys, brick arches to windows and doors, along with stone sills, weatherboarding, stock bricks and traditional (type) modern representations of pantiles and slates.

### *Analysis of Submitted House Designs*

Comment is only made on the design, materials, detailing. If suggestions are made to the building footprints/floor plans, this would then require a re-design of layout, which it is understood has been the subject of extensive negotiation.

### *Hierarchy of Buildings*

There is very limited hierarchy of buildings – almost all (with the exception of the Summersfield) are built to standard Building Regs min dimensions. There are obviously differences between garages and house types; it would be hoped that there could be two and a half storey, two storey, 1 and three quarter – one and a half storey housing + the single storey garages. This would require further thought on detailing which has the potential to add greatly to the townscape interest.

### *Hierarchy of Materials*

SCDC generally applies a hierarchy on the choice of building materials, based on the Design Guide. In this instance I would expect choice of materials to be based on the following principles:

- a) Two and a half storey houses, small pink/red plain tiles, warm red or buff/yellow local stock type bricks, detailing in contrasting/polychromatic brickwork.
- b) Two storey houses – formal design (such as the Thornton), small plain red/pink tiles, red or buff stock type bricks – NO contrasting detailing.
- c) Two storey houses – cottage types (Woodcote, Summersfield etc), red pantiles, buff stock type bricks OR flint and brick dressings or painted brickwork.
- d) Two storey flats over garages, pantiles, horizontal timber boarding and brick plinth or painted brickwork.
- e) Single storey, pantiles or Welsh Slate type (slate or hipped roofs), horizontal timber boards and brick plinth OR painted brickwork OR flint.

### *Hierarchy of Detailing*

Detailing needs to be appropriate to the locality, the building materials, and reflect the Building Hierarchy.

Almost all the dormer windows proposed are at odds with the above principles.

The box eaves and verge details will form visually assertive features in the landscape and should be omitted.

Features such as the massed brick kneelers, brick soldier course bands, flat brick on edge or lintel bands, flat roof cottage porches are all inappropriate.

Rear elevations will be seen in the landscape and therefore should include basic architectural detailing/some interest.

### *Recommendations*

This estate is the first phase of a larger scheme of development. It thus sets a benchmark for subsequent proposals. It is acknowledged that the development will have significant landscape impacts.

It is my view that the detailed design, choice of materials and architectural detailing do not fulfil the policy requirements referred to above.

I therefore recommend that this scheme is made subject to further discussions with the developers.

I cannot recommend approval as the proposals stand.

### *Notes*

I understand amended plans have been submitted; these have not been seen but it is thought these are unlikely to change the thrust of this response.

26. Conservation Officer's recommended conditions in relation to the most recent amendments:

### *Architectural Detailing*

Notwithstanding the indicative architectural detailing on front, side and rear elevation drawings, before work on site begins, drawings of at least 1:20 scale of the following detailing elements will be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority:

- (a) Chimney construction, materials and detailing
- (b) Porches, bay window and dormer construction, materials and detailing
- (c) Window and door heads and sills on front, rear and side elevations
- (d) Wooden cladding and boarding materials, construction and detailing including junctions with adjacent materials
- (e) Eaves and verge construction, including dentil courses where proposed

Reason. To ensure visual quality and compatibility between all phases of the development and the existing village built form and its landscape setting and to assure the long term character and appearance of the development.

### *Building Materials*

Prior to work beginning on site, details of the following will be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority:

- (a) Roof tiles and slates, and methods of fixing
- (b) All bricks
- (c) Horizontal wood and wood effect boarding, wooden cladding and other cladding materials
- (d) Rainwater goods, soil vent pipes and vents and other external mechanical, sanitary and electrical fittings and works
- (e) Garage and dwelling doors
- (f) Window materials

Reason. As *Architectural Detailing* above.

### *Building Material Sample Panels*

Prior to formal construction work beginning on site, the developer shall erect on site, in an agreed position sample panels for EACH of the building materials combinations proposed, comprising:

- (a) 2m sq. minimum area of roof slate and tile at an appropriate pitch AND
- (b) 2m sq. minimum of each brick type incorporating a sample window with proposed heads (arches) and sills.
- (c) 2m sq. of render incorporating brickwork below dpc, a sample window with arch and sill detailing and painted in proposed colour schemes
- (d) 1m sq. of each materials where combinations of materials are proposed (for example brick and horizontal boarding or render and wood cladding).
- (e) Gutters, eaves construction and formed plinths.

Reason. To ensure that each proposed individual building material and the proposed combinations can be properly and objectively assessed in the context of the existing village and landscape forms.

### *Colour Schedules*

Prior to formal construction work on site commencing, schedules of colour schemes for the following will be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority:

- (a) External dwelling and garage doors
- (b) Rainwater goods and other external pipe work
- (c) Cladding paints, stains and finishes
- (d) Painted surfaces including fascia boards, porches, bargeboards etc.

Reason. To ensure visual compatibility throughout all phases of the development.

### *Garages*

Prior to start of work on site, detailed drawings and full schedules of proposed materials for all garages will be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason. Details of the garages have not been submitted with the applications.

*Also consider conditions relating to the following:*

- (a) External Freestanding Walls, Fences and other enclosures – an overall plan is needed together with detailed design and specifications of materials etc
- (b) Treatment of Hard Surfaces, specification and samples of materials etc
- (c) Planting Areas, Tree, hedge and shrub planting , specifications, species, mixes etc
- (d) PD Rights – on solar panels, wind turbines, radio masts /aerials – Reason – to prevent loss of the visual appearance of the development and retain planning control where the use and enjoyment of neighbours may be prejudiced.

27. **Anglian Water** comments that it is obliged under the Water Industry Act 1991 to provide water and wastewater infrastructure for domestic purposes for new housing within its area. It further states that the foul flows from the development can be accommodated within the foul sewerage network system that at present has adequate capacity. There are no public surface water sewers within the locality.



Therefore, the applicant will either need to construct its own surface water sewers and submit those for adoption by Anglian Water or requisition the provision of a public surface water sewer for the locality under section 98 of the Water Industry Act 1991. Alternatively the applicant will have to find an alternative method of surface water drainage which will then need to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority....The foul drainage will be treated at Papworth Sewage Treatment Works that at present has available capacity.

28. **English Heritage** comments in relation to the most recent amendments are awaited. It previously commented: "We do not wish to comment in detail but offer the following general observations. We have previously advised the Council on the importance of maintaining a significant area of open ground between the development and the grade II\* listed parish church. We understand that the present developer is proposing alterations to the design of the new housing and would hope that the quality of building is kept to a high standard, but also wish to ensure that the green area in question is not altered during any negotiations on matters of detail. We would urge you to address the above issues, and recommend that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice. It is not necessary for us to be consulted again..."
29. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue** comments in relation to the most recent amendments are awaited. It previously commented that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants and access and facilities for the Fire Service should also be provided in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document B5, Section 16.
30. **Council appointed Urban Design Consultant** comments in relation to the most recent amendments are awaited. He previously commented :
- (a) "Plot 1 should face onto adjoining pond area as approved layout, driveway arrangement should allow vehicles to leave in forward gear.
  - (b) Plot 2 pitch roof in opposite direction and move unit back to provide 2m front garden depth, driveway arrangement should allow vehicle to leave in forward gear.
  - (c) Plots 3 and 4 move units back to achieve 2 m front garden.
  - (d) Parking court to rear of plot 6 very large and rear flat over garage unit (plot 7) has awkward relationship with site boundary. There are also some existing trees to this area that are not shown and will clash with both garage buildings. This area needs to be more organic in form.
  - (e) Plot 10 main area of rear garden very short (5m), where is parking for this unit?
  - (f) Area around thatched cottage green needs to be more informal, proposed layout very rigid.
  - (g) Row of garages next to plot 18 not acceptable fronting onto spine road.
  - (h) Parking for plot 21 very remote from dwelling.
  - (i) Double garage and driveway next to plot 78 not acceptable – results in very broad area of hard standing on streetscene.

- (j) Units along St Johns Lane to be positioned to relate to flow of road, current arrangement too rigid.
- (k) Disguise turning head outside plot 66, approved scheme had this coinciding with double driveway.
- (l) Is northern boundary correct – approved scheme shows substantial area of planting to this boundary.
- (m) Turning head to plot 63 frontage needs to be disguised to appear less engineered.
- (n) Triangular frontage to plot 64 is awkward.
- (o) Plot 30 gable very exposed – careful detailing required.
- (p) Row of 3 garages (plots 30-32) results in large area of hardstanding, move one garage to between plots 32 and 33.
- (q) Plot 34 pitch roof in opposite direction and ensure that side elevation has adequate fenestration.
- (r) Plots 41 and 49 would be better arranged as linked corner turning 45 degree units as approved scheme to allow re-introduction of tree to road frontage.
- (s) Plot 43 and 46 have large exposed gables these need to be carefully fenestrated to break down their bulk.
- (t) Plots 35 and 37 positioning results in exposed large gables that do not relate well to the public street frontages they face.
- (u) Open space next to plot 48 terminates in back wall of four garages and rear garden wall – needs to have more active frontage to this space.
- (v) Plots 48 and 49 should have 1200mm min front garden depth and driveway arrangement should allow vehicles to leave in forward gear.
- (w) Area between plots 50 to 54 is completely unacceptable, large open driveway onto spine road is contrary to tight knit structure that is required to spine road – addition of trees does little to disguise this area – rigid arrangement of plots 51 to 54 does not relate at all to Peter House Square.
- (x) Streetscenes are very uninspiring – no indication of front of house treatments i.e. front garden fences hedges walls etc., Row of identical house types plots 65 to 69 is not acceptable. Plot 11 looks out of place – dwarfed by neighbours.

#### *House Types*

- (a) Marlowe – stepped gable features inappropriate – clipped eaves with simple gable parapets would be more appropriate
- (b) Norbury – not sure that headroom works to top floor shower room area, consider veluxes to dressing and shower rooms
- (c) Palmerstone - gable feature to frontage very clumsy – would be better with flat frontage with continuous eaves line

- (d) Eskdale – lower window sills to wc and bathroom would sit better on elevations – introduce brickwork flat arches to ground floor windows on public faces of building
  - (e) Malvern – comments as Marlowe – this size of property should have chimney
  - (f) Maidstone – fenestration required exposed elevations – front door and surround is too grand for this scale of building
  - (g) Argyll – horizontal bars required to first floor windows – consider introduction of Juliette balcony arrangement to lounge to provide some variation in detail to upper floor – entrance stair and lobby extremely narrow
  - (h) Milford – comments as Argyll
  - (i) Richmond – generally okay – more fenestration required to exposed side elevations.
  - (j) All elevations appear to be brick work, no render or timber clad buildings proposed.
  - (k) No buildings identified as highlight plots.
31. **The Definitive Map Officer** comments in relation to the most recent amendments are awaited. She previously stated that she has commented on this site development before and has nothing further to add.
32. **Cambridgeshire Archaeology** comments in relation to the most recent amendments are awaited. It previously commented that the site was evaluated in 2006 and “significant remains of Iron Age, Roman and medieval date were found to survive in the vicinity. Excavations are currently ongoing within this area to mitigate the impact of the development proposed under applications S/2476/03/O and S/0093/07/RM. Given that the above applications already have archaeological conditions imposed upon them, and that excavation work is currently ongoing, we do not feel it necessary to request a condition for the area outlined in red to which this application specifically relates. Accordingly we have no comment to make..”
33. **The Council’s Ecology Officer** comments in relation to the most recent amendments are awaited. He previously stated that he had no objections to the proposal but noted that the ecological assessment is out of date and that a repeat ecological assessment should be provided. He says this is especially important with regard to the water voles who may have colonised additional areas associated with the drainage outfall. He further comments that the outfall from the balancing pond shows a long length of pipe linking to the Cow Brook. Pipes have the potential for blockages and harm to wildlife and people. Why can’t this pipe be replaced with an open channel such as a ditch? This would provide further habitat for water voles. He states that a revised survey can be requested by condition but would prefer it submitted in advance.
34. **Natural England** comments in relation to the most recent amendments are awaited. It previously commented that it had no objections but notes that the submitted ecological assessment is very out of date (taken between 2003-05). It recommends further survey work is undertaken by the developer and states that the Local Planning Authority should require this. In particular the presence of bats and water voles may have changed. It supports the recommendations in the ecological assessment at

paragraphs 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and paragraph 4.7.1 of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and Landscape Strategy Report.

35. It also states: "Site layout and design should, where possible, retain existing habitat features of benefit to wildlife such as trees and green areas. These should be kept in context rather than as isolated features. Damage to habitats should be minimised wherever possible, and the conservation management plan should also detail how potentially adverse effects will be minimised. All contractors working on site should be made aware of the possible presence of protected or biodiversity species; should such species be encountered during development contractors should be requested to cease work until professional advice has been sought."
36. **The Architectural Liaison Officer (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)** comments are awaited
37. **Hilton Parish Council** comments are awaited.
38. **EDF Energy** comments are awaited.
39. **Trees and Landscape Officer** comments in relation to the most recent amendments are awaited. She previously commented:
  - (a) *General*

My concerns relating to ownership of land around the dwellings and therefore its design and maintenance; the nature of the means of enclosure (if any); the practical arrangements of putting out the bins, their storage in gardens and placement for collection; and means of access to garages through gardens are broadly contained in Richard's summary of our meeting on 16.12.2008.
  - (b) *Boundaries*

Guidance needs to be given as to what we consider are acceptable materials for boundaries. My views are that the quality of the rear garage courts will be greatly enhanced by brick walls rather than fences. These can also benefit from planting within the courts and climbers tumbling over the boundaries from the rear gardens. I do not favour railings around small front gardens unless there is a real need to defend the space. It is an urban treatment that makes maintenance of these small spaces difficult. Picket fences are not to be encouraged either as over time different replacements and the contrast with occasional zealous timber treatments can make an area look run down. Hedges are to be encouraged or appropriate height shrubs that will not require trimming.
  - (c) *Planting*

I would like to see a detailed planting design along the lines of that submitted by Liz Lake in earlier proposals. This contained a balance of shrub planting with easy care herbaceous planting that would provide improved visual interest, seasonal change and wildlife value to the development. However it is impossible to determine the practicality of a planting design without the marking of rear garden access gates and the nature of the proposed plot boundaries both front and rear. The landscape designers need this information at an early stage so that they can make sensible proposals. The tree planting choices need to be revisited in some places.
  - (d) *Key Spaces*

Unfortunately the site has been divided through the middle of some of the key spaces and it is important that the plans are redrawn to overlap so that these

can be appraised as wholes. The coherence of the design of Church View Square seems to have been lost with the changes in house types. The trees are an important component and need to be shown along with the ground treatment, hard and soft. If they are expected to show above dwellings in the long term, they must be planted so there is space for large crowns to develop. The illustration on p16 of the Urban Design Study illustrates this.

Changes to Thatched Cottage Green since the Liz Lake Strategic Landscape Proposals drawing May 2007 (924 A2/01Rev D) have led to a much less sympathetic relationship between the new development and the listed building. It is desirable to make a feature of this interesting property from Cromwell Crescent, but also important that there is sufficient space to plant significant trees so that a buffer is created between the development and the cottage. Without this, the setting of the listed building is unacceptably compromised.

(e) *Specific Plots:* These are some of the issues

1: the house should be turned so that it looks over the open space. Its parking should remain on the side of the road however.

3: is there access to the rear of the garage?

7: garden is unsatisfactory.

9: how does the bin get put out?

11-27: is there a link between the garage court and Thatched Cottage Green?

32: how does no.32 get its bin out if 61 has its car parked outside the garage?

33: how is the bin put out?

48: how is the exterior of this garage maintained without entering the gardens of 37 and 49?

52: presumably you have to park your car somewhere else when you want to get your bin out through the garage?

53: how is the bin put out?

65-74: the space between the properties is so tight that reversing between the neighbour's parked cars and your house, sometimes at an angle might damage the house walls. The front gardens are so minimal and there are no other significant spaces where trees could be planted to relieve the view along the street.

The practicalities of negotiating the exterior space needs to be thoroughly considered.

40. **Environmental Protection Team Leader** comments are awaited.

41. **Housing Development and Enabling Managers** comments are awaited.

42. **Cultural Services Manager** comments are awaited.

43. **Arts Development Officer** states that the application falls within the scope of the Council's Public Art Policy.
44. **Environment Operations Manager** comments are awaited.

### **Representations**

45. None received

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

- (a) The siting of the buildings
- (b) Design and external appearance of the buildings
- (c) The landscaping of the site

### ***Background***

46. As stated above this application considers revisions to the details on part of the northern 'half' of the approved scheme for 365 dwellings. The site has been transferred in ownership resulting in this revised application for Reserved Matters Consent.
47. The site has an extensive history of pre application negotiation with the Council going back several years as well as the formal planning submissions. For more detail on this history and for a general background to the proposal please refer to the August 2007 report to Planning Committee in relation to the approved scheme for 365 dwellings under reference S/0093/07/F, attached as Appendix 2.

### ***Siting of the buildings***

48. The developers have largely retained the approved internal road layout and location of areas of open space. What is altered is the design of the dwellings, the mix and their siting. I consider the layout of the site to be generally satisfactory. As in the approved scheme there is a deliberate distribution of density and heights of buildings to take account of the desire to concentrate a more dense urban and enclosed feel to the central spine road. Dwellings along this road are therefore closer to the road with less front garden with detailing such as railings. The additional location here of the mainly 2½ storey dwellings adds to this more urban feel. A row of trees along this road will add a pleasant element of greenery and the regular placement will further add to the formality of the street scene. The density and heights of dwellings is reduced to the east and west and the arrangement largely follows the sweep of the roads in a more organic and less formal arrangement.
49. Visually this approach will also help to protect views of the site from its surroundings by concentrating the main bulk at its centre.
50. The scheme compares well to the approved scheme in relation to car parking.
51. The green avenue allowing views from within the site towards the church has been retained such that its width allows a clear focus on the church.

### ***Design and external appearance***

52. The design of the dwellings is, in general, traditional interspersed with more contemporary. It is generally consistent with the principles laid down by the design guide and closely follows those considered in the approved scheme. The most recent

amendment follows extensive negotiations involving Papworth Everard Parish Council, the applicants and the relevant experts, the detail of which is contained within the minutes for the various meetings attached as Appendix 3. There has been a consideration of hierarchy of design and use of materials resulting in defined character zones. The detail of these and the mix and use of materials throughout is contained within the sets of amended plans. Elements of 'standard' house type design that are not typical in the village have been excluded. Careful attention has been paid to detailing for each house type relating it to its position. In addition general principles such as ensuring that no roof pitches fall below 35 degrees have been applied.

### ***Landscaping***

53. The areas of open space and structural landscaping follow those in the approved scheme. Detailed landscape schemes for the whole site, including identification of individual species have been submitted as part of the recent amendments and follows the drawing up of the finalised layouts. Members will be updated at the meeting regarding the Trees and Landscape Officer's assessment of these details.

### ***Other matters***

#### ***Foul and surface water drainage***

54. Condition 17 of Outline Planning Permission ref. S/2476/03/O requires the submission of a drainage strategy prior to development commencing. All concerns regarding drainage can be addressed in the consideration of such a scheme.

#### ***Renewable Energy***

55. Condition 5 of Outline Planning Permission ref. S/2476/03/O states that no reserved matters on any phase of development shall be submitted unless a sustainability appraisal (and a design and landscape statement) has also been submitted. It further states that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved documents.
56. The submitted details indicate that no solar panels will be installed within this phase of the overall development but that 40 dwellings within the overall scheme will have solar panels representing 11% of the total number of dwellings within the Summersfield development as a whole which accords with the previous Reserved Matters consent (ref. S/0093/07/RM).

#### ***Ecology***

57. Conditions 21 and 22 of Outline Planning Permission ref. S/2476/03/O require an assessment of all semi-natural habitats to be carried out and surveys and schemes of mitigation for protected species and species of importance to local biodiversity, including habitat creation and enhancement. The conditions require the schemes to be implemented in accordance with the approved details. I note the comments of Natural England and the Ecology Officer and I agree that the details submitted with the application are out of date. It will be necessary for the applicants to comply with the conditions referred to above and also consider the Ecology Officer's comments in relation to drainage as part of their submissions for a drainage strategy for the site in accordance with the requirements of Condition 17 of the Outline Planning Permission. An informative could draw the developer's attention to the need for updated information.

### ***Public Art***

58. Public Art is encouraged to ensure the scheme is of high quality. I consider it to be an important part of the consideration of the overall design of the scheme. A draft brief had been discussed and agreed with the Council's Arts Development Officer prior to the approval of the earlier Reserved Matters consent. A condition can ensure that this or any revised brief is in place prior to development commencing and that the art will come forward in accordance with it.

### ***Mix***

59. The dwellings are generally larger than in the approved scheme with less 2-bedroomed dwellings and more larger dwellings. This proposal breaks down to: 4% 1-bed, 11% 2-bed 33% 3-bed, 38% 4-bed and 14% 5-bed.

The previous approved scheme overall contained:

3% 1-bed, 31% 2-bed 47% 3-bed, 18% 4-bed and 1% 5-bed (including 1 6-bed)

60. Whilst the mix has altered, this was not a matter controlled at the outline planning permission stage and this scheme is considering the detailed Reserved Matters only. Members should therefore consider the design implications for the change in mix rather than the principle of the change itself.

### ***Conclusions***

61. This scheme represents revisions to house design, siting and landscaping that are not sufficiently minor to be considered as amendments to the approved scheme yet do not fundamentally alter the design philosophy of the scheme, its road layout or areas of open space etc. There has been significant input from Papworth Everard Parish Council, the UD Consultant and the Conservation Officer on matters of design and layout in consultation with the Local Highways Authority and other bodies to the point where there is a degree of agreement that the revised scheme is acceptable. In my opinion the applicants have worked well with us to produce a scheme that works as well as that that already approved.

### ***Previous Reserved Matters Consent***

62. Papworth Everard Parish Council has, with regard to other parts of the site, wished to see all the previous conditions from S/0093/07/RM to be attached to any Reserved Matters consent granted. However, I have carefully considered these conditions and concluded that a number of them do not pass the tests laid down in planning legislation. Some, for example, are unnecessary as they concern matters already controlled by the Outline Planning Permission. Circular 11/95, "The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions", makes it clear in Paragraph 45 that:

"Once outline planning permission has been granted, it cannot be withdrawn except by a revocation order under Section 97 of the Act, and any subsequent approval of reserved matters does not constitute the granting of a further planning permission. Any conditions relating to anything other than the reserved matters should be imposed when outline permission is granted. The only conditions which can be imposed when the reserved matters are approved are conditions which directly relate to those matters".

63. I understand that this raises concerns within the Parish Council about the lack of control of the various matters and the status of its involvement in the consideration of



them. I have therefore agreed that should Reserved Matters Consent be granted that a letter confirming that the Parish Council will be involved in all of the matters previously outlined in the conditions for their direct involvement will be sent and that the views of the Parish Council in all of these matters shall be taken into consideration. I have asked the Parish Council to provide me with a list of matters it wishes to be directly involved with.

64. The applicants have worked with both SCDC and the Parish Council to consider an appropriate method by which matters that had formed the subject of these conditions, and which they are willing to offer, can still be addressed. The applicants are therefore willing to offer a Unilateral Undertaking which has been drafted and is attached as Appendix 4. Any grant of Reserved Matters Consent will be dependant upon this agreement being in place as it resolves matters that previously formed part of the approved RM consent. Discussions are ongoing on this matter and Members will be updated at the meeting.

### **Recommendation**

65. Delegated approval for the siting, design and external appearance of the buildings, and the landscaping of the site subject to comments received through the amendment consultation period, subject to the prior signing of an agreed Unilateral Undertaking, subject to the following conditions and in accordance with the outline planning permission ref: S/2476/03/O.
1. No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs of the dwellings, free standing walls and all hard surfaces have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.  
(Reason – To ensure the details of the development are satisfactory)
  2. No development shall commence until details of the proposed Flat Refuse and Cycle Stores have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The stores shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.  
(Reason – To ensure the details of the development are satisfactory)
  3. A scheme for the lighting of each parking court shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences on the residential development to which it relates. The work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.  
(Reason – To ensure the design details are satisfactory and in the interests of highway safety)
  4. No development shall commence until the detailed design and furnishing of the area immediately surrounding the pond has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.  
(Reason – To ensure the details of the development are satisfactory)
  5. No development shall commence until a scheme for public art, to include a detailed timetable for its design and implementation, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The public art shall be installed in accordance with the approved scheme and within the time periods specified within that scheme unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.  
(Reason – To ensure the design of the development reaches a high standard)

6. No services or storage of materials shall be placed within the area of the Plantations to be retained.  
(Reason – To ensure the existing trees are not damaged)
7. No development shall commence until a timetable for the provision of the strategic landscaping to the public open space areas, namely Summersfield Green and the Local Areas of Play, the balancing pond and all boundary planting, hereby approved, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The planting shall take place in the agreed planting seasons unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority. These planting/seeding areas shall be fully protected, managed and maintained during the construction phases.  
(Reason – To ensure that the landscape character of the site is established as quickly as practicable.)
8. All areas of land to be landscaped shall be fenced off and fully protected from damage and compaction prior to and during construction.  
(Reason – To maintain the soil structure and to ensure the trees and shrubs thrive)
9. The precise details of the play equipment and associated benches and bins shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the play areas are laid out. The work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.  
(Reason – To ensure the details of the development are satisfactory)
10. Before development commences, a scheme for the protection of all grass verges and landscaped areas adjacent to road edges consisting of extra high conservation kerbs shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.  
(Reason – To preserve the areas of open space and verge, which serve an amenity function and to aid their maintenance by preventing vehicles from parking on them)

+ Conditions addressing the comments of the Conservation Officer and layout and landscape issues arising out of the amendment consultations.

+ Conditions relating to the timing of the provision of the LAPs and LEAP in relation to the completion of neighbouring development if this is not to be contained within the Unilateral Undertaking.

+ Conditions relating to additional tree protection measures to be advised by Trees and Landscape Officer.

### **Informatives**

1. Bird and bat boxes will be required in accordance with conditions 21 and 22 on Outline Planning Permission reference S/2476/03/O.
2. Papworth Everard Parish Council should be consulted prior to the submission of a scheme for public art. In order for such a scheme to be approved it is likely that the Local Planning Authority will prepare a brief for the installation.
3. The details of the drainage of the kickabout area should be included with the submission of a drainage strategy for the whole site in accordance with Condition 17 of Outline Planning Permission reference S/2476/03/O.

4. Solar Panels to be erected in accordance with the Sustainability Appraisal.
5. An up to date ecological assessment will be required in order to comply with Conditions 21 and 22 of Outline Planning Permission reference S/2476/03/O.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework - 2007 (Core Strategy / Development Control Policies)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Planning Files Ref: S/1424/08/RM, S/2476/03/O and S/0093/07/RM
- Documents referred to in the report including appendices on the website only and reports to previous meetings

**Contact Officer:** Nigel Blazeby – Team Leader Development Control (Area West)  
Telephone: (01954) 713165