

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation
Control Committee

3rd November 2004

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/1911/04/F - Waterbeach
Chalet Bungalow and Internal Garages, Land Rear of 89 Way Lane for Miss S J
Colclough**

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. No. 89 Way Lane is a detached house, set well back from the road, on the western side of Way Lane, with the grounds of Waterbeach County Primary School to the south and west. To the north is a detached bungalow, No. 91, which has consent for a chalet style property in its rear garden (see history).
2. There are residential properties, including Fenleigh Close, opposite.
3. The full application, received 14th September, proposes the sub-division of the garden with the erection of a 5-bedroomed chalet bungalow to the rear.
4. The site area of 0.08 ha, results in a density of 12.5 dpha.
5. Access would be via a shared driveway with No. 89 and the new property to the rear of No. 91.

Planning History

6. Earlier this year an application (ref. S/0582/04/O) to demolish No. 89 Way Lane and replace it with three chalet bungalows, each 7.8 m high, set back in a line from the road, was refused for the reasons:

1. "The two sides of Way Lane in the vicinity of the application site are totally different in character with both frontage and in-depth development on its eastern side and the open grounds of the Primary School to the west; because of the attractive open character of the school grounds together with the bottom 53.0 m of the garden of No. 89 Way Lane, this area has been scheduled as a Protected Village Amenity Area in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2004), with Policy SE10 stating:

Protected Village Amenity Areas (PVAA) are defined within village framework boundaries in order to identify undeveloped land, the retention of which is of importance to the character, amenity and/or functioning of the village as a whole. Development of such areas will not be permitted if it would be harmful to the distinctive qualities and functioning lying behind their inclusion in the PVAA.

The redevelopment of No. 89 Way Lane in the manner proposed would, because of the siting of the dwellings back into the plot, present a form of

building out of keeping with the general pattern of development on this side of Way Lane and would appear unduly conspicuous and prominent when viewed across the grounds of the adjacent Primary School, the Protected Village Amenity Area. Although only the bottom (west end) of the present site of No. 89 is within the Protected Village Amenity Area and is to be retained as open garden in the proposed layout, the character and general openness of Way Lane will be unduly harmed.

For the above reasons the development would be contrary to Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) and Policies SE10, HG10 and HG11 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2004).

2. The means of access to the proposed dwellings forms part of this application. As submitted the application fails to show that the requirements of the Local Highway Authority can be met in that:
 - The access road should be at 90⁰ to Way Lane and be 5.0 m in width for a distance back of 15.0 m.
 - No common turning area is provided, especially for utility vehicles
 - Visibility splays of 2.4 m x 70.0 m
 - Pedestrian visibility splays of 2.0 m x 2.0 m.”
7. At the March 2003 Committee (item 7) consent was granted for a 4-bedroomed bungalow to the rear of No. 91 Way Lane.
8. At the November 2003 Committee (item 10) consent was granted for a 3-bedroomed chalet style property. This dwelling has not yet been constructed.
9. An application to extend No. 89 itself was approved at Chairman’s Delegation meeting on 18th October 2004.

Planning Policy

10. **Policy P1/3** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) requires a high level of design and sustainability in new developments.
11. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2004): **Policy SE2**. Waterbeach is classified as a Rural Growth Settlement
12. The School grounds and the rear part of the application site is a Protected Village Amenity Area. **Policy SE10** seeks to protect such areas from development. **Policy HG10** seeks a mix of house types and designs which reflect the wider character of the area. **Policy HG11** “Backland developments” only permits a dwelling in such a location if a) it is not overbearing to other properties, nor overlooks and/or overshadows them, b) noise and disturbance does not result, c) access is safe and d) will be in keeping with the pattern of development in the vicinity.

Consultation

13. **Waterbeach Parish Council** objects stating that the character and general openness of Way Lane will be unduly harmed. There is no common turning area for this, and adjacent properties, and the safety of pedestrians and road users will be put at risk.

14. The **Building Control Surveyor** has confirmed that the access arrangements are satisfactory for a fire service vehicle.
15. The **Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board** has no objection providing surface water is disposed off via soakaways. If other methods are used, the Board should be re-consulted.
16. The **Chief Environmental Health Officer** requests a condition restricting hours of machinery during building operations, plus informatives relating to pile driven foundations if used and “no burning”.
17. The comments of the **Trees and Landscape Officer** will be reported verbally.

Representations

18. One letter has been received from the occupiers of 84 Way Lane concerned that the additional traffic from the property would be prejudicial to the safety of parents and children going to/from the School next door. Visibility is often blocked by parked cars.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

19. The key issues in respect of this application is the suitability of the site as a building plot, the relationship of the existing, approved and planned dwellings to one another, the means of access to same, and the effect, if any, on the character of the area.
20. **As a plot.** With consent already having been granted for a chalet style property to the rear of No. 91 adjacent, it would be difficult to object to the current proposal especially as the site is slightly larger and the property is 1.6 m lower. The property has been designed to minimise any loss of amenity to it, from adjacent properties, or vice versa.
21. **Relationship to adjacent properties.** As planned, there will be a 19.0 m gap “corner to corner” between the approved chalet behind No. 91 and that proposed.
22. The gap between No. 89 and the proposal is less, 17.0 m at present reducing to 12.0m if the planned extensions recently approved are built. However, other than a dormer in the roof, and a first floor bedroom window, there is no overlooking.
23. The proposal has been designed with only a dining room window facing No. 89 so overlooking and loss of privacy will be minimal.
24. **Access.** The consent for the plot to the rear of No. 91 proposed a shared driveway, 4.5 m in width, with No. 89. No visibility splays were proposed other than that achievable across the existing verges. The Local Highway Authority did not comment on that scheme.
25. That now proposed is for three dwellings off a shared, private driveway and the highway requirements are the same for two or three dwellings ie. access at 90⁰ to Way Lane, 5.0 m wide for 15.0 m back, and with visibility splays of 2.4 m x 70.0 m. Discussions have been held with the Agent and revised plan submitted. In order to safeguard existing trees on the frontage, the driveway will be retained on its approved alignment but widened to 5.0 m for a distance of 10.0 m back, which is the point where the individual driveway to No. 89 forks off. With a verge/footway of 2.0 m – 2.5 m in width, the required splays are no doubt achievable. With the extant approval

for a driveway serving two dwellings, the applicant does not consider it necessary to provide all the highway suggestions.

26. In the circumstances I consider this approach to be acceptable.
27. **Character of area.** This scheme is totally different to the refused scheme for three chalet properties. This plan had dwellings 2.1 m higher than that now proposed, with one of the properties 17.0 m nearer to Way Lane than the present house.
28. The openness and character of the Protected Village Amenity Area will not be affected.

Recommendation

Approval as amended by letter and plan dated 19th October 2004, subject to:

1. Standard Condition A – Time limited permission (Reason A);
2. Sc5a – Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Rc5aii);
d – Refuse storage accommodation (Rc5d)
3. The proposed access driveway improvements shall be fully implemented before the occupation of the property hereby approved. (RC Para RC10 Safety).
4. SC21 – Withdrawal of permitted development rights
i) Part 1 Classes A, B, C and E. (RC21a) + “and to protect the character of the Protected Village Amenity Areas.”

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: P1/3** (Sustainable design in built development)
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: SE2** (Development in Rural Growth Settlements),
 - **SE10**
 - **HG10**
 - **HG11**
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Traffic and highway safety

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: County Structure Plan 2003
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
Planning Application files S/1911/04/F and S/0582/04/O.

Contact Officer: Jem Belcham – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713252