

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

2 February 2011

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director (Operational Services)/
Corporate Manager (Planning and New Communities)

**S/1951/10 - GIRTON
ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY DWELLING AND CREATION OF VEHICLE
ACCESS AND PARKING (REVISED DESIGN)
3 CHERRY BOUNDS ROAD, GIRTON FOR MS ATHENA POLYDOROU**

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

Date for Determination: 5th January 2011

The application has been referred to the Planning Committee as the recommendation of approval conflicts with the recommendation of the Parish Council,

Site and Proposal

1. The application site is an area of land to the North West of No. 3 Cherry Bounds Road. To the North is an area of grassed private land and an electricity substation. The site is located close to a bend in the road and the plot sits perpendicular to No. 3. The housing in the area is of a variety of types; two storey houses opposite the site and detached bungalows to the South and East. There is a relatively new dormer bungalow to the North. The plot of land is separated from the garden of No. 3 by a high close-boarded fence. The relatively mature hedging and tree to the front of the site have been removed during construction of the dwelling, which has commenced under a previous permission and the site is therefore now open to the street. To the North of the site there is a lower timber panelled fence.
2. The proposed development is the erection of a detached bungalow with associated access and parking on land adjacent to No. 3 Cherry Bounds Road, Girton. The scheme is similar to that approved in application S/1327/10/F, however the access is now to the North end of the dwelling, partly on land which, whilst in the ownership of the applicant, is the subject of an easement for the benefit of EDF Energy. The design of the bungalow has changed in one respect; the garage door proposed as part of the approved scheme has been removed and a window proposed in its place.

Relevant Planning History

3. S/1327/09/F – Planning Permission was granted for the erection of a detached bungalow with associated access and parking. The bungalow was smaller than the one previously refused and its drive way was located away from the easement which had previously been objected to by the owner, EDF Energy.
4. S/1943/08/F – Planning permission was refused for a dwelling on the site as its impact on the character of the area was considered harmful due to the cramped appearance and design which were considered to be out of keeping with other

properties in the area. In addition, the area proposed for hardstanding for parking was not able to be implemented due to an easement on that part of the site, relating to the substation to the North.

Policies

5. DP/2 – Design of New Development
DP/3 – Development Criteria
DP/4 – Infrastructure and New Developments
DP/7 – Development Frameworks
SF/10 – Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments
NE/1 – Sustainable Development
NE/15 – Noise Pollution

Consultations

6. Parish Council – has recommended refusal on the ground of the impact of the changes to the access and parking on highway safety in the area.
7. Local Highways Authority – does not object to the proposed development provided conditions relating to provision of pedestrian visibility splays, details of materials, construction and drainage of the parking area and the restriction of any gates to the parking area are applied to any permission.
8. UK Power Networks (formerly EDF Energy) - has confirmed verbally and in writing that it no longer objects to the use of the part of the land over its easement being used for the parking of a vehicle, as this still allows it to use the sub-station site as it wishes; provided the conditions set out in it's letter of the 27 October are adhered to. The conditions listed in its letter are that the use of the land does not prevent it from accessing the substation and that the land levels in the area of the easement are not adversely affected.
9. Environmental Protection Team Manager – previously requested details of the measures that would be taken to protect the proposed dwelling from noise emitted by the substation.

Representations

10. Two representations have been received in respect of this application.
11. The owner of No. 6 Cherry Bounds Road has objected to the proposed development on the grounds of the increased on street parking which would result from cars not being able to be parked on the driveway as it is under easement, noting that this arrangement has already been refused planning permission. The owner also expresses concern that development work has already begun and the permitted garage already bricked up to window height despite not yet having received planning permission. They also note that the boundary hedge and trees have been removed, contrary to the conditions on the previous planning permission and express concern about whether any replacement landscaping would be possible given the new access arrangements.
12. The owner of No. 1 Cherry Bounds Road, does not object to the proposal but states

that the site is not larger than that of No. 1. They also note that when they built their property they were obliged to provide a garage and the fact that this property would not have a garage is unfair and they should be allowed to convert their on garage if this application is passed. In addition, they claim that the current issue over the access was predictable.

Planning Comments

13. The main planning considerations in this case are the principle of development, the impact on the streetscene, parking and highway safety and residential amenity.
14. Principle of the development – As established by the previous permission, the site for the proposed dwelling is approximately 180 sqm and a single dwelling on the plot would achieve a net density of just less than 56 dwellings per hectare. This is in excess of the net density of 30 dwellings per hectare required by policy HG/1 of the Local Development Framework and it is therefore considered that the principle of just a single dwelling on the site is acceptable.
15. Impact on the Streetscene – The overall bulk of the proposed dwelling has not changed from that approved under the previous planning permission. The removal of the garage door and replacement with a window is not considered to cause any additional harm to the visual amenity of the streetscene. Therefore as with the previous application, in terms of its impact on the character of the area, on balance, it is considered that the dwelling has an acceptable relationship with existing buildings in the immediate area and the development does not lead to an unacceptably cramped form of development. The proposed dwelling is therefore considered acceptable in terms of its impact on the visual amenity of the area.
16. The boundary treatments which previously screened some of the proposed dwelling at the front and Southern side of the site have been removed by the applicant during construction. The previous permission contained a condition requiring a landscaping scheme which included the retention of the tree (since removed) and the retention or replacement of the hedges on site (also since removed) as well as the ‘beefing up’ of the hedges where necessary. It is considered necessary to apply a condition requiring that those hedges removed are replanted in order to screen what is now quite a stark view of the dwelling sited close to the front boundary of the site.
17. Given the potential for future extensions to create an overdevelopment and cramped appearance on site, it is considered necessary to remove permitted development rights for extensions and other development that could significantly increase the impact of the development on the streetscene and neighbouring properties. This can be achieved by the implementation of a restrictive condition.
18. Highway Safety and parking – The original access approved required the removal of a Virgin Media switch box from the land immediately in front of the garage to allow creation of the access and parking. The applicant states that the initial costs for moving the switch box have risen from £5,000 to over £15,000. Whilst this is not a planning matter in itself, the alternative location for the access has therefore been proposed by the applicant. The objections previously raised by UK Power Networks (formerly EDF Energy) which has an easement over the land in front of the adjacent substation have been withdrawn. It is now content for the application to construct a vehicle parking space in this area, provided that the land levels do not significantly

change and access remains possible to the substation. It is considered that both of these provisos could be met by the current arrangement.

19. The Local Highways Authority has visited the site and commented at that time that the proposed new arrangement would be preferable to the previously approved arrangements as the driveway would be in accordance with standard minimum dimensions. The previously approved driveway was slightly substandard in length.
20. There is therefore no objection in principle on highways grounds provided pedestrian visibility splays for the access, surface materials, drainage and construction methods and the restriction of any gates to the parking area are conditioned.
21. The proposed dwelling is a small, one bedroom unit and the proposed car parking is considered to be adequate for the anticipated needs of the property. Whilst this would necessitate visitors to the property parking on the road, this is not considered to be significantly different to the situation at most of the properties in the area. Although parking on the corner of the road may not be the most desirable situation from a highway safety point of view, there are several locations close to the property where safe on street parking is possible and the proposed arrangements are therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of their impact on parking and highway safety in the area.
22. Impact on Residential Amenity – The proposed bungalow is of a low profile design and it is not considered that it would cause any significant loss of light, visual intrusion or overshadowing.
23. It is not considered that the siting of the bungalow, which does not have any windows above ground floor level (save for a roof light to the loft) would result in any loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. It is not considered that any of the ground floor windows, including the new window in place of the garage door, would cause any significant overlooking of neighbouring properties, given the boundary treatments of the site and the distance from neighbouring properties.
24. Other Matters – The applicant has previously agreed to provide a scheme for the provision of outdoor play space and open space in accordance with policy SF/10 and has entered into a Section 106 legal agreement in respect of the previous application. A similar requirement would be necessary in this case to ensure the mitigation of the additional burden the dwelling would place on formal outdoor sport space and informal open space.
25. The existence of the electricity substation to the North has the potential for noise created by the substation to impact on the amenity of future residents of the proposed dwelling. It is considered that the dwelling would not be adversely affected by any noise created provided it is properly insulated and windows and doors are adequately soundproofed. Further details of this soundproofing were required by condition on the previous permission and were provided by the applicant. A similar condition for the insulation and soundproofing measures necessary would be applied to this permission.

Recommendation

26. Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is recommended that the application

be granted planning permission, subject to conditions relating to the following:

1. 3 year time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Pedestrian visibility splays
4. Details of materials construction and drainage of the parking area
5. Implementation of the parking area
6. Restriction of gates to the access
7. Removal of Permitted Development rights
8. Details of landscaping and implementation, specifically requiring replacement of the hedge that has been removed.
9. Details of boundary treatments
10. Scheme for noise insulation
11. Scheme for formal outdoor sport space and informal open space provision

Contact Officer: Daniel Smith - Planning Officer
01954 713162