

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

2 November 2011

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

S/0893/11 –LITTLE ABINGTON

Full Planning Application for erection of new scout headquarters building, toilet/shower block and extension to existing training buildings, and erection of three detached bungalows with covered car parking following the demolition of existing buildings At Scout Hut, Cambridgeshire County Scout Camp Site, Church Lane, Little Abington, Cambridge for Cambridgeshire County Scout Council.

Recommendation: Delegated Minded to Approve (Departure application)

Date for Determination: 12 July 2011 (already expired)

Notes: This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the recommendation of approval is contrary to that of the Parish Council and Councillor Orgee requested the application to be presented at the planning committee if officers are minded to recommend approval.

Site and Proposal

1. The application site relates to an established scout hut site located to the southern side of Church Lane. Single storey scout buildings are located towards the northern end of the site and are located within the village framework. These buildings are adjacent to shared boundaries with residential properties of Church Close. Currently the training centre is the only building that is located outside the village development framework and is located within the countryside and partly within the conservation area.
2. Access is provided to the site from Church Lane via a single width driveway, which widens to the south. The access road runs along the rear gardens of neighbouring residential dwellings and to the rear of the chain-link fence and trees adjacent to a public footpath to the west of the site.
3. There are listed buildings in the locality: No. 33 Church Lane, Nos. 1, 26, 28, 30, 32 and 33 Church Lane, and Abington Hall, which is located 400m to the southwest of the site beyond a landscape of open fields and a watercourse. There are protected trees in the south and southeast parts of the site.
4. The site is located within Flood Risk Zone 1 (low risk). No part of the identified application site is located within flood zones 2 or 3.
5. The site is heavily enclosed with mature trees to the south, east and west boundaries and 2m high panel fencing is located to the northern boundary of the site with the adjoining residential properties.
6. The full planning application, validated on 17 May 2011, seeks permission for the erection of a new scout headquarters building, toilet/ shower block and extension

to existing training building and erection of three detached single storey dwellings with covered car parking following demolition of existing buildings, within an established scout hut site

7. Discussions with the applicant and agent have taken place, which have resulted in the submission of amended plans. The revised scheme involves the following amendments:
 - A redesign of the bungalows, Scout HQ buildings, Toilet/Shower Block buildings to a more simple design with a lower height and smaller mass
 - The HQ buildings and toilet block have been re-sited such that they are away from the western boundary to allow further landscaping.
 - The proposed bungalows have been re-positioned and designed as such that they allow a screen to visibility to be placed to the south of them to obscure views over and from the scout field and are of a smaller scale to that originally proposed.
8. The application is accompanied by supporting documentation including a Planning Statement, Design and Access Statement; Heritage Appraisal. The applicant has confirmed that the bungalows were needed to fund the cost of the proposed works for the new scout hut buildings.
9. A section 106 Agreement would accompany any grant of permission in respect of a contribution towards affordable housing and associated contributions, which the applicant has agreed to.

Relevant Planning History

10. A full planning permission application under ref: S/0435/10 for the Erection of new scout headquarters building, extension to existing training building and erection of three detached dwellings, was withdrawn on the advice of officers.
11. Earlier planning history from the 1970s to 1990's associated with the Scout Hut use includes approvals for car parking area, and gas tank, erection of new Banbury pre-cast building and lavatory, erection of Banbury pre-cast building and demolish existing wooden building and change of use of the car park area for users of the scout camping site.

Planning Policy

12. National Policy
 - PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment**
 - PPS3: Housing**
 - PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas**
 - PPS13: Transport**
13. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2007
 - Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2007:**
 - ST/6 – Group villages**
14. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies 2007
 - DP/1 – Sustainable Development**
 - DP/2 – Design of New Development**
 - DP/3 - Development Criteria**
 - DP/4 – Infrastructure and New Developments**
 - DP/7 – Development Framework**

HG/1 – Housing Density
HG/2 – Housing Mix
HG/3 – Affordable Housing
CH/2 – Archaeological Sites
CH/4 – Development within/ affecting the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building
CH/5 – Conservation area
SF/9 – Protection of Existing Recreation Areas
SF/10 – Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments
SF/11 – Open Space Standards
NE/1 - energy efficiency
NE/6 – Biodiversity
NE/11 – Flood Risk
NE/15 – Noise Pollution
TP/1 – Planning for more Sustainable Travel
TP/2 – Car and Cycle Parking Standards

15. District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010
Trees and Development Sites SPD (2009)
Open Space and New Developments SPD (2009)
Landscape in New Developments SPD (2010)
Listed Buildings SPD (2009)
Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD (2009)
District Council District Design Guide (2010)
16. **Circular 11/95 (The use of Conditions in Planning Permissions)**
Advises that planning conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.
17. **Circular 05/2005**
Advises that planning obligations must relevant to planning, necessary, directly related to the proposed development to be permitted, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respects.
18. **The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009**
This sets out the circumstances in which local planning authorities are to refer to the Secretary of State applications for planning permission, including those decisions which are departures from the development plan.

Consultations

19. **Little Abington Parish Council** recommends refusal of the application on the following grounds:
 - a) Overdevelopment of the site, which is a much valued open space in the village and adjacent to a conservation area.
 - b) Concerns with building in a conservation area and in an open space outside the village envelope
 - c) Inadequate parking provision
 - d) Concerns with traffic flows and vehicular access
 - e) Concerns with Access for Emergency vehicles
 - f) Concerns with Child protection and child safety

The Parish Council maintain their objections in respect of the amended plans.

20. **Local Highway Authority** requests conditions regarding 'no unbound materials to be used within 6 metres of the highway boundary' and provision of a better 'visibility splay'.
21. **The Environment Agency** has no objection to the proposal, in principle, but suggest that PPS25 (Para E9) requires that any site over 1ha in Flood Zone 1 must include a Flood Risk Assessment. Whilst the proposed built development appears to be within FZ1 (low risk) part of the site is within FZ2/3. The Environment Agency are happy for a condition requiring the submission of a Flood Risk assessment to be placed on any approval
22. **The County Council Rights of Way and Access Team** - No objection to the proposal, but recommends the following Informatives are added to any approval:
- a) There is a public footpath/right of way within the site area, which must be unobstructed etc.
 - b) The proposed site layout plan and Design and Access Statement refers to existing trees being removed and a new hedge line being planted along the western boundary of the site. Part of the western boundary abuts the Public Footpath. We would request that hedges and other vegetation are planted at least 2m away from the Public Footpath to ensure that future growth does not obstruct the path.
23. **Cambridgeshire County Council's Archaeologist** has no objection to the proposal.
24. **The Housing Strategy Manager** - No objection to the proposal and Happy for there to be a condition on any approval that building work must not commence until the affordable housing contribution has been agreed and the valuation process commenced. (Applicant confirmed that he would agree to this condition).
25. **Ecology Officer** - No objection to the proposal
26. **The Landscape Design Officer and Trees Officer** - No objection to the removal of trees identified on the plans and discussed/agreed with the applicant. Details of the tree protection for trees T1 – T5 located in open space opposite the Scout Huts to be demolished for the proposed bungalows – details in accordance with paragraph 4.2.6 and Clause 7 of BS 5837 20051/8/2011

Amended plans - No objection to the proposed hedges along side boundary and it is not necessary to move the car parking spaces away for the building to accommodate the trees

Landscape Officer – no comments on amended plans. Original plans:

Bungalows

- a) The present layout is not viable and the plots are tight for space. The front gardens and very narrow access path (together less than 2 metres wide) front a dense screen of native shrubs and small trees, presumably planted to prevent views to the scout field. The planting will be only 2.5m from the south facing windows and will certainly affect light levels in the living room and bedrooms – more space is needed

- b) A possible suggestion is to turn the bungalows through 90 degrees and reduce the numbers from 3 to 2. This will enable pathway access from the northern boundary, limit views into the scout field and provide gardens of a reasonable size, which can accommodate tree and screening planting as required. The proposed 5m rear gardens are too small to accommodate screen planting.
- c) The dense screening south of the bungalows could then be removed and replaced with a small number of parkland trees, which would be more in character with the historic parkland setting.

Car Park

- a) The car parking bays to the north of the new HQ building may damage existing roots and tree canopies of trees to the west of the car park. These trees are in a conservation area, and a tree protection plan will be required.
- b) Car parking spaces should be pulled back from the west boundary away from the trees, leaving a wide verge 2-3m. There is space to achieve this.
- c) A major tree in the conservation area (Field Maple) will be lost, and so a replacement should be provided. This will soften the bulk of the new HQ building and car parking.

Shower and Toilet Blocks

- a) The proposed position will remove a number of dying Elm trees and also a Substantial field Maple. Proposals for replacement trees should be included.
- b) The impact of the proposed building could be reduced by hedge and parkland tree planting

Parkland Landscape

- a) The current scout field is separated from the adjacent parkland landscape of Abington Hall by thick belts of woodland, and at present there are no views between the two. However some of the woodland is in a poor condition (Elm etc) and may fail in the future opening views to the Park. The scout field should be seen as part of the historic landscape and planting proposals should include significant parkland trees and management of the surrounding woodland, with consideration given to visually linking the two spaces in the future.

27. The **Crime Prevention Design Team/Architectural Liaison Officer**: Church Lane links the High Street with Bourn Bridge Road, which is not especially busy. In terms of crime risk, carried out 2 x years analysis of the area and can find only one recorded crime and there are no instances of anti social behaviour. There are no recorded matters relating to the existing site.

No issue with any of the proposed buildings on site. The issue of child protection has been mentioned within the documentation and needs to be dealt with in terms of who occupies the bungalows. Apart from this issue, I have no objection to layout and location of any buildings on site

28. The **Disability forum** make the following comments:

- a) The HQ Building ramp should be 1:20 or 1:15-16 gradient
- b) HQ side door should be open inward (electric door) or the platform should be bigger to allow space for users and the door to open outward

Informatives that are recommended to be placed on any approval:

- a) No gravelled area next to fire exit (should be hard standing)

- b) Disabled car parking should be provided at a rate of 6% of total car parking spaces

29. **Cambridge Fire and Rescue** - No response received

30. **Conservation Officer** - original plans:

The Heritage statement misses the significance of the landscape being part of the Repton Garden forming part of the curtilage of the grade II Abington Hall, and the position of the adjacent grade II Old Vicarage (No 33. Church lane), which is set back from the street.

The position of new buildings within the historic landscape have not been addressed. The demolition of the 20th Century buildings is supported, and they currently have a minimal impact on the adjacent conservation area. The impact on the Old Vicarage would be limited due to the shelter belts.

The proposal extends the development beyond the built-up part of the village into the conservation area and specifically into the open part of the Repton landscape, an important part of open landscape within the conservation area. It is screened from the two listed buildings by trees, but the trees and the land forming the site were part of the designed garden constructed as part of Abington Hall's early nineteenth century redesign.

The buildings proposed within the conservation area are bulky, particularly the HQ building, which has a complex form and deep span. The complexity of the design with cutaway forms and chamfered gable, and wide high level dormer vent, increases this apparent bulk and intrusion into the open garden.

The loss of part of the garden under development and the creation of a percent of moving into the open centre of the garden, together with the bulk, form, design and complexity would therefore be harmful to the character of this part of the conservation area and to the setting of Abington Hall.

Therefore recommend refusal under policies:

Conservation Area – CH5 and PPS5 HE6, HE7 and HE9.

Setting of listed building – CH/4 and PPS5 HE6, HE7, HE9 and HE10

31. **Planning Officer meeting with Conservation and Landscape Officers**

Given the consultation responses received from landscaping and the Conservation Team, a meeting with both departments in order to suggest amendments to make to the scheme for it to become acceptable was suggested.

Proposed bungalows:

- a) In order to provide reasonable space for landscaping and gardens, it is suggested that the bungalows should be re-orientated to turn around to that they would be parallel to the neighbouring properties No's 6-12 Church Close. The size of the bungalows would need to be reduced
- b) Northern boundaries of the bungalows to include hedgerows and southern boundaries to include hedgerows and chain-link fencing. The proposed planted screen buffer shown on the submitted site layout plan would need to be removed from the scheme. The existing mature trees and proposed boundary treatment with hedges and chain-link fencing would be sufficient to provide screening to address EHO's concerns. 1.8m close boarded fencing

along the south side boundaries of the bungalow is not suggested in relation to landscape character.

- c) Footpath to the bungalow to be relocated to the northern side boundary and adjacent to the shared boundaries with No's 6-18 Church Close.

Proposed Shared car parking block for bungalows:

- a) Could be moved eastward to allow space to accommodate the proposed HQ building

HQ Building:

- a) To simplify the design by reducing the width. Suggest a longer and thinner building and set approximately 2m from the west side boundary to allow space for re-planting
- b) To revise the roof design with one single ridge height and removal the triangular feature in the front elevation
- c) To revise the window arrangement so that no window would be open onto the refuse area

Toilet Block:

- a) Set back 2m from the west side boundary to allow space for re-plant
- b) To revise the roof design with one single ridge height and remove the triangular feature in the front elevation
- c) Enlarge store area to the south end of the building so to bring the front elevation in line with the main building
- d) Preferably, the front elevation of the building to be set back from the front elevation of the HQ building

Proposed west side boundary treatment:

- a) Proposed car parking space should be set 2m away from the west side boundary to leave sufficient space for re-planting.
- b) Suggested replacement planting – Could be conditioned and expected species would be hedgerows, Hazel and Field Maples

Other replacement plantings:

Suggestion – An Oak Tree to the southeast of the proposed toilet block and to the north of the HQ building (car parking area)

Hard surfacing area for emergency training

Question about why such a large area is required. Revised scheme to minimise the required hard surfaced area. Details of hard surfaced materials need to be provided/conditioned

Outstanding Issue

Extension to the training building would affect the existing mature trees. The impacts upon the trees have not been addressed in the submitted tree survey. The tree officer confirmed that this issue was not discussed and mentioned at the pre-application meeting. Officers have objections to the loss/impacts upon trees Please note that this issue was resolved. Tree officer now raises no objection.

32. **Conservation Officer** comments in respect of amended plans:

The proposal has an inappropriate over developed suburban form and design which is considered to have a significant harmful impact on the open character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and it could encourage a precedent for similar suburban extensions into the open landscape area contract

to LDF Policy CH/4 Setting of Listed Buildings, CH/5 Conservation area, Planning Policy Statement 5, Policies HE6, HE7, HE9 and HE10.

Representations

33. **Councillor Tony Orgee** - was at the Parish Council meeting at which the Parish Council opposed this application, and if officers are minded to approve the application, he requests that it goes to the SCDC Planning Committee for decision.
34. Letters of representation were received from the neighbours at:
- 73 Alex Wood Road, Cambridge
 - 33 Badminton Close
 - 1 Brunswick Cottages, Cambridge
 - 12 and 47 Church Lane
 - 37 Coleridge Road
 - 132 Cromwell Road
 - 23 Eden Street. Cambridge
 - 21c, Emery Street
 - 180 Foster Road
 - 30 Fulbrooke Road
 - 34, High Street
 - 7 London Road, Harston
 - 1 Luard Road,
 - 31 Madingley Road
 - 3 Mill Villas
 - 196 Sturton Road
 - 12 The Haven, Fulbourn
 - The Cedars, West Wrating Road, Balsham

Which make the following observations:

- Buildings will be outside the village framework
- Loss of open space
- Detrimental to public footpath
- Concerns with lack of car parking, as there are already issues with on-street car parking
- Some visitors travel by coach
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Concerns with the introduction of three bungalows
- Impractical parking for bungalows
- Additional traffic generated from the development
- Concerns with the access/exit into the site
- Concerns with the northern access into the HQ buildings, being in close proximity to the 1st car parking space
- Concerns with the potential occupiers of the bungalows, as they can look out onto the scout field and have open access into the scout site – (Child Safeguarding Concerns)
- The Scout's privacy would be impacted upon by the introduction of bungalows into the site
- Concerns with the proximity of buildings and houses, as the scout activities would result in conflict with residents, due to noise in the mornings, evenings and weekends. The existing building currently acts as a sound barrier between residents and scouts

- Concerns with their being no bin storage areas for the bungalows provided
- There is a strong view in the village that the open space should be preserved
- The new bungalows are the issue, not the new scout buildings
- The Scout Camp is used for scouting activities, and shortly a Duke of Edinburgh activity. The site benefits from being close to an urban centre, such as a great playing field, forest and a stream
- In favour of the site, both as an asset for the Scout Association and of benefit to the wider community
This is a valuable resource and provides wonderful activities

8 Letters of representation were received in response to re-consultation of amended plans, which make the same objections as previously noted.

Comments relating to received representations

35. The possible occupants of the proposed bungalows is not a material planning consideration. It is noted in response to these comments that there is a public footpath running along the side of the site and public land to the rear of the site. Despite this not being a material planning consideration, screening is proposed in-between the scout field and the proposed bungalows

Planning Comments

36. The main issues are the impacts on the Conservation Area and wider setting of the nearby listed buildings, no. 33 Church Lane and Abington Hall, housing mix, housing density, street scene and visual amenity, residential amenity interests, development outside the village framework, access and highway safety interest, biodiversity and landscape character, archaeology, infrastructure contributions, and flood risk
37. The site relates to an established scout use and none of the buildings or the use is restricted by a temporary condition/restriction

Principle of the Development

38. The northern part of the site, which includes the car park, hard surfaced area, all scout buildings apart from the training building are located within the Village Development Framework and outside the Conservation area. The southern part of the site, which includes the training building and scout field are located outside the Village Development Framework and within the Conservation area.
39. The proposed bungalows and new HQ building would be located outside the Conservation area and within the Village Development framework and are therefore acceptable in principle
40. The proposed toilet/shower block and the extension to the existing training building would be located outside the Village Development Framework and within the conservation area. These developments would be located within a field which has been used as part of a long established Scout Hut use (D2). Policy DP/7 is concerned with the Countryside and limits development outside frameworks. The proposed development located outside the framework would need to accord with this policy in order to be acceptable in principle.

Other harm

Conservation Area, streetscene and impact upon the setting of listed buildings and the historic landscape area

41. The buildings would be located north of the grade listed Abington Hall and Repton landscape area. They are sited near to existing built development. It is considered that the development proposal would be read as part of the existing built development area, as residential properties are located within close proximity of the buildings. There are a number of other buildings located within closer proximity to Abington Hall.
42. It is not considered that the proposal would impact significantly open the Repton landscape area of the listed building, given its location and both replacing and near to existing built development. Abington Hall is located a great distance away, within a significantly enclosed site. The Scout Hut site is also a significantly enclosed site and the buildings proposed are of a single storey nature.
43. **The proposed dwellings:** The existing scout hut buildings are considered to be permanent and established structures for the following reasons; they have unrestricted planning permission for their use as part of Scout Hut activities, the buildings have been there and in regular use for a number of years and are incapable of being classed as mobile.
44. In terms of their appearance, they appear to be three attached buildings with pitched roofs. In comparison with the proposed three dwellings, the rhythm of development (3 structures) would be the same, the footprint of the dwellings would be smaller to that of the building they would replace and they would be moved further away from adjoining residential properties. The proposed bungalows would be of a similar appearance, but of different materiality, but which conforms to that of surrounding residential dwellings.
45. The dwellings would be well screened from the streetscene by the existing neighbouring dwellings to the front and the existing boundary fencing along the northern boundary with the neighbours.
46. In regard to the covered car parking area; It would be set well back from the streetscene and partially screened by the existing boundary treatments and bungalow in front of it. There are some concerns with the detailing to the top of the roof of the proposed structure and the applicant/agent has agreed that this can be amended. Given the limited height of the structure and its siting, it is not considered to have a detrimental visual impact, subject to the imposition of a condition removing the roof details or requesting an amended design to be agreed no objection is raised to this part of the proposal in design terms.
47. **In regard to the new HQ building and toilet/shower block;** The new HQ building is of a single storey and simple design with a low ridge height. The structure has been re-positioned as such from the original scheme so that it is away from the western boundary, as requested by the landscape officer.
48. It would be well screened from the western boundary by existing mature trees and screened from the streetscene by a bungalow and shrubbery to the northern boundary. The HQ building would only be visible from the streetscene when standing almost directly in front of the access into the site. The building would be set a considerable distance from the eastern and southern boundaries and

would be screened by mature trees at both boundaries as well as the proposed toilet/shower block.

49. The toilet/shower block would be screened from the streetscene by the proposed HQ block and by mature trees at the other boundaries.
50. Both buildings are of a single storey low ridge height and of a simple design and well screened from the streetscene and neighbouring sites. It is not considered that these buildings would result in a detrimental impact to the Conservation area, streetscene or the surrounding area
51. **In regard to the extension of the Training Building;** The development would be located within a conservation area, but relates to an extension of a single storey building measuring 4.2m wide and 7.5m deep. The extension would be completely obscured from neighbouring dwellings by the existing training building itself and would be heavily screened by shrubbery and trees within the site as well as heavy screening located along the eastern boundary of the site. On this basis it is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the streetscene and neighbouring dwellings. The extension would match in terms of design, height and depth to that of the existing building and is of a simple design and reasonable scale. It is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the conservation area.
52. **In regard to the car parking area;** The car parking area can be marked and 'formalised' without planning consent, as this is not considered to constitute an engineering operation or 'development' and a refusal on this basis is not judged to be able to be defended at appeal
53. **Concluding comments;** It is not judged that the development would have a significant impact upon the listed building and its wider setting or the landscape area.
54. The proposed structures have been sited as such that they are contained within the car-parking area and within the development framework (apart from an extension to an existing building) and are kept away from the attractive, open, scout field. They are set well back from the streetscene, and screened by existing residential bungalows, boundary treatments and are of a simple design and a single storey height.
55. The existing buildings are in need of replacement and are of a poor visual appearance. The proposed buildings would be of a visual improvement to the existing buildings and would continue to maintain this community facility.
56. Conditions can also be applied to any consent to comply with the suggestions of the disability forum in regard to access and use of the buildings.

Countryside

57. Countryside policy (Policy DP/7) limits development outside frameworks to that which is essential in the countryside. The aim of the policy is to protect the countryside from gradual encroachment, to guard against incremental growth in unsustainable locations.
58. Policy DP/7 specifically states that "outside urban and village frameworks, only development agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted"

59. The proposed extension of the training building and the proposed shower/toilet block would be located outside the Village Framework and within the Countryside and would be used for the purposes associated with the established scout hut use (D2 use), which is a use relating to outdoor recreation within an established site.
60. For the reasons explained above the parts of the development proposal which are located outside the village framework are associated with an appropriate use and the proposal is therefore acceptable in principle and would not therefore result in a departure from the development plan
61. It is also noted that the proposed building would be located to the very north of the Scout field and towards the western boundary on the edge of the existing car park and the other part of the proposal outside the framework relates to an extension of a building. Both buildings are of a single storey height and well screened and in close proximity to the built development surrounding the site.

Residential Amenity

62. Residential amenity concerns the impact of a development in regard to surrounding residents, which can include noise and disturbances as well as physical impact of the structures, such as overshadowing from a proposed building.
63. The site already has use for Scout activities. It is not possible to now limit this activity, as planning permission already exists. The parking area is not considered to be significantly reduced, as the new HQ building would be sited in an area currently used for the storing of wood and residential car parking spaces for the bungalows would be located further into the site.
64. Occupiers of the proposed bungalows would be well aware that the site is used for purposes related to the scouts and would be able to decide whether or not living in such a location would be acceptable to them, as appose to having an existing dwelling and a new use introduced into a site. Screening would also be provided in between the proposed bungalows and scout field. It is also noted that the proximity of the proposed bungalows would be further away from scout buildings than the proximity of the existing neighbouring bungalows to the existing scout buildings.
65. In terms of the impact upon surrounding neighbours, the scout buildings are currently located 2.6m from the northern boundary with a number of neighbouring dwellings. The proposal would mean that a buffer is provided from the scout's to the existing neighbours by the introduction of the three proposed bungalows. The new scout buildings would be moved further away from neighbours than the current scout buildings. The proposed bungalows would be located 5.9m from the northern boundary, which would mean that they would be 3.3m further away from neighbours than the current scout buildings. On this basis it is considered that noise and disturbances from the use of the site for both residential and Scout activities would be less than what would be currently possible and/or currently experienced in terms of the impact upon existing residential neighbours.
66. In terms of overshadowing; The built form would be located 3.3m further away from existing neighbours and the proposed bungalows would be detached from each other, rather than being one large building and are of a single storey height and would be partially screened by existing panel fencing located on the northern

boundary of the site. It is not therefore considered that the proposal would result in excessive overshadowing and dominance to neighbours.

67. Noise and disturbances from a site are also protected under Environment Health policies and neighbours would be able to contact the Environmental Health team if noise occurred from the site. It is noted that the Environmental Health team have raised no objection to the proposal.
68. On this basis it is considered that a reason for refusal based on impact upon the amenities of surrounding neighbours would not be supported at appeal, as the proposal would actually mean that the scout hut activities are moved further away from existing neighbours.

Housing Density, Housing Mix and Affordable Housing

69. Additional housing developments in South Cambridgeshire are currently required to meet a shortfall identified through the Regional Spatial Strategy. Any shortfall in housing provision within the current Local Development Framework process will, however, be made up from allocated sites and windfall sites at more appropriate and sustainable locations, in accordance with policy ST/2.
70. Little Abington is a group village where residential development within the framework is limited to 8 dwellings or exceptionally about 15 where it would make best use of a brownfield site. The proposed bungalows would accord with this policy and would be located within the development framework.
71. 1 unit of affordable housing (2 bedroom bungalow) has been proposed, which meets the requirements of Council Policy relating to affordable homes. Contact has been made to three relevant housing associations who have stated that they have no interest in taking on such an affordable property. A sum of around £50k-£60k (subsequent to a valuation process) would be contributed towards affordable housing provision elsewhere in the Borough, A condition can be applied to any consent to ensure that the proposal accords with policy.

Highways and access

72. The existing access into the site would be used. The Highway Authority have raised no objection to the proposal and have recommended that conditions relating to a wider site splay and that no unbound materials shall be used within 6 meters of the highway.
73. Three dwellings would be introduced into the site, which could mean that 6 or more further vehicles would use the access into the site. The proposal would reduce a small insignificant part of the car park with the introduction of the new HQ building. This would mean that less cars would be able to use this area. The site relates to an established Scout Hut site, where an endless amount of traffic movements could potentially take place. It is not considered that the introduction of three dwellings would significantly increase car/vehicle movements and it is noted that no objection was raised to the proposal by the Highway Authority and subject to the imposition of a condition, the site splay would be improved to that existing.
74. Policy TR/2 - Appendix 1 of the Parking standards states that at least 5% of the total number of car parking spaces should be reserved for people with disabilities. For D2 uses, such as the Scout hut activities, there is a requirement for the provision of 1 car parking space per 22m² of floor area and 1 cycle space

per 25m². For residential dwellings a provision of an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling should be provided.

75. Three dwellings are proposed and six spaces have been allocated to the dwellings. Whilst this is above the policy requirements, it would be possible to reduce car parking provision for the dwellings, however given the location of the dwellings, it is considered reasonable to have one space for the dwelling and an additional space for guest parking per dwelling.
76. The total area of scout hut buildings would be 396.96sqm, which would require the provision of 18 car parking spaces. 17 spaces, including a larger disabled car parking are indicated on the proposed site plan. It would be possible for a further car to be accommodated to the south of space number 17. This is an established Scout Hut site and as such no objection can be provided to the proposal on grounds of a lack of inadequate parking provision, as the site can accommodate the car parking spaces required.
77. A refuse area and cycle store is shown to be located to the south of the HQ building, and is considered acceptable in terms of the provision of cycle parking.

Flooding and Drainage

78. In terms of drainage from the buildings, Building regulations would have to be satisfied at the development stage.
79. In terms of flooding the site is located within a Flood Risk Zone 1 only, which is of low risk. Flood Risk zones 2 and 3 are located further south of the site area.
80. New buildings within sites of this type, which are within a flood risk zone 1 require the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment containing a surface water drainage strategy setting out how the surface water from the site will be managed. The Environment Agency have raised no objection to the proposal and state that a condition can be imposed on any approval to require the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment.

Contributions

81. The applicant and the agent are aware of the contribution required for open space, community facilities and waste receptacles and it is stated in the submitted statement that these will be dealt with by S106 agreements.
82. This application involves section 106 agreement for a scheme of the provision of recreation infrastructure that would require the applicants to pay a contribution towards the cost of monitoring and administering the legal agreement. The applicants are aware of the fee of £50.

Conclusion

83. The proposed redevelopment of the site would involve the development of buildings for the Scout association within a well established site. The existing buildings are in need of replacement. The proposal makes good use of the site and the agent/applicant have thought well about placing the dwellings within the development framework and some of the Scout buildings just to the south of the framework area, but within the most ideal locations. The scheme provides 3 dwellings, which would provide further homes in the borough and would contribute to the costs of the building works, as well as contributing to affordable

homes. The buildings are of a single storey height and screened well from neighbours and the proposal would mean that the scout buildings are moved further away from existing residents.

Recommendation

84. Minded to approve subject to delegated powers for:

- (a) Addressing concerns in relation to the design of the roof of the covered car parking area
- (b) Section 106 agreement in relation to affordable homes contributions
- (c) Flood Risk assessment to be submitted and agreed
- (d) Site splay improvements
- (e) Materials of the buildings

These conditions will be worked up and published in the written update report, along with any further consultation responses and associated requirements.

Contact Officer: Jason Parker – Planning Officer (East)
Telephone: (01954) 713250