

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

4 April 2012

AUTHOR/S: Corporate Manager (Planning and New Communities)

S/1708/10 – BASSINGBOURN CUM KNEESWORTH

Part demolition of existing garage and replacement double garage, new access, entrance gates and wall at 37 High Street, for D Chapman Esq

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Date for Determination: 2nd December 2010

The area is within a Conservation Area.

Members will visit the site on the 3rd April 2012.

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee at the request of a Local Member.

Site and Proposal

1. The application site measures approximately 0.77 hectares and the site is located within the village framework and conservation area. The building of 35/37 High Street Bassingbourn is a Grade II Listed Building and approximately 3m x 5m of the garage/store that is currently connected to the shop is curtilage listed. On the opposite side of the road is a Grade II Listed Building (34 High Street). The public highway defines the southern boundary. The site is also now within floodzones 2 and 3a.
2. The application was validated on the 7th October 2010 but at a future date the development will require Listed Building consent before works can commence. The development does not need Conservation Area Consent, due to the building being altered not removed. The proposal is to part demolish the existing garage, while preserving the attached older part of the curtilage listed building and replacing with a double garage with new access, entrance gates and wall.
3. The development being considered in this report is the scheme as amended on the 31st January 2012.
4. The previous scheme as amended on the 22nd September 2011 had the support of the case officer, the conservation officer and the Local Highways Authority but was considered by the Interim Head of Planning and Development Control Manager as not being acceptable in regards to impact upon the conservation area. The applicant/agent between 22nd September 2011 and 31st January 2012 came to the Local Planning Authority for pre-application advice and following positive comments by the Development Control Manager submitted the current amendment.

Planning History

5. *Relevant planning history*

S/1399/08/F – Erection of 4 dwellings and garage was refused due to harm to the listed building, conservation area, inappropriate design, density, housing mix, affordable housing and highway safety.

S/1400/08/CAC – The proposal to totally demolish the existing garage/outbuilding was refused due to the harm this buildings removal would cause on the conservation area.

S/0132/77/F – Alteration to barn and garage to form garage and stable was approved. This building is of similar footprint to the existing garage but had a coach entrance with a double gate.

Planning Policy

6. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007:**

DP/1 – Sustainable Development

DP/2 - Design of New Development

DP/3 - Development Criteria

NE/6 – Biodiversity

NE/11 – Flood Risk

CH/3 – Listed Buildings

CH/4 – Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building

CH/5 – Conservation Areas

South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Documents

District Design Guide SPD – Adopted March 2010

Listed Buildings SPD – Adopted July 2009

Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD – July 2009

Consultations

7. Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council –

(22nd November 2010) The Parish Council recommends refusal. It states that the existing garage/outbuilding in its current location is considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area and streetscene. Its demolition goes against the historic pattern of development in the village.

Concerns over the loss of car parking spaces on the High Street.

(29th March 2011) The Parish Council recommends refusal. The reasons for refusal is due to the virtue of its design, location, scale and form detrimentally affecting the setting of a listed building.

In addition it will neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The application will exacerbate an already unsatisfactory High Street traffic management/parking issue and therefore significant concerns are raised by this application with respect to the safety of pedestrians bearing in mind the close proximity of a proposed new vehicular cross over to the local village stores.

This application has not given proper consideration to bio-diversity contrary to policy NE/6.

(8th April 2011) The Parish Council recommends refusal. The Parish Council also provides additional evidence including pre-war photograph and neighbour objection letters.

It still considers that the amended plans neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

(10th October 2011) The Parish Council recommends refusal, due to concern over loss of streetscene quality.

(22nd February 2012) – The Parish Council object to the amended application for the same reasons as advised in previous applications. The Parish Council consider that the proposal will neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The following comments made by parishioners are also supported:-

- Concern on pedestrian safety (SCDC policy objective DCP 2007 TR/g and TR/h).
- Garage makes a positive contribution to Conservation Area (SCDC policy DCP 2007 CH/5).
- Proposal does not comply with SCDC policies (SCDC policy DCP 2007 CH/4)

The Parish Council recommends that a site meeting for the planning committee be arranged so that members can see the proposed impact for themselves.

8. Ecology – The Ecology Officer confirms that there is no biodiversity concern over the proposed development and no need for conditions.
9. Conservation – The Conservation Manager's latest comments are to recommend approval of the planning application with suitable conditions. The Conservation Manager states these conditions will need to include schedule of works, sample panels, details of development (eaves verge, doors, exposed posts and gates), boundary treatment and landscaping.
10. Local Highways Authority (13th February 2012) -

The Local Highways Authority states the following are based on Drawing Number 101 Revision J:

It would request that the proposed new 215mm facing brick wall to the site frontage be 600mm in height and not 760mm as shown on the proposed drawing. This area shall be kept clear of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm high at all times.

It requests a condition to any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue in regard to this proposal requiring that the 2.0m x 2.0m and 1.5m x 1.5m pedestrian visibility splays shown on the drawings shall be kept clear of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm.

It requests a condition requiring the proposed drive way to be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway.

In addition it requests a condition requiring the proposed drive to be constructed using a bound material to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway.

It requests an informative to the effect that the granting of a planning permission does not constitute a permission or licence to a developer to carry out any works within, or disturbance of, or interference with, the public highway, and that a separate permission must be sought from the Highway Authority for such works.

Following the provision of the above, the Local Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposal will have no significant adverse effect upon the public highway

11. (7th March 2012) The Local Highways Authority confirms that the double lines in the vicinity of 37 High Street Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth are not to be implemented in the foreseeable future.

Representations

12. Representations have been made by the occupiers of 36 High Street, 34 High Street, 2 Playles Yard, 1 Playles Yard, 3 Popular Farm Close and 33 Mill Lane. Some people made comments without providing an address, these comments did not mention any additional material considerations.
13. It should be noted that only the latest representations are provided below. This is in order to provide a clear understanding of the concerns of the local residents.
14. 36 High Street (13th February 2012) The new positioning of the gated entrance to 37 High Street has hardly been altered from that proposed in September 2011, so their objections remain the same.

The occupant states that it is infinitely preferable to keep the garage entrance to 37 High Street where it is, giving adequate parking access to the huge delivery lorries and other vehicles to access the only entrance to the busy Spar Village Shop. Breaking up the parking pattern on the north side of the High Street will only result in more parking on the south side where there is a yellow line on the wide pavements opposite.

The Parish Council has received approval for double yellow lines on the north side of the High Street outside the entrances of various properties, including 37 and 45-49 High Street. The occupant has provided a copy of Cambridgeshire County Council Highways comments on the double yellow lines and associated plan. The moving of the entrance would cause a disadvantage for using double lines as required parking space would be reduced.

The sight line of drivers exiting the proposed new access will in no way be improved as parked traffic will still obscure the drivers vision where they access the road and will have to drive onto the road to check if it is safe to proceed. The occupant currently has this problem on her driveway.

The occupant states that the existing continuous wall of the present garage and store is well established as an integral part of the pleasantly mixed village streetscene.

15. **34 High Street (21st February 2012) –**

The occupant appreciates that the amended applications relate only to a new access for a double garage (now car port), but it has to be noted that it might in the future be used for an access to a number of new dwellings.

The occupant states that whilst the latest amendment might be seen as a step in the right direction the main objections are as follows:

- This is an unnecessary and poorly designed access, which will cause unacceptable danger to pedestrians and other road users and further complication on the already restricted on street parking available.
- The demolition of most of the pleasant red brick building will be a detriment to the visual aspect of the High Street Conservation Area.

The occupant would prefer if the existing carport area is removed to allow better access and turning, as this would preserve the majority of the existing red brick building and minimise traffic/pedestrian conflicts.

16. **2 Playles Yard** (21st February 2012) The occupant has provided very detailed comments, photo (dated circa 1960) and maps (1886, 1947 and 1976).

The occupant states that the replacement of the existing garage with a series of set backs, small outbuildings, low level walls, planters, a raised area, gates etc would not be satisfactory substitute for the effective, unfussy, simple contribution that the existing garage offers to the scene.

The occupant states that by virtue of its design, location, scale and form it detrimentally affects the setting of the listed building.

The occupant also raised biodiversity concerns and that it may lead to a long term litter problem.

The occupant also recommends a similar alternative suggestion to that raised by 34 High Street.

The occupant asks if a Conservation Area Consent would be required in addition to this application.

17. **1 Playles Yard** (30th September 2011) – The occupant makes reference to planning application S/1399/08/F and states:

“The existing garage/outbuilding in its current location is considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area and streetscene. Its demolition goes against the historic pattern of development in the village”.

States that the current garage presents a single continuous built element hard up against the pavement line, with an appropriate form and scale. This kind of structure being located here since the Victorian period. The proposal by being a series of buildings weakens the character of the streetscene.

The occupant states that the proposal will cause significant increase in highway safety risk and the proposal could harm local biodiversity.

18. **3 Popular Farm Close** (6th April 2011) - The occupant raises concern over vehicle parking and highway safety.

19. **33 Mill Lane** (21st February 2012) – The occupant states that the proposed development will detrimentally harm the character of the listed building and will make

the streetscene look more cluttered. The occupant also raised concerns relating to highway safety.

20. ***Cllr Cathcart (11th February 2012)*** – The Local Member has raised concerns over loss of historic fabric, impact on conservation area, unsuitable development in the curtilage of a listed building and the loss of high street parking that while modest could be crucial when considered in connection with efforts being taken to improve the situation.
21. The Local Member also points out that an alternative proposal that has been suggested would be less intrusive.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

22. It must first be noted that this planning application is for part demolition of an existing garage, with a replacement of a double carport, a new access and entrance gates. The proposed development does not involve the erection of any new dwellings and for this reason any comments relating to the erection of new dwellings are immaterial in the consideration of this application.
23. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:
 - Visual Impact and Impact on Historic Character
 - Highway Safety and Parking Provision
24. Principle of Development – The proposed development is a householder application within the village framework, there is no concern over the principle of the development.
25. Visual Impact and Impact on Historic Character – The dwelling element of the Grade II Listed Building defines the western boundary and the proposed store area defined on drawing number 101 revision J is the remaining part of a 19th Century outbuilding. The rest of the garage building is considered to have been rebuilt sometime in the 1970 and 80s but has reused some of the historic material.
26. The proposed development will, therefore, have to preserve the historic material on site. In addition officers are of the same view as local residents that fairly narrow entrances define this part of the conservation area and the linear building form is important within the streetscene. However, the importance of maintaining the replacement garage in principle has not been given such weight by officers. The focus needs to be on the preservation or enhancement of the conservation area.
27. The existing access between garage and dwelling is approximately 4 metres; the proposed openings on the frontage of this site will increase by approximately 1.5 metres. This additional amount of opening is not considered to be detrimental to the conservation area; this seems to be accepted by some local residents who have put in an argument that a better option would be to increase the opening between the garage and dwelling by a similar amount. The main argument, therefore, is the location of the opening and the effects this has on the streetscene.
28. The proposed buildings measure approximately 7.7 metres x 5.4 metres (store building) and 6.5 metres x 5.4 metres (carport). With the existing building having a frontage of approximately 15.5 metres, the loss in built frontage is relatively small. With both buildings having a linear form the streetscene is changed but the principles and character of the conservation area is maintained. In short the enclosure of the streetscene remains.

29. The proposal does not add additional buildings close to the listed buildings in the area, nor does it change any view to the listed buildings. It is for these reasons that the view of the Conservation Manager that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the nearby listed buildings is noted and accepted.
30. The conditions suggested by the Conservation Manager would need to be added to any consent to ensure that the development is built to a high standard that is appropriate within the conservation area and setting of listed buildings.
31. In addition the developer has agreed to enter into a S106 Agreement that will enforce that the development from the start of demolition is built in a timely manner. This will prevent any gaps in the built form of the streetscene remaining.
32. Highway Safety and Parking Provision – The existing carport on site has space for two average size cars to park. There is a reversing space of 8 metres, which would allow both cars to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. With the exiting of the site in a forward gear it is possible to see both ways to check for pedestrians, though the extent of this will change slightly on each use of the driveway. It is noted that because of the layout of the garage and reversing space this manoeuvring is not currently easy.
33. The proposal seeks to create an entranceway of 3 metres, widening to 4.5 metres where the double gates are set back from the public highway by 5.5 metres. This arrangement would allow for easier manoeuvring to allow a car to enter and leave in forward gear.
34. The visibility splay on the eastside is slightly below the normal standard but this has been carefully considered with the input of the Local Highways Authority in order to meet the concerns over the conservation area raised by the Interim Head of Planning over the plans stamped amended on the 22nd September 2011. The current visibility splays are considered to maintain highway safety but do not provide a clear improvement over the existing situation.
35. The existing access measures approximately 8.5 metres while the proposed access is 4.5 metres. The proposal will, therefore, lead to 4 metres more additional on street parking provision.
36. There has been a comment raised that the moving of this access will cause problems of the adoption of the double yellow lines on this site but the Local Highways Authority states that it does not see the implementation of these in the foreseeable future. The proposal is, therefore, considered to have no impact on the placement of double yellow lines.
37. A concern raised by local residents is that moving the access closer to the shop is going to cause problems with delivery lorries. The shop has a frontage of approximately 16 metres, which should allow space for a lorry to deliver goods without blocking the proposed access to 37 High Street or any other entrance. It is also noted that a delivery lorry will only be in situ for a short period of time and when not there, the same existing space can be used for the parking of customer's vehicles.
38. A condition will be required in order to ensure that the existing access is closed and put back to an acceptable standard to the Local Highways Authority in a timely

manner. An additional condition is required in order to ensure that visibility splays remain unobstructed of any object over 0.6 metres.

39. The proposed development is considered to have a neutral impact upon highway safety and does not lead to any loss of parking provision. The proposed development is considered acceptable in regards to these matters.
40. **Residential Amenity** – The proposal is in a similar location and is of a similar scale to the existing development on site and does not, therefore, lead to any residential amenity concerns.
41. **Ecology** – The ecology officer comments that the proposal will have no noticeable impact on biodiversity in the local area and for this reason the proposal is considered to be acceptable with regards to ecology.
42. **Flood Risk** – Since the submission of the application, the site has now fallen within flood zones 2 and 3a. With the proposal being for ancillary outbuildings and not including any habitable spaces, this change in constraints is not considered to be significant in the determination of this application.
43. **Other Matters** – The applicant and local residents have raised the issue of litter. It has been noted on site that litter appears within the front garden/carport of the applicant's property. The local residents have put forward an argument to state that the proposed development will lead to a similar level of littering. It is considered that both arguments have equal weight. It is, therefore, considered that the proposed development will not lead to additional littering that could potential detract from the conservation area.

Conclusion

44. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable subject to conditions to ensure that the proposed development is built to a high standard and that the proposed entrance way is maintained to a safe standard.

Recommendation

Approve, subject to conditions as detailed in the report

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007

Contact Officer: Andrew Phillips, Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713169