

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

4 July 2012

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

S/0507/12/DC – PAPWORTH EVERARD

Discharge of Condition 23 of Planning Permission S/1101/10 at land west of Ermine Street South for Mr Patrick MacCarthy (David Wilson Homes)

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Date for Determination: 4 May 2012

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the Parish Council's recommendation of refusal conflicts with Officers' recommendation and the current design of the proposed dwellings is significantly different to that previously considered.

Conservation Area

To be presented to the Committee by Andrew Phillips

Site and Proposal

1. The site is located within the village framework and conservation area. The public highway defines the eastern boundary. To the south and north are the existing residential properties of Ermine Street South. To the west is the main section of the Summersfield Development.
2. The approval for Plot 160, which faces Ermine Street South, under Planning Permission S/1101/10 had proposed a very modern design with an L-Shape footprint. This modern design was discounted by the Local Planning Authority, due mainly to the likely extension of the Papworth Everard Conservation Area. It was considered that this design would not be in keeping within a Conservation Area and the design was dropped from consideration. Conditions 22 and 23 from planning permission S/1688/08/RM were carried forward on the decision notice of planning permission S/1101/10 as conditions 23 and 24. These required the details of the dwellings of plots 160 + 161 to be the subject of further approval.
3. The proposal is seeking to confirm the design and layout of plots 160 and 161 in order to discharge condition 23. The application was amended on the 14 June 2012, which changed the number of dwellings being proposed from three to two. The single proposed dwelling facing Ermine Street South (Plot 160) has been designed in order to more actively reflect the adjacent existing dwellings. The developer has provided a new site layout in order to reflect the Local Highways Authority comments and a landscaping scheme on the 15 June 2012. The comments from consultees and adjacent residential properties regarding these amendments will form part of an update to Planning Committee.

Planning History

4. **S/1101/10** – Variation of Condition 12 and 26 of Planning Application S/1688/08/RM was approved.
5. **S/1688/08/RM** – Siting, design and external appearance of 166 dwellings was approved.

Planning Policy

6. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, adopted January 2007**

ST/5 – Minor Rural Centres

7. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Development Control Policies, adopted July 2007**

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/5 - Conservation Areas

TR/2 - Car and Cycle Parking Standards

Consultation by South Cambridgeshire District Council as Local Planning Authority

8. **Papworth Everard Parish Council** – The Parish Council state that the condition requires that plot 160 requires a “special treatment consistent with their prominence and importance on the streetscene”. However, the developer is emphasising their similarity with the existing houses on Ermine Street South.
9. The Parish Council continues to state that the intention, ever since Supplementary Planning Guidance on the design of the Summersfield development was adopted by the planning authority is that the houses on Plot 160 and 161 should be of high quality, special character and individually (i.e architect) designed. They should have some architectural relationship to the apartment block that is to be placed at the southern entrance to the Summersfield.
10. The Parish Council conclude that the developer is not responding to the prominence and importance of the plots. The intention was that this should be a significant gateway, inviting pedestrians through the Summersfield estate and into the public

open space to the west, whereas the current proposal downgrades the path to a mere alleyway through a row of houses fronting Ermine Street South.

11. **Conservation** – The Conservation Manager states that the design of the entrance from Ermine Street, including the frontage building, presents a particular challenge. The argument has been made that the entrance should be marked by a feature building, and this approach would often be correct. However, in this case the advantages would be outweighed by a clash with the uniformity and relative simplicity of the Interwar houses along this side of Ermine Street South. The approach should, therefore, be to give a higher priority to reflecting the character of the existing houses and their relationships than to making a strong gateway feature to the new estate.
12. The Conservation Manager goes on to state that in their view the proposals go a little way to reflecting the existing character, but fall short of what is necessary. The front elevation is less simple than that of the neighbouring houses and loses their rhythm and relationship of openings, the block is deeper and the roof has a steeper pitch and lacks a chimney.
13. In addition linked to the inadequate response to the neighbouring houses is the pressure put on the design by making the block two dwellings rather than one. This has led to the deeper plan and higher roof. It also means that a major part of the front garden is taken up with hardstanding, including next to the path to the estate. This detracts from the new building, the conservation area and estate approach.
14. The Conservation Manager concluded that while therefore I support a design approach which responds to the character and uniformity of the neighbouring houses, I do not think that it has been adequately reflected in these proposals and cannot support this application without revision.
15. **Local Highways Authority** – (15th June 2012) The Highways Authority states that conditions are required in order to secure two 2.0 x 2.0 metre visibility splays, control of water drainage, creating a bound surface up to 5 metres back from the public highway and condition that the manoeuvring area is kept free of obstruction. These conditions are to ensure highway safety. The Local Highways Authority also requests an informative to ensure that the developer understands highway legislation.
16. **Urban Design** – (15th June 2012) The overall design proposed for Plot 160 is considered satisfactory. The architect should modify the roof form to create two gable ends to complement the Georgian architecture, which is characterized by its proportion and balance. Whilst nos 56 & 58 and nos 48 & 50 both have hipped roofs, their built form and overall elevation treatment are non-distinctive and the introduction of a gable roof to Plot 160 would create a more varied and interesting streetscene. The design of the proposed garage to Plot 160 is considered to be satisfactory.
17. The design of the proposed elevations for Plot 161 is considered of a good quality. The fenestration on the south elevation is well designed and would provide overlooking onto the public footpaths.
18. The rationale of incorporating chamfered brick walls (brick colour to match plots 160 and 161) to maximise natural surveillance over the public footpath is strongly supported.
19. Lighting should be installed along the public footpath to prevent crime and to improve public safety.

Representations by members of the public

20. No representations currently received

Material Planning Considerations

21. The key issues to consider in this instance are:
- Visual Impact
 - Residential Amenity
 - Highway and Pedestrian Safety

Principle of Development

22. The principle of the development has been defined within planning application S/1101/10. Planning permission S/1101/10 also defines the contributions that the development needs to provide to the local area.

Visual Impact

23. Plot 160 in particular has the constraints of both having to create an entrance into Summersfield, while preserving and enhancing the newly adopted Conservation Area. The west side of Ermine Street South has a uniform streetscene being made up of the semi-detached 1920/30s dwellings. It also needs to be noted that Plot 160 will never be viewed in connection with the proposed contemporary flat block on the southern entrance to the site, due to the distance (approximately 220 metres) between the two parts of the development. The developer has followed advice provided by the Conservation Manager in order to try and seek a design that preserves the character of the local area. It is considered that the proposed development is of similar form and design to the existing adjacent properties. It is considered that the current proposed dwelling is of an appropriate design for this location that meets the needs of both preserving the Conservation Area and being of an appropriate building to one of the entrances into the Summersfield Development. Officers will require at a later date to agree an appropriate materials pallet for this dwelling.
24. The aim for Plot 161 is to create an aesthetically pleasing design when being viewed from the Summersfield Green and the public footpath that is located to the south of the plot. The further towards Ermine Street South from Summersfield Green the more traditional in appearance the approved dwellings become. The proposed dwelling has a traditional "Georgian" style, which is a similar style to Plot 112 located approximately 11 metres to the southwest. The proposed design is considered to be in keeping within the context of the development, both when looking eastwards from Summersfield Green and for pedestrians using the footpath that connects to Ermine Street South.

Residential Amenity

25. Plot 160 will have two first floor windows (En-suite and Bedroom) facing 50 Ermine Street South but both these windows will be overlooking the front garden space of No.50. It is, therefore, considered that the proposal will not cause a significant loss of privacy to 50 Ermine Street South. It is not considered that the proposed property is going to cause any significant increase in loss of light or increase in undue overbearing than the previous dwellings on site. There will be no detrimental harm to the residential amenity of 50 Ermine Street South.

26. Plot 160 has no first floor windows facing 55 Ermine Street South and is set 8 metres to the north of the boundary line of No.55. It is considered that the proposed dwelling on Plot 160 will not have any detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of 56 Ermine Street South.
27. The dwelling on Plot 161 by virtue of its layout and siting will not have any detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of 50 Ermine Street South. The proposed dwelling has three first floor windows (two bedroom windows and one En-Suite window) facing 56 Ermine Street South. These windows will create some overlooking over the most rear section of the rear garden 56 Ermine Street South. However, the level of overlooking is not considered to be significant enough to warrant refusal. The proposed dwelling is set approximately 8.6 metres to the north of the boundary line of 56 Ermine Street and for this reason there is no concern over loss of light or undue overbearing.
28. The submitted landscaping scheme is still under consideration by the Landscape Officer. The Landscape Officers comments will form part of an update to Planning Committee.

Highway and Pedestrian Safety

29. The path that will run to the south of Plots 160 and 161 will be surveyed by three ground floor windows and three first floor windows from the proposed two dwellings. In addition the existing property of 56 Ermine Street South has two first floor windows that will provide overlooking of the public footpath. It is considered that the amount of natural surveillance should ensure that the users of the proposed footpath remain feeling safe.
30. Drawing labelled 'Site Extraction Plots 160 & 161' dated 15 June 2012 shows the driveway with two 2.0 x 2.0 metre visibility splays. The submitted landscaping scheme will need to be checked to ensure that the proposed planting is unlikely to grow over 0.6 of a metre. Officers will at a later date seek assurance that the driveway will be constructed with a bound material and that water will not drain onto the public highway.
31. It is not considered reasonable to add a condition requiring the manoeuvring area to be permanently maintained and kept free of obstruction, as this would in fact add an additional condition to the approved development retrospectively.

Recommendation

32. It is recommended that the Planning Committee give officers delegated powers to approve the application as amended. With the proposal being for a discharge of an existing condition, no conditions or informatives will be added, but the Case Officer will continue to seek appropriate details as defined above.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, adopted January 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Development Control Policies, adopted July 2007

Case Officer: Andrew Phillips – Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713169