

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

5 December 2012

**AUTHOR/S:** Planning and New Communities Director

---

**S/2024/12/FL - FULBOURN**  
**Erection of two dwellings following demolition of existing bungalow**  
**16 Teversham Road**  
**for R & T Hogger Builders Ltd**

**Recommendation: Approve Conditionally**

**Date for Determination: 20 November 2012**

**The application has been referred to the Planning Committee as the Officers' recommendation conflicts with that of the Parish Council.**

To be presented to the Committee by Dan Smith

### **Site and Proposal**

1. The application site is a single detached bungalow situated parallel to the road on a relatively generous plot totalling approximately 1740 m<sup>2</sup>. The site is approximately 20 metres wide and 85 metres deep and sits opposite the T-junction serving Thomas Road. There is a ditch to the front of the site between the front garden of the property and the road and there is a bridged vehicle access across it. The front boundary is enclosed by hedging and the side boundaries are enclosed by a mixture of hedging and fencing. The property to the South East of the site is a two storey detached dwelling, while the property on the North West side is a bungalow similar in scale and character to the existing bungalow on the application site. The site lies within the Development Framework of Fulbourn.
2. The proposed development is the erection of two dwellings on site following the demolition of the existing bungalow, including the creation of an additional vehicle access. The proposals have been amended at the request of the case officer to reduce the projection of the single storey element to the front of the 4 bedroom dwelling and to improve the roof design by moving the flat roof element to the rear.

### **Relevant Planning History**

3. S/1207/11 – Planning Permission was refused for a scheme for 4 dwellings on the site (including the rear portion of the garden of the neighbouring property No. 18) which extended back into the rear of the site. An appeal against the refusal was also dismissed on the grounds of the adverse impact the development would have on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the neighbouring residents.

### **Policies**

4. **ST/4 Rural Centres**

**DP/1** Sustainable Development

**DP/2** Design of New Development

**DP/3** Development Criteria

**DP/7** Development Frameworks

**HG/1** Housing Density

**HG/2** Housing Mix

**NE/6** Biodiversity

**NE/15** Noise Pollution

**SF/10** – Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments

**SF/11** – Open Space Standards

**TR/2** Car and Cycle Parking Standards

### **Consultations**

5. **Parish Council** – has recommended refusal of the application on the grounds that the proposals are an overdevelopment of the site, the impact of the projecting garage element on the 4 bedroom house on the streetscene (which has been amended in later plans) and insufficient parking. It also states that the impact on neighbouring properties is unacceptable. The Parish Council also requested the Committee visit the site.
6. **Council Scientific Officer** – has no objection and does not request any conditions relating to contaminated land.
7. **Council Trees Officer** – does not object to the proposed development, noting that no significant trees would be affected.
8. **Council Environmental Health Officer** – has no objections but requests conditions relating to hours of construction and foundations.
9. **Local Highways Authority** – has not objected to the proposed development but has asked for conditions relating to visibility splays, drainage, hardsurfacing and the provision of the parking and turning area.
10. **Council Ecology Officer** – has no objection to the proposed development, noting that no bat survey is required given the age and condition of the existing bungalow and that the watercourse to the front of the site was inspected for water voles and that no evidence of them was found. The new bridge would therefore have little impact on the watercourse.

### **Representations**

11. No representations have been received in respect of the proposed development.

## Planning Comments

12. The main planning considerations in this case are the principle, the impact on the streetscene, Parking and Highway safety, Trees, Ecology, the impact on Residential Amenity and the provision for open space and community facilities in Fulbourn.
13. **Principle** – The proposed dwelling would be located within the Development Framework of Fulbourn and is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle. The site is approximately 1740 m<sup>2</sup> and the pair of dwellings would result in a density of approximately 11.5 dwellings per hectare. While this is significantly below the required density of 30 dwellings per hectare of policy DP/1, it is considered that given the constraints of the site including its limited width, the character of a linear built form in along Teversham Road and the potential harm to the amenity of neighbours which would arise from development in depth on the site, are such that the pair of dwellings to replace the existing bungalow is the most appropriate form of development and the proposed development is therefore acceptable in principle. The proposed dwellings are one two bedroom property and one four bedroom property replacing an existing two bedroom bungalow. This is considered to be an appropriate mix and is in accordance with policy HG/2 Housing Mix. No affordable housing is required as the development results in a net gain of only one unit.
14. **Impact on the Streetscene** – In terms of scale, the proposed two bedroom dwelling is taller than both the bungalow it replaces and the neighbouring bungalow to the North West. It is set down from the level of the proposed four bedroom property which is itself taller than the neighbouring house to the South East by approximately half a metre. However, the additional height when compared to the neighbouring dwelling to the South East is not considered to be so significant that it would be particularly noticeable when viewed from the public domain, nor is it considered to be excessive. The lower two bedroomed property, while taller than the neighbouring bungalow, provides a step down from both the proposed dwelling and the house to the South East and this creates a stepped change in levels which is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the streetscene.
15. The design of the dwellings reflects that of adjacent properties, picking up the front facing gables of No. 14 on the taller dwelling and providing a long ridge on the smaller dwelling which echoes that on the neighbouring bungalow to the North West. The single storey front projection on the larger dwelling has been reduced at the request of the Case Officer and Parish Council to improve the overall appearance of the dwelling and to create a greater separation between the front of the site and the built forms. The design of that dwelling has also been improved by the redesign of the main roof to provide a pitched roof to the front concealing the flat part of the roof, originally proposed at the front of the house, at the rear.
16. The proposed dwellings are considered to be acceptable in terms of their scale and design and are not considered to cause any significant harm to the visual amenity of the area, nor would they be out of character in the streetscene.
17. **Parking and highway safety** – The Local Highways Authority has no objection to the creation of a new access on to the road. A shared turning area would be provided to serve both dwellings on site and would allow vehicles to leave in a forward gear. The proposed development is not considered to cause any harm to highway safety in the area.

18. The proposed parking areas would allow two vehicles to park clear of the highway at each property. This is considered to be an adequate provision and the proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of parking.
19. **Trees** – The proposed development would not result in the loss of any significant trees on site. Landscaping of the areas in front of the dwellings has been proposed and the development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on trees.
20. **Ecology** – There are not considered to be any significant concerns regarding the impact of the development on ecology. The setting back of the single storey element from the front boundary will benefit the hedge and ditch to the front of the site. The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on ecology in the area.
21. **Impact on residential amenity** – The proposed dwellings would occupy broadly the same building line as the existing bungalow and would not project significantly outside the front or rear elevations of the neighbouring properties. The only element which projects forward of the established building line is the single storey element on the four bedroom property. This has been reduced in projection at the request of the Case Officer and is not considered that it would cause any significant loss of light, visual intrusion or overshadowing to the neighbouring property to the South East. The buildings would increase in height compared to the existing bungalow, however given the limited extent of the windows in the side elevations of the neighbouring properties, it is not considered that the proposed dwellings would cause any significant harm to the light received into the neighbouring homes.
22. The proposed dwellings would have first floor windows facing the rear of the site, however they would only allow relatively oblique views into the rear gardens of neighbouring properties and it is not considered that this would result in any significant loss of privacy to the neighbours.
23. The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the residential amenity of neighbours.
24. **Open Space and Community Facilities** – The proposed development would not provide open space or community facilities on site and would therefore be required to contribute to their provision off site, in order to mitigate the additional burden that the occupants of the proposed new 4 bedroom dwelling would place on such facilities locally. The applicant has agreed to enter into a Section 106 legal agreement to make such contributions. At present the amounts would be as follows: Public open space - £3,104.38; Community facilities - £513.04; Waste receptacles - £69.50 and a Section 106 monitoring fee of £50. The applicant's willingness to enter into such a scheme is considered sufficient to comply with the relevant policies in this case.

### **Recommendation**

25. 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:
  1. Timescale for implementation
  2. Approved plans
  3. Materials
  4. Hard and soft landscaping

5. Boundary treatments
6. Provision and retention of access, parking and turning area
7. Removal of permitted development rights for fences and walls to the front of the site
8. No new windows in first floor side elevations
9. Drainage of parking area
10. Hours of construction
11. Legal Agreement securing open space, community facilities and waste receptacles contributions

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

- **Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2007**
- **Local Development Framework Development Control Policies 2007**
- **Planning File ref: S/2024/12/FL**

**Contact Officers:** Daniel Smith - Planning Officer  
01954 713162