

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

6 November 2013

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

S/1523/13/VC – PAPWORTH EVERARD

Variation of Condition 22 (approved plans) of planning approval S/1424/08/RM for 81 dwellings

**At Land to the South, Southbrook Field
(for Barratt Homes)**

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Date for Determination: 25 September 2013

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the recommendation of the Parish Council conflicts with the recommendation of officers.

To be presented to the Committee by Andrew Winter

Site and Proposal

1. The development is located within the village framework of Papworth Everard and is adjacent to and partly within the Conservation Area, the boundary of which runs along the eastern and north-eastern edge of the site.
2. The application, validated on 31 July 2013, seeks permission to vary the previous approved plans and agree the following changes to the scheme:
 - (a) Updated house types to meet the latest versions of Building Regulations requirements
 - (b) An increase in the number of smaller units on the site, with the original mix of: 12no. 1 & 2 beds and 27no. 3 beds, revised to: 14no. 1 & 2 beds and 35no. 3 bed units.
 - (c) Due to amendments to the house types and styles to the south of the site (Plots 54-64 David Wilson Homes), a revision to the dwelling types to the southwest edge of the site to reflect these changes.

Planning History

On site

3. Reserved matters for 81 dwellings was granted in 2009 (**S/1424/08/F**) and works to the access road and some service installation have taken place to implement this permission.

4. An extension of time application **S/2288/10** was permitted to the original outline residential scheme for this site (**S/2476/03/O**).

Nearby

5. To the north of the site, permission has been granted for a second access to the summerfield site, public open space and a new car park and driveway for the Bernard Sunley Centre (applications **S/2171/12/VC & S/2173/12/VC**).

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/4 – Infrastructure and New Developments

DP/7 – Development Frameworks

NE/6 – Biodiversity

NE/12 – Water Conservation

NE/15 – Noise Pollution

SF/10 - Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space and New Developments

SF/11 - Open Space Standards

CH/5 – Conservation Areas

TR/1 – Planning for More Sustainable Travel

TR/2 – Car and Cycle Parking Standards

8. **Supplementary Planning Documents**

District Design Guide SPD – adopted March 2010

Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD - adopted January 2009

Landscape in New Developments SPD – adopted March 2010

Trees and Development Sites SPD – adopted January 2009

Open Space in New Developments SPD – adopted January 2009

9. **Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2013)**

S/7 Development Frameworks

S/9 Minor Rural Centres

H/7 Housing Density

H/11 Residential Space Standards

SC/7 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments

SC/8 Open Space Standards

TI/2 Planning for Sustainable Travel

TI/3 Parking Provision

Consultation by South Cambridgeshire District Council as Local Planning Authority

10. **Papworth Everard Parish Council** – Recommends refusal “This is a key phase of the Summersfield development as it is the point at which it meets the existing village and therefore acts as the ‘doorstep’ to the development. Papworth Everard Parish Council recommends refusal of this application largely on the grounds of poor design and appearance, and incompleteness of the application.

(i) ‘The Square’
11. Care must be taken to ensure that the design of dwellings and use of materials complements the design and materials used in the previous phases of the Summersfield development, particularly with the phase immediately to the south and specifically with regard to the dwellings around the circle at the junction of Cromwell Crescent and Summershill Drive. The design and use of materials on the 3 storey dwellings on plots 306, 307, 343, 344 and 345 should respond to and complement the materials used on the southern and eastern sides of the ‘square’. The current proposals. Indicate that the dwellings on these plots will be ‘Style C’ – red brick with reconstituted stone; this does not imply to our council that notice has been taken of the architecture of the other buildings on the ‘square’. (We recommend that Andrew Phillips (previous Planning Officer dealing with this development) is consulted to explain the overall design proposal for the square.

(ii) Use of small square windows in doors
12. In none of the previous phases of Summersfield development have small square front door windows been permitted, except in the doors of flat-over-garage (FOG) dwellings. They should not be permitted where they appear in the two storey dwellings in this phase of the development. They give a constricted appearance to the houses and provide minimum light in the hall ways for residents. They should be replaced with significantly larger square windows or windows of the same width as the small square windows, but which are at least twice the height. This applies to the Tiverton, Finchley and Faringdon house types (dwngs 013-012-012 & 013-012-013).

(iii) Use of small window panes
13. The use of heavily divided window openings in small panes (up to twenty panes on an average sized window) has been objected to strongly by the parish council in previous applications for other phases of the Summersfield development. The creation of ‘mock’ 18th Century fenestration goes against the aim on this development to have plain simple designs that fit pleasingly with house designs on the existing village and the more contemporary designs elsewhere within Summersfield. Previous objections to this styling have been successful. This includes houses of types: Padstowe, Woodbridge, Warwick and Stratford. (Small window panes are only acceptable on K1s style as the building proportions more accurately reflect 18th/early 19th century town houses and are married with six panelled doors).

(iv) Character areas – too much variety
14. It is felt that the character style types (dwng 013-012-002) exhibit too great a variability, which will result in a fragmented development. From the outset the intention had been for Summersfield to be an essentially buff brick development, with the use of red, orange, or other colours of brick being restricted to key buildings, which operated like punctuation marks in a written sentence. By making the changes

proposed by the parish council (above) the character of the buildings will be more harmonious, but is also important to reconsider the high proportion of dwellings with stronger brick colours.

(v) Conservation kerbs

15. The green space along the southern edge of the phase requires the protection of 'conservation kerbs' to prevent the casual parking of cars beyond the road edge.

(vi) Boundary treatments

16. The application does not contain a plan illustrating boundary treatments. This is a serious omission. A planning condition requiring the specification of boundary treatments must be appended to any planning approval that is ultimately issued."
17. **Urban Design Officer** – The proposed development is positive in many regards but it would benefit from further improvements on the elevation treatment, approach to materials and private amenity space provision. Updated comments to follow on the amended drawings submitted on 17 October 2013.
18. **Landscape Officer** – No objection in principle with the proposed variations. However, there are minor comments with regards to soft and hard landscaping details to be agreed.
19. **Local Highways Authority** – Recommends refusal of the application because the submitted roads are unadoptable being at 4.8m width instead of the required minimum width of 5m. Such a width presents an undue hazard to pedestrians using the shared surface and should be designed out. If the applicant is offering the roads for adoption they should also submit diagrams of swept path analysis to demonstrate that the typical refuse vehicle can turn in this area.
20. The Highway Authority requests that the applicant provide a drawing demonstrating that all private drives that are accessed off the proposed adoptable highway are divisible by 5m, thus enabling a domestic car/s to be parked wholly off the adopted public highway. This will prevent parked cars from obstructing the footway and thus forcing pedestrians out into live carriageway or into the path of oncoming vehicles in shared surface areas.
21. For the avoidance of doubt, there should be a key to the drawing to show where the maps and raised areas of carriageway will be. Please add a condition requiring 2m x 2m visibility splays and appropriate surface water drainage to each access point onto the highway.

Representations by members of the public

22. No representations received.

Material Planning Considerations

23. The revised housing mix in this application is supported as previous amendments to surrounding sites within the Summerfield site have seen a decrease in the number of smaller units. Consequently, the key issues to consider in this instance are:
 - Design
 - Materials
 - Residential Amenity

- Highway Issues
- Landscaping & Boundary Treatment

Design

24. The residential scheme, in large, remains similar in scale and layout to that approved in 2009 (S/1424/08/F). Whilst the majority of the proposed elevations are considered to be well designed, several proposed buildings, due to their key locations have been revised to create more attractive street frontages following the concerns of both officers and the Parish Council. In summary, these changes now include:
- a) More prominent facades facing the public realm (amended Plots 346, 351 and 355)
 - b) An enhanced design to Plot 288 to better address the public open space and serve as a landmark building
 - c) Introduced windows to the ground floors of 4 Flat Over Garages (FOGs) to provide more attractive public frontages
 - d) Amended and enlarged front door glazing elements to address the concerns of the Parish Council (see Revised House plan drawing Nos. 013-012-012 Rev A & 013-012-014 Rev A)
 - e) Simplified window design to avoid moch-18th century fenestration and instead create a more contemporary feel and appearance to the development.

Materials

25. A revised and simplified materials palette has been submitted to rationalise the approach to the 'character areas' along the main spine road, with darker coloured bricks deployed on buildings in key/prominent locations within the development to aid legibility. Buff brick remains the dominant brick along the spine road and, consequently, the amended character areas plan is considered to address the main concerns regarding the general theme and appearance of the development as viewed from the site and its surroundings.

Residential Amenity

26. Paragraph 6.75 of the SCDC District Design Guide (2010) states that "residential units should be provided with access to private outdoor amenity space". As submitted, none of the FOGs in the proposed scheme were provided with any private amenity space and this is not acceptable. The architect has addressed this issue and incorporated private amenity space to all 5 FOGs in the proposed development, which is considered to improve the scheme significantly in terms of residential amenity provision.

Highway Issues

27. The comments of the Local Highways Authority are acknowledged and the developer aims to address the width and dimensions of the internal roads to meet the recommended adoptable standards; however, it should be noted that the existing road layouts and dimensions have already been approved in application S/1424/08/RM. An update on this issue will be provided to members and a condition

is recommended to secure visibility splays for each plot and diagrams showing swept path analysis for refuse vehicles.

Landscaping and Boundary Treatments

28. No objection is raised in principle of the submitted landscape plan and the landscape officer has made suggestions and sought clarification on minor elements of the scheme. The applicant has submitted a boundary treatment scheme, which is being assessed by the Council's landscape officer and her comments will be updated to members.
29. A normal road kerb is being proposed in this scheme in contrast to the extra high conservation kerbs previously sought next to the areas of open space and landscaping under condition 18 of S/1424/08/RM. Conservation kerbs were previously sought both on design terms, creating a high quality development, and also acting as a protective measures to prevent vehicles eroding grass verges next to public amenity spaces and soft landscaped areas. This condition is recommended again to ensure unity throughout the Summerfield site, especially as adjoining sites to the south of the revised scheme have already installed conservation kerbs.

Other Matters

30. With no other significant changes from the determination of planning permission S/1824/08/RM it is considered reasonable to maintain the majority of the previous conditions on this application if approval is given, though rewording as necessary to reflect the change in plans. An updated Unilateral Undertaking is being agreed with the developer to reflect the previous legal obligations made under application S/1824/08/RM.

Conclusion

31. The proposed scheme has been revised and improved by the applicant following comments and suggestions from both officers and the Parish Council. Residential amenity spaces have been introduced to the FOGs, which is a marked improvement on the previous approved scheme and active frontages have been incorporated to key buildings to promote visual interest and natural surveillance. The scheme is therefore considered to have an acceptable impact upon the local character area.

Recommendation

32. Delegated approval, subject to the following:
 - (a) appropriate safeguarding conditions addressing the following matters prior to any further works continuing on the application site:
 - Architectural detailing on front, side and rear elevations drawings for each house type
 - All material samples for the external elevations of the garages and dwellings
 - Refuse and cycle stores to the Flats
 - External lighting scheme for each parking court
 - Public Art
 - Balancing Pond details (if applicable still pending drainage scheme)
 - No services or storage of materials to be placed within the area of the retained trees

- Timetable for provision and implementation of the strategic landscaping to the public open areas.
- Visibility Splays
- Site meeting to agree landscape scheme implementation
- Protective fencing for landscaping during development
- Play equipment, street benches and bin details
- Scheme for protection of all grass verges and road edge landscaping, including extra high conservation kerbs
- Tree protection methods
- Public Open Area Specification to be submitted, as defined under S106 agreement dated 29 September 2005

(b) the agreement of a Unilateral Undertaking controlling: means of access for construction vehicles; footpath improvements; the delivery of 'St Peter's Recreation Area' and LAP or equipped play area; and a plan confirming the boundaries of the curtilage of each dwelling and showing the boundaries of those amenity landscaping and public open spaces, as are to be adopted by the Parish Council.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted January 2007)
- South Cambridgeshire LDF Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)
- South Cambridgeshire LDF Site Specific Policies, DPD (adopted January 2010)
- South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Case Officer: Andrew Winter – Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713082