#### SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee 1 October 2014

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

**Application Number:** S/2762/13/FL

Parish: Linton

**Proposal:** Erection of 12 dwellings following

demolition of dwelling

Site address: Newdigate House, 3 Horseheath Road

**Applicant:** Mr Andrew Hodgson (Savills (UK) Ltd)

**Recommendation:** Delegated Approval

**Key material considerations:** Principle, density, mix and affordable

housing, character of the area, residential amenity, highway safety and parking,

drainage and other matters.

Committee Site Visit: No (Site visited July 2014)

**Departure Application**: No

Presenting Officer: Paul Sexton

Application brought to Committee because: The officer recommendation of delegated

approval is contrary to the

recommendation of refusal from Linton

Parish Council

**Date by which decision due:** 6 March 2014

#### **Background**

- Members will recall that this application was withdrawn from the July agenda at the request of the applicant to allow the proposed scheme to be considered by the Design Enabling Panel at its meeting on 14 August 2014.
- A copy of the officer report to the July meeting is attached at Appendix 1 and Members should refer to that report for the Site History, Policy, Consultations and Presentations (updated in this report), Site and Proposal, and Planning Considerations (updated in this report in response to revised drawings)

## **Comments of Design Enabling Panel and Amended Drawings**

- 3. The Design Enabling Panel considered this to be a generally interesting scheme, which has been quite carefully developed, as demonstrated in the Design and Access Statement. The scheme has the potential to accommodate the proposed number of dwellings for this site, which is at the upper end of the allowable density. It was felt that the scheme would benefit from some further detailed design considerations.
- 4. The Panel considered the question of whether the proposed density, layout and design of the scheme was appropriate to the context of the site and surrounding residential properties. It concluded that the proposal was just acceptable in these terms, but some concerns were expressed in respect about the limited distance between Plots 6/7 and Plot 9; the roof design for Plot 1; and private amenity space provision for Plots 6/7 and Plot 9.
- 5. The Panel considered the question of whether the scheme was sensitive and responsive to its immediate and wider context. It concluded that the scheme was reasonably sensitive and responsive to its setting, and in particular it appreciated the references and design development based on the experience of the more historic parts of Linton.
- 6. In respect of Plot 9 the Panel was asked to consider whether the principle of having a landmark building in this position was appropriate. The Panel concluded that the relative height of Plot 9 to the Horseheath Road itself would add significance to the building. This coupled with the proposed elevational treatment and roof form combined make Plot 9 sufficiently significant.
- 7. In addition the Panel considered that Plots 6 and 7 would benefit from accessible balconies/terrace as there is a lack of private outdoor amenity space for these units. The Panel suggested that consideration could be given to modifying the layout so as to allow some increase in the rather tight space between Plots 6/7 and Plot 9.
- 8. The Panel recommended that the flat roofed area to the rear of Plot 1 could be reduced and/or modified. Further consideration should be given to the materials for the flat roof areas which will be viewed from both the new properties and in the view south from Keene Fields.
- 9. The efficiency of the internal layout of Plot 1 was questioned.
- 10. Consideration should be given to modifying the design of the proposed balconies to Plots 10 and 11, or removal of these features.
- 11. Plot 8 should have fenestration to facilitate principle living room views to the south, to help reduce potential impact on neighbouring property to the south east.
- 12. Consideration should be given to raising the garden level of Plot 9 in the south east corner.

#### **Amended Drawings**

- 13. Revised drawings have been submitted, which include the following amendments:
- 14. Introduction of pitched roof to the rear extension of Plot 1. The applicant states that this provides a more pleasing 'fifth elevation' to the surrounding houses. The internal planning of the unit has been reconsidered, with the increased volume to the roof

space of the rear extension being brought into the kitchen/dining space to create a more lofty room. Rooflights will increase daylight into the otherwise north facing space. This unit has also been reduced in height from the original scheme to reduce impact on properties in Parsonage Way.

- 15. On Plot 7 a new staircase is located on the side of the building, which creates a landing in the middle of the gable end. The stair is dog legged at the bottom to avoid passing by the lower bedroom window. The space at the bottom of the stair allows for additional landscaping. The design of the roof has been altered, with the roofline being moved further north, and a new gable extended over Unit 5. The applicant states that this breaks up the scale and massing of the building and results in a more pleasing and detailed level of design.
- 16. The large sliding screen on the East elevation of Plot 8 has been removed. A small gable window has been introduced on the North elevation to break up the blank gable, and to assist with privacy the windows have been reduced slightly on the west elevation which faces the street.
- 17. On Plot 9 the revised drawing reflects the changes suggested by the Panel in respect of external ground levels. The applicant states that this will create a more distinct boundary to Keene Fields edge of the garden. This unit is now a 3-bedroom unit rather than 4-bedroom
- 18. Balconies on Plots 10 and 11 have been removed, with Juliet boundaries now being shown, however the applicant states that he is prepared to take the Council's recommendation in this respect.

**Consultations** (on latest revised drawings)

- 19. The comments of **Linton Parish Council** on the latest revisions will be reported at the meeting.
- 20. After the publication of the July agenda objections were received from the Parish Council in respect of the previous amendments to the scheme. It stated that its previous objections remained and added additional comments that Unit 1 remained overshadowing to 7 Parsonage Way; that Unit 2 had changed from a 4-bedroom house to a 2-bedroom bungalow, but would still have an overbearing effect on Horseheath Road; a planning condition not to allow extensions into the loft space is requested, despite permitted development regulations; and insufficient parking spaces.
- 21. **Local Highway Authority** any comments on the revised drawings will be reported at the meeting
- 22. **Urban Design Team** comments on the revised scheme will be reported at the meeting.
- 23. **Trees Officer** any further comments will be reported at the meeting.
- 24. **Anglian Water** has no objection stating that the foul drainage from the development is in the catchment area of Linton Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.
- 25. Other consultation responses remain as set out in the report to the July meeting.

## Representations

- 26. At the time of writing the report 2 letters had been received from the occupiers of 1 Keene Fields and 3 Rhugarve Gardens in respect of the latest amended drawings and objecting on the following grounds, most of which rehearse comments outlined in the July report. Other comments received will be reported at the meeting.
  - a. There are only minor changes to the original design. There remain too many properties. Only solution is to build fewer houses.
  - b. Those behind Nos. 1-3 Keene Fields are too high
  - c. Too few parking spaces for residents, visitors and deliveries will lead to parking on main roads
  - d. No provision on site for refuse vehicles
  - e. Private road is too narrow to accommodate large vehicles
  - f. Pinch points can the builder impose these on existing residents?
  - g. The poplar should not be removed
  - h. Possible future flooding
  - Lack of access to fence at rear of Nos 1-3 and 11 Keene Fields for maintenance.
  - j. Concern about safety of junction of access and Horseheath Road, which is well used by pedestrians and children.
  - k. Concern about drainage capacity.

Prior to the July meeting a number of letters were received from local residents in response to consultation in respect of earlier amended drawings, rehearsing concerns set out in the July report. The reduction to 20 car parking spaces increased local concern about parking problems.

#### **Planning Considerations**

Site and Proposal

27. Members should refer to the July report for the main details of the Site and Proposal. The revisions to the application following consideration by the Design and Enabling Panel are set out earlier in this report.

Principle of development

28. The officer comments in respect of the principal of development remains as set out in the July report.

Density, Housing Mix and Affordable Housing

29.. The officer comments in respect of Density, Housing Mix and Affordable Housing Remain as set out in the July report.

30. The Design Enabling Panel considered that the proposal was just acceptable in terms of density. The distance between Plots 6/7 and Plot 9 has been increased, and officers are of the view that this significantly improves the relationship between these plots, which form the entrance to the development from Keene Fields.

Impact on character of the area

- 31. The officer comments in respect of the impact of the proposal on the character of the area remain as set out in the July report.
- 32. The Design Enabling Panel concluded that the scheme was reasonably sensitive and responsive to its setting, and in particular it appreciated the references and design development based on the experience of the more historic parts of Linton.
- 33. The slight relocation of Unit 9 further from the access road improves its relationship with the surrounding area. The Design and Enabling Panel supported the principle of a building in this location.

Residential amenity

- 34. Officers addressed the main areas regarding the impact of the scheme on residential amenity in the July report.
- 35. The amended drawings propose a pitch roof over the previous single storey section to the rear of Plot 1. This new roof will be 4.7m high. The roof slopes away from the boundaries of properties in Parsonage Way, and officers are of the view that the relationship with these properties remains acceptable.
- 36. The changes to fenestration details to Plot 8 will help reduce the impact on the adjoining house in Horseheath Road.
- 37. The amenity areas for Plots 6/7 will be the subject of further discussion with the applicant.

Highway safety and parking

- 38. The officer comments in respect of the impact of the proposal on the highway safety remain as set out in the July report, as the amended drawings do not materially change this aspect of the proposed development.
- 39. Other matters
- 40. The application is accompanied by an arboricultural assessment. Whilst some existing planting within the site will be lost the individual quality of these trees does not of itself warrant retention.
- 41. The applicant has provided a small area of space which meets the requirements for on site provision for the number of units proposed. This development cannot be required to make up any shortfall in open space in the existing Keene Fields development.
- 42. Anglian Water has indicated that there is capacity in the sewage system to cater for the proposed development.

- 43. The applicant has accepted the need for contributions in respect of public open space, community facilities and waste receptacle provision, and a draft Section 106 securing these is being prepared to cover these matters, and secure the provision of the affordable housing. The County Council has confirmed that no education contribution is required.
- 44. A condition can be imposed on any consent for a scheme of surface water drainage, and renewable energy technology.

Conclusion

45. Comments on the revised drawings will be reported. Officers are of the view that the scheme as amended is acceptable, subject to any further minor revisions required.

#### Recommendation

46. That subject to the consideration of comments on the revised drawings, and the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure the required contributions to public open space, community facilities and waste receptacle provision, that delegated powers to approve the application.

# Conditions (to include)

- (a) 3 year time limit
- (b) Approved drawings
- (c) Landscaping
- (d) Tree/hedge protection
- (e) External material
- (f) Boundary treatment
- (g) Surface water drainage
- (h) Restriction on hours of power driven machinery during demolition and construction
- (i) Levels
- (j) Withdrawal of PD
- (k) No further windows in specified elevations

## **Background Papers**

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission July 2013
- South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- Planning File References: S/2762/13/FL, S/0730/10/F, S/0348/06/O and S/1640/08/RM

**Report Author:** Paul Sexton – Principal Planning Officer

Telephone: (01954) 713255