#### SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee 03 June 2015

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

**Application Number:** S/0070/15/FL

Parish(es): Melbourn

**Proposal:** Erection of a single dwelling and access

following demolition of extension and garage associated with 40 Medcalfe Way

Site address: 40 Medcalfe Way, Melbourn, SG8 6HU

Applicant(s): Mr A De Simone

Recommendation: Approval

**Key material considerations:** Principle and density of development

Residential amenity

Character of the surrounding area Highway safety and parking

Committee Site Visit: No

**Departure Application:** No

Presenting Officer: David Thompson

**Application brought to Committee because:** The recommendation of Melbourn Parish

Council conflicts with the Officer's recommendation of approval.

Date by which decision due: 3 March 2015

1. Planning History

2. S/0863/90/F – extension to dwelling at 40 Medcalfe Way – refused and appeal

dismissed

3. SC/0135/52 – erection of dwelling - refused

4. Planning Policies

5. National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

#### 6. Local Development Core Strategy 2007:

ST/5 Minor Rural Centres

# 7. South Cambridgeshire LDF Development Control Policies DPD, 2007:

DP/1 Sustainable Development

DP/2 Design of new development

DP/3 Development Criteria

DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments

**HG/1 Housing Density** 

NE/1 Energy Efficiency

**NE/6 Biodiversity** 

NE/9 Water and drainage infrastructure

NE/10 Foul Drainage

SF/10 Outdoor Playspace, informal open space and new development

SF/11 Open Space standards

TR/1 Planning for more sustainable travel

TR/2 Parking Standards

# 8. South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

District Design Guide

## 9. Proposed Submission Local Plan

S/1 Vision

S/2 Objectives of the Local Plan

S/3 Presumption in favour of sustainable development

S/9 Minor Rural Centres

HQ/1 Design Principles

NH/4 Biodiversity

H/7 Housing Density

H/11 Residential space standards for market housing

TI/2 Planning for sustainable travel

TI/3 Parking provision

SC/7 Outdoor play space, informal open space and new development

SC/8 Open space standards

#### **Consultations**

### 10. **Melbourn Parish Council** – object to the proposal for the following reasons:

- The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site
- The development would not respect the character of the surrounding area
- Lack of parking provision also needs to be considered

# 11. Local Highway Authority – no objection subject to conditions

# 12. **District Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO)** – no objections subject to conditions

# Representations

13. No representations received

# **Planning Comments**

- 14. The application site is land within the curtilage of no. 40 Medcalfe Way in Melbourn. The property is one of a pair of semi-detached properties in a residential area which is characterised by properties of a similar size, arranged in a mixture of short terraces and semi-detached dwellings. There is an existing garage to the rear of the dwelling, with the access to this running to the west of the dwelling.
- 15. The applicant seeks full planning permission for the erection of a dwellinghouse to be adjoined to the eastern elevation of the existing property at no. 40. The existing garage and the single storey extension on the side elevation of no. 40 would be demolished as part of the scheme.

Principle of Development

- 16. The NPPF advises that every effort should be made to identify and then meet the housing needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Additionally the Development Plan (Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted January 2007 and Development Control Policies Development Plan adopted January 2007) identifies Melbourn as a Minor Rural Centre where the construction of new residential dwellings within the framework is supported.
- 17. The site is within the Melbourn development framework. The proposed development would have been acceptable in principle having regard to adopted LDF and emerging Local Plan policies, had policies ST/5 and DP/7 not become out of date as a consequence of the Council not currently being able to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.
- 18. The application site areas is 0.45 hectares and so the erection of an additional dwelling on the site would be in excess of 40 dwellings per hectare and given that the plot layout in the surrounding area is relatively high density, this is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

Residential amenity

- 19. The gable elevation of the proposed dwelling adjacent to the boundary with no. 42 would be 13 metres from the corresponding side elevation of that property. The oblique relationship between the properties, the extent of the separation distance to be retained and the fact that the gable elevation of the proposed dwelling would be blank are factors which are considered to ensure that the development would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of that neighbouring property.
- 20. A separation distance of 20 metres would be retained to the side elevation of no. 1 Medcalfe Way to the south west of the site. Given the oblique angle to be retained and the fact that the rear building line of the proposed property would not extend beyond that of 38 and 40, it is considered that the proposed development would not allow unreasonable overlooking into or overshadowing of the property at no. 1.
- 21. In relation to the existing property at no.40, the single storey element at the rear of the proposed dwelling has been reduced in projection by 1 metre, to ensure that there would not be any unreasonable overshadowing of the ground floor window on the rear elevation of that neighbouring property.
- 22. There would be no adverse impact on the residential amenity of any of the other neighbouring properties.

## Character of the surrounding area

- 23. The Parish Council have commented that the proposal would result in overdevelopment of the plot and would be contrary to the character of the locality. It is the case that the existing property is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, as are the properties to the north on the opposite side of the road and to the east. Nevertheless, there is a row of terraced properties to the north west (17-23 Medcalfe Way) and to the south west (1-7 Medcalfe Way).
- 24. Within this context, given that the proposal would respect the front and rear building lines of the existing properties at 38 and 40, it is considered that the development would not be out of character with the surrounding area, given the variation in building types evident within the street scene. By matching the height and proportions of the existing pair of properties, it is considered that the scheme would not result in overdevelopment of the plot and would not have an overbearing impact on the character of the street scene.

Highway safety and parking

- 25. The proposal would result in the loss of the garage that currently serves no. 40. The scheme would make provision for one on-site parking space per dwelling. In terms of the introduction of an additional driveway on the street, the Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposals. Given that a number of properties on the opposite side of Medcalfe Way have parking spaces in front of the dwelling, it is considered that the proposed on-site parking arrangements would not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the surrounding area.
- 26. The Parish Council has raised the issue of parking capacity in the area and the need to avoid a detrimental impact in this regard. The proposal would provide one parking space per dwelling. This is below the average parking requirement of 1.5 spaces per dwelling across the district stipulated in the Development Control Policies DPD.
- 27. However, policy TR/2 states that in more sustainable locations, lower levels of parking provision will be sought. Melbourn is classified as a Minor Rural Centre and the site is 0.5 miles from High Street, where a number of shops and facilities and public transport links to Cambridge and Royston exist. Given this situation and the fact that a number of the existing dwellings on Medcalfe Way have similar parking arrangements to those proposed in this development, it is considered that the proposal does meet the requirements of local plan policy in this regard.

#### Other matters

- 28. The Environmental Health Officer has raised no objections to the proposed development, subject to conditions being imposed in relation to restricting noise during construction which can be attached to the decision notice.
- 29. The proposal would result in the loss of an existing hedgerow at the front of the property. Given that there are a range of front boundary treatments evident on the street scene, including close boarded, post and wire fencing and hedges of various species, it is considered that the removal of the hedge would not harm the character of the area on the basis that a suitable replacement boundary treatment is secured. This, along with details of proposed landscape planting can be secured by condition.
- 30. Following the revision to the NPPG in November 2014, developments of 10 dwellings or less are no longer subject to the requirement to pay 'tariff based' contributions

through section 106 agreements. In this case therefore, no off-site open space or infrastructure provision can be secured, despite this being a requirement of the adopted policies within the LDF.

#### Conclusion

- 31. The proposed development is considered to respect the character of the surrounding area in terms of scale, density and design, given the variety of property types available within the street scene. The proposal would result in a loss of one on-site parking space serving no 40 and only one space is to be provided for the new dwelling. Given the sustainable location of the site in terms of connectivity to facilities and local transport, this arrangement is considered to comply with policy. The Highway Authority and the Environmental Health Officer have not raised any objections to the proposals.
- 32. Any adverse impacts of the development are not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the material considerations set out in this report, and the development remains acceptable

#### Recommendation

33. Approval subject to the following:

#### **Conditions**

- a) Time limit
- b) Approved plans
- c) Details of construction materials
- d) Details of boundary treatments to be submitted and agreed
- e) Landscaping scheme
- f) Landscaping maintenance
- g) Car parking spaces to be laid out prior to occupation and retained free from obstruction
- h) Details of driveway construction
- i) Pedestrian visibility splays to remain free from obstruction
- j) Removal of permitted development rights for extensions and alterations (including front boundary treatments)
- k) Control of noise during construction
- I) Management of traffic and material storage during construction phase
- m) Surface water drainage details
- n) Foul water drainage details

#### **Background Papers**

Where the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 require documents to be open to inspection by members of the public, they must be available for inspection: -

- (a) at all reasonable hours at the offices of South Cambridgeshire District Council;
- (b) on the Council's website; and
- (c) in the case of documents to be available for inspection pursuant to regulation 15, on payment of a reasonable fee required by the Council by the person seeking to inspect the documents at the offices of South Cambridgeshire District Council.

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 Core Strategy DPD 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents
- Proposed Local Plan
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012

**Report Author:** David Thompson – Principal Planning Officer

Telephone: (01954) 713250