

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Development and Conservation Control Committee

6<sup>th</sup> July 2005

**AUTHOR/S:** Director of Development Services

---

**S/1717/04/F - Harston**  
**Erection of 3 Homes Following Demolition of Existing Dwelling at 103 High Street for Upware Marina**

**Recommendation: Approval**  
**Date for determination: 11<sup>th</sup> October 2004**

### Site and Proposal

1. The application site extends to approximately 0.22 hectares/0.55 acres and is currently occupied by No.103 High Street, a two-storey buff brick and large flat tile house with single storey elements on its southwest side and rear and an attached double garage to the northwest, and its garden. The site is bounded by High Street (A10) to the southeast, No.99 (a two-storey house) and bungalows in Chapel Lane to the southwest and west and the house and gardens of No.107 (a thatched cottage) to the north. There is a row of large deciduous trees along the boundary between the rear part of the site and No.107.
2. This full application, registered on the 16<sup>th</sup> August 2004 and amended by plans date stamped the 26<sup>th</sup> November 2004 and the 26<sup>th</sup> May 2005, proposes the erection of three dwellings on the site following the demolition of the existing house (No.103). 2no. 5m high to eaves, 8.5m high approx. to ridge, two-storey, four bedroom detached houses would front High Street. The third dwelling, also with four bedrooms, would be sited to the rear of the frontage dwellings and would have 3.6m high eaves, a 7.6m high ridge and would be accessed via a 5m wide access between the two proposed frontage dwellings. The two frontage dwellings would also access the A10 via this driveway. A 1m high wall with hedge behind is proposed along the site frontage. The density equates to approximately 14 dwellings to the hectare.

### Planning History

3. Planning permission was granted for a house adjacent to No.103 in 2002 under reference **S/0788/02/F**.
4. An outline application to erect a bungalow and garage on the part of the site where House 1 (the proposed dwelling to the rear of the two proposed frontage dwellings) is now proposed with access alongside No.99 and the southwest boundary of the site was refused in 1988 under reference **S/1827/88/O** on the grounds that it would have resulted in significant harm to neighbours through noise and disturbance generated by traffic using the driveway and manoeuvring on site and it would harm the attractive character of the area since it was likely to have led to the felling of an ash tree. A subsequent appeal was dismissed on the grounds of the likely noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents and uncertainty that a satisfactory access could be achieved onto the A10.
5. Permission for the erection of No.103 was granted under references **S/1182/77/O** and **S/1804/77/F**. An earlier outline application for the erection of a house and garage

was refused under reference **S/0525/77/O** on the grounds that the development would have been connected to a sewage works which was already receiving flows above design capacity.

### **Planning Policy**

6. Structure Plan 2003 **Policy P1/3** requires a high standard of design for all new development which responds to the local character of the built environment.
7. Local Plan 2004 **Policy SE4** states that residential development up to a maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings (and, exceptionally, up to 15 dwellings if this would make the best use of a brownfield site) will be permitted within the village framework of Harston provided that (a) the retention of the site in its present form is not essential to the character of the village; (b) the development would be sensitive to the character of the village, local features of landscape or ecological importance, and the amenities of neighbours; (c) the village has the necessary infrastructure capacity; and (d) residential development would not conflict with another policy of the Plan, particularly policy EM8 which relates to the loss of employment sites. It also states that all developments should provide an appropriate mix of dwelling size, type and affordability.
8. Local Plan 2004 **Policy HG11** states that development to the rear of existing properties will only be permitted where the development would not: result in overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing of existing residential properties; result in noise and disturbance to existing properties through the use of its access; result in highway dangers through the use of its access; or be out of character with the pattern of development in the vicinity.
9. Local Plan 2004 **Policy HG7** relates to affordable housing and states that in Harston up to 50% of the total number of dwellings for which planning permission may be given should be affordable, although higher or lower percentages may be agreed in the light of factors such as proximity to local services, access to public transport, the particular costs associated with the development, and whether or not the provision of affordable housing would prejudice other planning objectives warranting greater priority in the particular case.

### **Consultation**

10. **Harston Parish Council** recommends refusal on the following grounds:
  - Too many dwellings for the site. Two bungalows would be more in keeping with the area;
  - Residents of surrounding areas object to the overpowering presence of these sized houses, especially in Chapel Lane; and
  - Exiting on the very busy A10 also needs to be considered.
11. In relation to the latest amended plans, it states “Comments of surrounding residents are - The amended plan for the two storey house is the same size as before and far too large for the plot. The small bungalows surround this pl/app will be completely dwarfed. Some of the objections will be sent to the Planning Officer. The Parish Council is in complete agreement with the above comments.”
12. **Trees & Landscape Officer** raises no objections to the scheme as amended which shows ‘House 1’ pulled away from the trees along the boundary to 107 High Street

but states that any driveway construction should be of no-dig construction and a tree protection condition should be imposed on any approval.

13. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** recommends that conditions relating to the times when power operated machinery shall not be operated during the demolition and construction periods except in accordance with agreed noise restrictions and driven pile foundations are attached to any approval. He also recommends that informatives are attached to any approval stating that there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site during demolition and construction except with his Department's prior permission and, before the existing property is demolished, a Demolition Notice will be required.
14. **Local Highway Authority** notes that House 1 is 50m away from the High Street which exceeds the carrying distance for dustbins and also exceeds the distance required for access for fire appliances and there does not appear to be enough room for a refuse vehicle or fire appliance to turn round within the plot. It states that it has no further comments.

### **Representations**

15. Objections have been received from the occupiers of 1A and 3 Chapel Lane on the following grounds:
  - The 1½ storey house is much higher than a normal 1½ storey house and is inappropriate for this location, being set among bungalows;
  - It is also too large for the size of the plot;
  - Overlooking from first floor Bedroom 1 window in dwelling to the rear of properties in Chapel Lane of 2 adjoining single storey houses; and
  - Any dwelling to the rear of properties in Chapel Lane should be single storey or, at the most, a smaller less bulky 1½ storey house.
16. Occupier of 99 High Street comments that the new house nearest her would be very large and very close to the boundary and, if that house is to be built, she would like a brick wall erected along the boundary. She also comments that the proposal would add more traffic congestion and she would lose privacy if any windows were allowed to the side of the property.
17. Occupier of 107 High Street was concerned that the original scheme would compromise the trees along the boundary between the site and No.107. He/she also states that the site is liable to flooding and should not be rectified by raising the level of the site and thereby resulting in significant run-off to No.107, and the development will increase congestion problems experienced when trying to access the A10 into the village.

### **Planning Comments - Key Issues**

18. The key issues in relation to this application are:
  - The affect on the character and appearance of the area;
  - Impact on neighbours; and
  - Affordable housing.
19. There is an unimplemented permission for the erection of a two-storey dwelling between Nos. 99 and 103 High Street and I consider that the position, design and

street scene impact of the two proposed frontage dwellings would be acceptable. The site is surrounded by a mix of storey heights, including bungalows in Chapel Lane, but I consider that the scale and design of the dwelling to the rear is acceptable in terms of the character and appearance of the area. The 1m high frontage wall with hedge behind now proposed is considered to be far more in keeping with the street scene than the 1.8m high wall originally proposed.

20. The proposal would have an impact on the amenity of neighbours through some overlooking. The proposed rear dwelling would also affect the outlook from the rear of bungalows in Chapel Lane, and No.1 in particular. However, the scheme as amended has reduced the degree of overlooking and, due to the length of No.1 Chapel Lane's rear garden and the position of the dwelling to the north of this garden, I do not consider that the scheme as amended would seriously detract from the amenity of neighbours. It would be important to remove permitted development rights for the insertion of further first floor windows to protect the amenity of neighbours.
21. This application proposes the erection of two additional dwellings and I would normally expect one of these additional two dwellings to be affordable. However, in this instance, there is an extant, unimplemented permission for a further dwelling on the site which predates the current policy on affordable housing. As this application proposes one additional dwelling compared to the approved situation at the time the current affordable housing policy was first implemented, I consider that it would not be appropriate to require any of the dwellings to be affordable in this instance.
22. All three dwellings would have four bedrooms and I would normally expect a scheme for three dwellings to include a better mix of dwellings sizes. However, in this instance, the scheme would replace the existing and approved dwellings which are of similar size to the proposed dwellings and, as the scheme is considered to be acceptable in all other respects, I do not consider that this issue alone is reason to refuse the application.
23. In relation to the Local Highway Authority's comments, it is likely that occupiers of the dwelling to the rear would have to wheel their bins to High Street to be emptied and access for fire appliances would need to be resolved through Building Regulations.

### **Recommendations**

24. Approval (as amended by drawing nos. 9A, 10A, 11A, 16A and 17A date stamped 26.11.04 and drawing nos. 17D, 18C, 19B, 20B and 21A dated stamped 26.5.05)
  1. Standard Condition A - Time limited permission (Reason A);
  2. SC5a&f - Details of materials for external walls, roofs and hard surfaced areas (RC To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development);
  3. SC51 - Landscaping (RC51);
  4. SC52 - Implementation of landscaping (RC52);
  5. SC56 - Tree Protection (RC56);
  6. SC60 - Details of boundary treatment (RC60 and to protect the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining properties);
  7. The vehicle parking and manoeuvring areas to the northwest of the words "Entrance Access" on drawing no. 17D date stamped 26.5.05 shall be constructed in accordance with the Arboricultural Advisory and Information Service's Arboricultural Practice Note 1 'Driveways Close to Trees' unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority - RC To protect the adjacent trees) ;

8. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the rooflights in the southwest elevation of 'House 1' shown on drawing nos. 17D, 20B and 21A shall be a minimum of 1.8 metres above the first floor finished floor level (RC22);
9. No further windows or openings of any kind shall be inserted at first floor level in any of the dwellings hereby permitted unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf (RC22);
10. During the demolition and construction periods, ... Standard Condition 26 - Control over power operated machinery (RC26).

### **Reasons for Approval**

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
  - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:** P1/3 (Sustainable Design in Built Development)
  - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:** SE4 (Development in Group Villages) and HG11 (Backland Development)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
  - Residential amenity
  - Character and appearance of the area
  - Highway matters
  - Flooding
  - Impact on trees

### **Informatives**

Should driven pile foundations be proposed, before development commences, a statement of the method for construction of these foundations should be submitted to and agreed by the District Council's Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.

During demolition and construction, there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site except with the prior permission of the District Council's Environmental Health Officer in accordance with best practice and existing waste management legislation.

Before the existing property is demolished, a Demolition Notice will be required from the District Council's Building Control Department establishing the way in which the property will be dismantled, including any asbestos present, the removal of waste, minimisation of dust, capping of drains and establishing hours of working operation.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Refs: S/1717/04/F, S/0788/02/F, S/1827/88/O, S/1804/77/F, S/1182/77/O and S/0525/77/O.

**Contact Officer:** Andrew Moffat - Area Planning Officer

Telephone: (01954) 713169