

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

13 January 2016

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

Application Number: S/1686/15/FL

Parish(es): Hardwick

Proposal: Erection of single, detached bungalow, along with car parking

Site address: 11 Cambridge Road

Applicant(s): Mr A De Simone

Recommendation: Approval

Key material considerations: Principle of development, impact on character of the area, and residential amenity

Committee Site Visit: Yes

Departure Application: No

Presenting Officer: Paul Sexton, Principal Planning Officer

Application brought to Committee because: Officer recommendation is contrary to the recommendation of refusal from Hardwick Parish Council

Date by which decision due: 8 September 2015

Planning History

1. S/0645/15/FL – Erection of 3-bed dwelling and two 2-bed dwellings, along with car parking and hard and soft landscaping following the demolition of the existing dwelling – Withdrawn

Planning Policies

2. *National Planning Policy Framework
Planning Practice Guidance*
3. *South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, adopted January 2007*

ST/6 – Group Villages
4. *South Cambridgeshire 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 Framework
SF/10 – Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments
SF/11- Open Space Standards
NE/1 – Renewable Energy

5. *South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)*

District Design Guide SPD – adopted March 2010
Open Space in New Development SPD – adopted January 2009

6. *Draft Local Plan*

S/3 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
CC/3 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments
CC/6 – Construction Methods
HQ/1 – Design Principles
SC/7 – Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments
SC/8 – Open Space Standards

Consultation

7. **Hardwick Parish Council** – recommends refusal in respect of the amended drawings. ‘The building extends beyond the existing building line of the neighbouring properties. Highways, the proximity to a blind bend and the lack of off street parking. Plot density and overdevelopment of the site. It would like the application to be referred to Planning Committee, and urges the Planning Department to take the views of the neighbouring residents into account’
8. **Local Highway Authority** – No objection subject to conditions, which include the provision of 2.0m x 2.0m pedestrian visibility splays, and the submission of a traffic management plan.
9. **Environmental Health** – No objection subject to conditions restricting the hours of use of power operated machinery during the period of construction, and informatives.

Representations

10. The occupiers of Nos.3 and 13 Cambridge Road, and 6 Kesters Close object on the following grounds:
- i. Proposed development will appear cramped as the plot will be the smallest in Cambridge Road. Existing bungalows in Cambridge Road are well spaced out, with wide frontages. The development will be over-dense at 37dph, a low density area.
 - ii. Proposed dwelling will be out of keeping with surrounding area in terms of scale and bulk. Does not respect the existing building line.
 - iii. Parking at the front will dominate the plot and unacceptably alter the character and appearance of this stretch of Cambridge Road. There is no room to accommodate soft landscaping at the front of the plot.

- iv. Development will therefore not comply with the criteria in Policy DP/2 or District Design Guide criteria. The front of dwelling will only be 6m from the road. Others are set well back from the road. The majority of the existing beech hedge on the front boundary, and existing planting on the south boundary of the site, will need to be removed to accommodate the proposed dwelling, which will detract further from the rural character of the area. The rear garden is too small.
- v. Unacceptable impact on residential amenity on residential amenity due to loss of privacy and overbearing impact.
- vi. Highway safety – proposed access is within 50m of a blind bend and does not meet acceptable standards. Revised plans exacerbate risks to pedestrians as access has been moved even closer to the hazardous bend. The blind bend has been the scene of several ‘incidents’ and recorded accidents over recent years. No provision for visitor parking. No new properties have been built along Cambridge Road for several decades, during which time levels of both road and pedestrian traffic have increased immeasurably, with no road improvements. Will lead to overspill parking on Cambridge Road. The turning area will not work.
- vii. There is no provision for cycle parking.
- viii. The development does not form a coherent, integrated plan concerning housing development in Hardwick, and is not an obvious infill plot as described by the applicant. It is not sustainable development as it represents a trivial and isolated increase to housing density in Hardwick, which has to be balanced against the much greater adverse impact of the proposed development on the character and ambience of this rural setting. The proposed development will have little impact on Hardwick’s housing stock.
- ix. Inaccuracies in the Planning Statement, including uncertainty over the plot size, the dimensions of the dwelling proposed in relation to existing properties, the building line and density.
- x. How will the telegraph pole at the front of the site be dealt with?
- xi. Will set a precedent
- xii. Scheme is not likely to comply with Building Regulations as steps will be required to enter the dwelling.

11. **Councillor Chamberlain** has submitted the following comments:

- 12. ‘It is fair to say that there is a great deal of concern not only in the properties adjacent to this development but also in the wider community. I have received a number of comments from residents whose properties are much further along Cambridge Road, close to the Egremont Road junction, who are similarly concerned that a precedent may be set if additional houses or bungalows may be built in between existing houses where there are larger gardens.
- 13. In view of this, I support the Parish Council request that this application should be considered by Planning Committee in due course.’

Site and Proposal

14. No.11 Cambridge Road is a detached 2-bedroom bungalow set back 8m from the front boundary of the site. It has a rear and side garden on the south side. The site is raised above the level of Cambridge Road. The front boundary currently comprises a beech hedge apart from at the point of access to the existing bungalow.
15. To either side of the site are single storey dwellings. Opposite the site is the side garden of No.6 Kesters Close, and to the rear the rear garden of No.2 Main Street.
16. The full application, as amended, proposes the erection of a single storey 2-bedroom dwelling, with a ridge height of 4.5m, on a 0.025ha area of garden land to the south of the existing bungalow. The new dwelling, which has an external floor area of 80m² will be set a minimum of 6m from the front boundary of the site, and 1m from the south boundary. A small conservatory structure will be removed from the south elevation of the existing bungalow, giving a 1.7m gap between the existing and proposed dwellings. The proposed dwelling has a 2.4m deep front projection on this north side.
17. A new vehicular access is proposed at the southern end of the site, which will require the removal of a 6m section of the existing beech hedge. Two parking spaces and a turning area are provided in front of the dwelling.
18. The density of the proposed development is approximately 40dph.

Planning Assessment

Principle of development

19. 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 Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD's identify Hardwick, as a Group Village' where the construction of a new residential dwelling within the framework is supported.
20. The proposed development would still have been acceptable in principle having regard to the settlement policies in the adopted LDF and emerging Local Plan policies, had policies ST/6 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. Notwithstanding this the development still has to be considered against other policies in the Plan.

Impact on the character of the area.

21. The west side of this section of Cambridge Road, is characterised by low single-storey dwellings. The existing house to the north of No.11 is set within 1m of its north and south boundaries. Nos. 3 and 11 Cambridge Road are sited on the northern plot boundaries, although both have existing gardens on the south side.
22. Although the proposed dwelling will be sited 1m from the south boundary, and 1.7m from the flank wall of No.11, officers are of the view that while the development will appear tight to its boundaries, in this respect it will not appear out of character in the street scene to an extent that would justify refusal of the application.
23. The proposed dwelling will project 2.4m forward of the existing front wall of No.11, and be set forward of other dwellings along this stretch of Cambridge Road. However,

officers are of the view that as the front of the dwelling will be set back 6m from the front of the plot, and the ridge height at 4.5m is low, it will not result in a feature that will appear out of character in the street such as to justify refusal of the application.

24. Whilst the proposed vehicular access will result in the loss of a 6m long section of the beech hedge at the front of the site, the central section (14m) will be retained. This can be secured by condition.

Impact on residential amenity

25. The proposed dwelling will be adjacent to the blank flank wall of No.3 Cambridge Road to the south. It will project forward of that property by 1m. The site is higher than that of No.3, however, given the low ridge height of the proposed dwelling, it is not considered that it will have an overbearing impact, or result in loss of light.
26. The front projection of the proposed dwelling extends forward of No.111 to the north by 2.5m, and to the rear by 1.5m. The closest windows to the proposed dwelling in the front and rear elevation of No.111 both serve bedrooms. The south elevation of the property contains no openings. The proposed dwelling is not considered to result in significant loss of amenity to the occupiers of the existing property.
27. The proposed dwelling will have a rear garden area of 60m², which exceeds the minimum recommended size for a 2-bedroom dwelling in the District Design Guide SPD. A condition should be imposed on any consent restricting permitted development rights to prevent overdevelopment of the plot. The existing dwelling will retain a similarly sized rear garden.

28. *Highway Safety*

The Local Highway Authority is aware of the local concerns regarding the proposed vehicular access to the site, but has raised no objection. The new access will be located approximately 30m north of the bend in Cambridge Road/Main Street. As the access will serve a single dwelling only no vehicle to vehicle visibility splays are required. The application drawing shows the provision of the appropriate pedestrian splays.

29. The Highway Authority has confirmed that the proposed parking layout at the front of the site provides sufficient space for vehicles to leave the site in forward gear.
30. Parking provision on site meets the adopted car parking standards.
31. Officers are therefore of the view that there are no highway safety grounds which would justify a refusal of the application.

Other matters

32. Government planning policy that sought to introduce a new national threshold on pooled contributions was introduced on 28 November 2014 but has since been quashed. Policies DP/4, SF/10 and SF/11 therefore remain relevant in seeking to ensure the demands placed by a development on local infrastructure are properly addressed.
33. There remains restrictions on the use of section 106 agreements, however, resulting from the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (amended). CIL Regulation 122 states that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting

planning permission for the development if the obligation is (i) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (ii) Directly related to the development; and (iii) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

34. CIL Regulation 123 has the effect of restricting the use of pooled contributions. In accordance with Planning Practice Guidance “When the levy is introduced (and nationally from April 2015), the regulations restrict the use of pooled contributions towards items that may be funded via the levy. At that point, no more may be collected in respect of a specific infrastructure project or a type of infrastructure through a section 106 agreement, if five or more obligations for that project or type of infrastructure have already been entered into since 6 April 2010, and it is a type of infrastructure that is capable of being funded by the levy”. The pooling is counted from 6 April 2010.
35. Less than five planning obligations have been entered into for developments in the village of Hardwick since that date. As such, officers are satisfied that the Council could lawfully enter into a section 106 agreement to secure developer contributions as per development control policies DP/4, SF/10, SF/11 should the application be approved.
36. However, no specific projects for either outdoor or indoor community facilities have been identified that are directly related to the development; fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development; or necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms (as per the requirements on paragraph 204 of the NPPF). As such, no request for such contributions should be sought in the event the application was to be approved.

Recommendation

37. Officers recommend that the Committee approves the application, as amended, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

- (a) Time limit for commencement
- (b) Approved drawings
- (c) External materials
- (d) Hours of working during construction
- (e) Parking and Turning
- (f) Pedestrian Visibility
- (g) Retention of front hedge accept at point of access
- (h) Levels
- (i) Withdrawal of PD

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 Core Strategy (adopted January 2007)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Planning File Ref: S/1686/15/FL and S/0645/15/FL

Report Author:

Paul Sexton
Telephone Number:

Principal Planning Officer
01954 713255