

Merton House
Grantchester
Cambridge CB3 9NQ

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



Paul Sexton Esq,
Principal Planning Officer (West)
South Cambridgeshire District Council
South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge CB23 6EA

By email: [REDACTED]

24 January 2016

Dear Paul,

Erection of new dwelling in Church Lane, Madingley

As Local Member, I write in support of this application, which I understand will be considered by February's Planning Committee.

I am afraid that I am unable to attend Planning Committee, so I should be grateful if this letter is either included in the agenda pack, or circulated to all members at the meeting.

My reasons for supporting the application are:

1. Madingley Parish Council is not against it.

The minutes of its meeting on 10th September 2015 record that *"it was agreed unanimously that the Parish Council would inform SCDC that the Planning Application would be left to the Planning Officer to make the final decision"*.

I have many conservation areas in my ward. Some planning applications lead to strong negative responses; when they don't, I regard that as very significant; I believe that, **in the absence of strongly-expressed opposition, the presumption should be in favour of the applicant.**

2. I appreciate that a former application was declined in 2000/2001 but:

- (a) this is a re-modelled application which addresses all of the previous concerns
- (b) since that date, SCDC has adopted a new Supplementary Planning Document (Development Affecting Conservation Areas, Jan 2009)

and I believe that **the re-modelled application accords with the NPPF and SCDC's new SPD.**

3. The application is for a small new house, in a gap in a row of existing houses. I believe that:
- (a) it is **not** in a particularly sensitive part of the village
 - (b) the gap is **small** and does not afford views through it, as **the land rises very sharply behind it (this, to me, is a key point)**
 - (c) the **design of the new house is of high quality** and respects the context of the other houses in the row.

I appreciate that PPG15 is no longer in force, but its text is perhaps a useful guide to the treatment of "gap sites" such as this. It stated at para 4.17 that "*Many conservation areas include gap sites ... that make **no positive contribution** to ... the character or appearance of the area; their **replacement** should be a stimulus to imaginative, high quality design, and seen as an opportunity to enhance the area. What is important is ... that new buildings should ... be designed with respect for their context, as part of a larger whole which has a well-established character and appearance of its own.*"

4. This is an infill site, so paras 2.1 to 2.7 of SCDC's SPD "Development Affecting Conservation Areas, Jan 2009" applies. I believe the application meets the criteria for approval in all seven of those paragraphs, because:
- (a) the site is **large enough** to accommodate the small house proposed
 - (b) the site is **not open ground** and makes **minimal contribution** to the Conservation area and the wider setting
 - (c) the site is **not important** as regards the **pattern and rhythm** of the village
 - (d) there are **no vistas** through it
 - (e) the site is **not located adjacent** to a Listed Building

I therefore believe that the application meets the relevant criteria.

As an aside and away from planning law and policy:

- Madingley is a small village and I understand that the Parish Council has previously stated that it would benefit from a few extra houses and additional residents to slightly boost its population.
- the small size of the house would assist the demographic balance, as many other houses are large.
- being within easy cycling distance from Cambridge, it would be a sustainable development.

I therefore support the application.

Yours sincerely,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Francis Burkitt. A small blue mark is visible to the left of the box.

Francis Burkitt