A meeting of the DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL will be held in the GREAT HALL, PRIORY CENTRE, PRIORY LANE, ST NEOTS PE19 2BH on MONDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 2010 at 7:00 PM and you are requested to attend for the transaction of the following business:-

APOLOGIES

1. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 4)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 18th January 2010.

2. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

To receive from Members declarations as to personal and/or prejudicial interests and the nature of those interests in relation to any Agenda Item. Please See Notes 1 and 2 before.

3. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT (Pages 5 - 134)

3.1 Other Applications

(a) Consultation: Great Haddon

The New Township of Great Haddon

(b) St. Neots

Change of use from storage and distribution (B8) to car service and MOT Test Centre, 1 Levellers Lane, Eynesbury

To consider reports by the Head of Planning Services and Planning Service Manager (Development Management).

3.2 Section 106 Applications

(a) Hilton

Use of converted outbuilding as separate residential unit for short term holiday lettings, The Cottage, Potton Road

(b) St. Neots

Outline application for residential development of up
To consider reports by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management).

3.3 Applications requiring reference to Development Management Panel

(a) **St. Neots**
Erection of a smoking shelter, The Hyde Park, New Street

(b) **Somersham**
Substitution of house types for existing approved development, land at and including 6, 8 & 8A High Street

(c) **Stilton**
Change of use of ground floor of shop to hot food takeaway (A5 use class) and installation of extractor fan duct in the form of a mock brick clad chimney on the roof of the rear outbuilding, 4 Church Street

(d) **Tilbrook**
External alterations to sub-divide light industrial Unit 5. Erection of new office unit and construction of new access, land at Blackwell Farm, Station Road.

(e) **Warboys**
Construction of covered hand car wash bay, workshops to be used for MOT testing station, new pitched roof incorporating first
floor storage, cladding and rear extension container, Garage, New Road.

(f) Buckden
Erection of 4 apartments with associated works including access arrangements and hard and soft landscaping, 21 High Street.

(g) Brampton
Erection of 3 dwellings and garages, land at and including 1 to 3 Huntingdon Road.

(h) Great Gransden
Change of use of land from agricultural to outside storage with roads and landscape planting, land at north end of Park Riddey.

(i) Hemingford Abbots
Erection of ancillary golf chalet accommodation block, Fairways Lodge, Cambridge Road.

(j) Kimbolton & Stonely
Variation of Condition 3 of planning permission 0400316FUL to permit B1 use (pictures, photographs, posters and paintings) sales counter. Variation of condition 6 to allow the sale of picture frames, pictures and posters, Milk Depot, Park Lane, Stonely.
(k) Ramsey

Erection of 2 semi-detached dwellings with garages, land south of 131 Herne Road, Ramsey St. Mary's.

To consider reports by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management).

4. APPEAL DECISIONS (Pages 135 - 142)

To consider a report by the Planning Service Manager (Development Manager).

LATE REPRESENTATIONS AND INFORMATION TO BE VIEWED ON THE DISTRICT COUNCIL'S WEBSITE WWWHUNTSDC.GOV.UK ON FRIDAY 19TH FEBRUARY 2010.

5. LATE REPRESENTATIONS AND INFORMATION (Pages 143 - 154)

Dated this 12th day of February 2010

[Signature]

Chief Executive

Notes

1. A personal interest exists where a decision on a matter would affect to a greater extent than other people in the District –

   (a) the well-being, financial position, employment or business of the Councillor, their family or any person with whom they had a close association;

   (b) a body employing those persons, any firm in which they are a partner and any company of which they are directors;

   (c) any corporate body in which those persons have a beneficial interest in a class of securities exceeding the nominal value of £25,000; or

   (d) the Councillor’s registerable financial and other interests.
2. A personal interest becomes a prejudicial interest where a member of the public (who has knowledge of the circumstances) would reasonably regard the Member's personal interest as being so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Councillor's judgement of the public interest.

Please contact Ms C Deller, Democratic Services Manager, Tel No. 01480 388007/e-mail: Christine.Deller@huntsdc.gov.uk. However, if you wish to speak at the Panel’s meeting regarding a particular Agenda Item please contact Jackie Holland - Tel No. 01480 388418 before 4.30pm on the Friday preceding this meeting.

Specific enquiries with regard to items on the Agenda should be directed towards the Contact Officer.

Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting as observers except during consideration of confidential or exempt items of business.

Agenda and enclosures can be viewed on the District Council’s website – www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk (under Councils and Democracy).

If you would like a translation of Agenda/Minutes/Reports or would like a large text version or an audio version please contact the Democratic Services Manager and we will try to accommodate your needs.

**Emergency Procedure**

*In the event of the fire alarm being sounded and on the instruction of the Meeting Administrator, all attendees are requested to vacate the building via the closest emergency exit.*
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MINUTES of the meeting of the DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL held in the Burgess Hall, St Ivo Leisure Centre, Westwood Road, St Ives on Monday, 18 January 2010.

PRESENT: Councillor P G Mitchell – Chairman.


APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors Mrs M Banerjee and P A Swales.

52. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 21st December 2009 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

53. MEMBERS’ INTERESTS

No interests were declared by Members.

54. DRAFT PROPOSED SUBMISSION - DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT DPD

A report by the Head of Planning Services was submitted to which was attached a copy of the Draft Proposed Submission: Development Management DPD (copies of both documents are appended in the Minute Book).

It was explained that the document was part of the Local Development Framework and would support the Core Strategy and East of England Plan. It set out the Council’s policies for managing development in Huntingdonshire and would be used in assessing and determining planning applications. It was clarified that the DPD document would replace the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement, which had been in place since 2007, and would improve, develop and better define the policies contained within that statement and elaborate upon the objectives of the Core Strategy. To assist Members in understanding where changes had occurred, the Planning Services Manager (Policy) undertook to provide an index indicating whether existing policies had been retained and, if so, their location within the DPD or Core Strategy documents. The Panel noted that the Development Management Policies should be cross-referenced to those contained within the Core Strategy.
Having briefly discussed the reasons for specifying the named sites in policy P7 Development in the Countryside and confirmed that there had been no change to maximum car parking provision for residential dwellings in the market towns, the Panel

RESOLVED

that Members be invited to forward their comments on the Draft Proposed Submission: Development Management DPD to the Planning Service Manager (Policy) by 31st January 2010 in advance of the submission of the proposed policies to the Cabinet and Council in February.

55. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

The Planning Service Manager (Development Management) submitted reports (copies of which are appended in the Minute Book) on applications for development to be determined by the Panel and advised Members of further representations (details of which also are appended in the Minute Book) which had been received in connection therewith since the reports had been prepared. Whereupon, it was

RESOLVED

(a) Proposed 2 storey rear extension for disabled use, 3 Dart Close, St. Ives - 09/01431/FUL

(Mr Claxton, objector, addressed the Panel on the application).

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Planning Services to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted.

(b) Variation of existing permission from 11 flats to 14 affordable units, former bus depot, Stukeley Road, Huntingdon - 09/01399/FUL

(i) that the Director of Central Services be authorised either to enter into an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or to complete a supplemental unilateral agreement requiring the provision of affordable housing and contributions towards open space; and

(ii) that the application be approved subject to completion of one of the Agreements referred to in (i) above and to conditions to be determined by the Head of Planning Services to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted and additionally to include window details and cycle storage.
SUMMARY OF ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY FOR 2009

By way of a report by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) Members were advised of the extent of enforcement activity undertaken by the Enforcement Team in the Planning Division during 2009 and the proposed objectives of the service in 2010. The Panel also were requested to endorse the content of the revised Planning Enforcement Policy document.

The Planning Enforcement Team Leader described the impact on the Team of staff absence at a time when the complexity and extent of workload had increased to a record high of 416 active files - 56% higher than the same period measured in January 2009. It was acknowledged that the extension of the temporary contract of a Team Support Officer for a further twelve month period had proved valuable in assisting the service to continue to function. In addition to the significant enforcement issue at Hartford Marina, mention also was made to the action required to respond to unauthorised gypsy sites at Ramsey Heights, Bluntisham and Great Gransden.

Despite these difficulties, the Panel were pleased to note that 290 cases had been closed during 2009 which represented a small increase over 2008, that the priorities set for 2009 largely had been met and that the five key objectives identified for 2010 included proposals to reduce case loads still further and to introduce a process for monitoring the use of agricultural buildings.

In extending their appreciation to the Enforcement Team for their hard work during 2009 and in particular for the successful outcome at the site of Anglo in St. Neots, the Panel expressed concern at the burden placed on the Team both as a result of the extent of their workload and in the event of the long-term absence of one officer in such a small team. The Executive Councillor for Planning Strategy and Transport acknowledged the difficulty in maintaining the service through a period of staff absence and reported that he had requested the Head of Planning Services to monitor the situation and to consider whether resources could be utilised from elsewhere in the Division to cover. However, he underlined that it was unlikely that funding could be made available for additional resources without making reductions elsewhere.

Having discussed the process for handling complaints in the future, it was

RESOLVED

(a) that the content of the report now submitted be noted and the key objectives identified for the service in 2010 endorsed;

(b) that the contents of the Planning Enforcement Policy document (revised January 2010) be endorsed; and

(c) that the Cabinet be requested to review staffing levels in the Enforcement Team of the Planning Division.
57. OPERATION OF A WOOD SHAVINGS LINE OUTSIDE THE PERMITTED HOURS, SUNDOWN STRAW PRODUCTS, STATION ROAD, TILBROOK, HUNTINGDON - 09/00142/ENBOC

The Panel received and noted a report by the Planning Services Manager (Development Management) regarding the unauthorised operation of a wood shaving line at Sundown Straw Products, Station Road, Tilbrook contrary to Conditions 3 and 4 of planning consent reference no. 08/03545/FUL which related to hours of activity.

It was reported that an appeal against refusal to vary the operating restrictions was to be heard on 10th February 2010 and that pending the outcome no further enforcement or prosecution action would be taken against the company concerned.

58. APPEAL DECISIONS

The Panel received and noted a report by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) in respect of seven appeals against refusal of planning permission by the District Council.

59. MONITORING OF SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS (PLANNING OBLIGATIONS)

In noting the contents of a report by the Head of People, Performance and Partnerships (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book), the Panel was advised that the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) would also now be monitoring the information collated on the receipt and expenditure of Section 106 monies. Despite these circumstances, the Panel still indicated a wish to continue to receive the information on a quarterly basis.

Chairman
THE NEW TOWNSHIP OF GREAT HADDON

Development of an urban extension comprising up to 5350 residential dwellings; a district centre (with up to 9200 square metres (99031 square feet) retail floor space) and two neighbourhood centres (with up to 2300 square metres (24758 square feet) retail floor space) comprising district/neighbourhood retail (A1-A5); community and health (C2, D1); leisure(D2); residential (C3) and commercial (B1) uses. Provision for education facilities (sites for three primary and one secondary school); sports and recreational facilities; site for 5 gypsy and traveller pitches; a range of strategic open spaces including new landscaping, woodland and allotments; and cemetery provision. Associated highway infrastructure (including pedestrian, bridleway and cycle routes), public transport infrastructure and car parking for all uses. Utilities and renewable energy infrastructure; foul and surface water drainage networks (including SuDS and lakes), land to the north of Norman Cross, East of the A1(M) and west of London Road (A15), Peterborough.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 An outline planning application has been made to the Peterborough City Council for the development of a further new township south of Hampton Vale between the A15 and A1 west of the village of Yaxley. Huntingdonshire District Council is a Consultee in this instance. There is a separate related application for employment (totalling 65ha) situated to the west of Hampton Vale and north of the new township.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Application

2.1 The development proposed is for up to 5350 new residential units, a district centre with retail totalling 9200sqm, two neighbourhood centres totalling 2300sqm, three primary schools and a secondary school, space for community uses and open space and recreation including a cemetery for Yaxley.

2.2 Between 2007 and 2009 there have been a number of opportunities for statutory bodies, Officers and the public to become involved with the developers and comment on the emerging development concepts of this proposal. During that period this Council has maintained a consistent view that the village of Yaxley should ‘retain’ its identity and that the obligation of providing a bypass, which was required as part of the Hampton development, should be carried forward.
The Design and access statement that accompanies the application contains an illustrative master plan that claims to have addressed the initial issues that this Council and others raised during the pre-application engagement process by:

- Relocating the secondary school and outdoor recreation to serve Yaxley as well as Gt Haddon and provision of a cemetery to meet the requirements of Yaxley Parish Council.
- Retaining the physical separation between Gt Haddon and surrounding settlements and softening and greening the western development gateways.
- Minimising the visual impact of built development along the A15 from the south.
- Providing additional formal space around the Scheduled Ancient Monument at Normans Cross to improve its setting.
- Diverting the A15 into and through the east of the site with a bus gate to the north that helps to define the new character of London Road and to reduce through traffic in Yaxley.

Planning Policy

The area of land to the south of Hampton has been identified as one of the locations for a new township in the recently published Peterborough’s Submission Core Strategy. There are still further processes that the City Council has to go through (possibly taking more than a year) before their Core Strategy is adopted as council policy. Even without a firm backing to this proposal, it cannot be argued that this application is premature and the City Council is obliged to determine it. A planning decision for this proposal could be given in advance of the adoption of the Core Strategy. However the City Council must be content that their policy regarding the identification of this land is a sound one otherwise their decision could be challenged.

There is an opportunity for this Council to make representations to the City Council on the Core Strategy but they must be on the basis that their strategy is unsound. The closing date for representations is the 4th March 2010.

3. COMMENTS

In the opinion of the Council there are a number of issues that still need to be satisfactorily addressed. They are set out below:

**Issue 1: The need to ensure the retention of Yaxley as a village in a rural setting**

The road layout through the proposed development, and the close proximity of new development to the east of the village, together with the alteration of the character of the approach to the village along the A15 from Normans Cross with the inevitable removal of vegetation, could result in Yaxley and its approach being consumed into an urban extension with the loss of the village’s identity. This aspect of the proposed master plan needs to be re-evaluated.
**Issue 2: The urban design process**

It is not considered that the matters described above were evaluated sufficiently thoroughly in arriving at the developer’s illustrative master plan. In their site evaluation and in the structural elements that influence the development concept there is no mention of the character of the vegetation along the A15 and the rural nature of the approach to Yaxley. The developer appears to have decided on the road network, justified it by traffic impact and continued the principle of frontage development onto the A15 as in Hampton (a development on brown field land) without having regard to the impact on the character of the surrounding countryside area.

**Issue 3: Transport/traffic matters**

Whilst measures are needed to discourage through traffic from using the A15 there does not appear to be a convincing argument for the closure of the A15 by a bus gate situated to the north of Yaxley. The bypass that is proposed is not attractive enough to encourage car users to use it (being located through an urban area) and in its current position will result in a likely over engineered junction arrangement to the detriment of the current rural character of the A15. The result will probably be that traffic will be encouraged to travel through Yaxley and Farcet and then on to the Frank Perkins highway to the detriment of two communities.

**Issue 4: The benefits to Yaxley and Huntingdonshire**

It is recognised that there could be benefits to Yaxley and Huntingdonshire by the closer proximity of services and increased access to facilities situated in Gt Haddon. Yaxley will benefit if children are able to use the new secondary school which is even closer to the village than the Hampton one. The experience of Hampton has been different. The development of a District centre with a 4000sqm convenience store could be seen as a benefit to some but a disadvantage to existing retailers in the village. It should also be recognised that facilities to be provided in the Gt Fen project to the south of Yaxley will benefit this nearby large growth area and better access to the Gt Fen area will be needed to be provided as part of the development.

4. **CONCLUSION**

4.1 This Council will be seeking further meetings with the City Council to discuss these issues as the application is processed. A strong case should be made to Peterborough to rethink the master plan to lessen the physical impact of the development on the village of Yaxley and its approach from the south west. There is also a need to resolve the bypass issue and bus gate as part of the reconsideration of the master plan.

4.2 There will be a considerable demand on section 106 monies and whilst this Council may be justified in taking a share particularly for green infrastructure links it may not amount to a significant amount. The secondary school issue is going to be difficult to resolve with two education authorities and recent catchment areas changes in the City.
4.3 This Council has no specific comments to make on the employment application.

5. **RECOMMENDATION**

5.1 That Members:

Endorse continuing engagement with the City in order to address the issues of the master plan, transport matters, and the likely benefits accruing from the development relating to this application as identified in paragraph 3.1 above.

**Background Papers:**

*Peterborough’s Submission Core Strategy*
*Planning application for Gt Haddon township and associated documents*

**CONTACT OFFICER** - enquiries about this Report to Nigel Swaby, Development Management Team Leader ☎ 01480 388370.
AGENDA ITEM NO.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL 22 FEBRUARY 2010

Case No: 0901541FUL (FULL PLANNING APPLICATION)
Proposal: CHANGE OF USE FROM STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION (B8) TO CAR SERVICE AND MOT TEST CENTRE
Location: 1 LEVELLERS LANE, EYNESBURY
Applicant: MR AND MRS M BUNDY
Grid Ref: 518855 259163
Date of Registration: 14.12.2009
Parish: ST NEOTS

RECOMMENDATION - APPROVE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 This is an industrial unit in a development within a small industrial area of Eynesbury, St Neots. This building fronts the Cromwell Road and has a shared access to the north and south of the building. The parking spaces are located directly south of the building within a wider yard used by other occupiers of the units. There is a mobile home park and residential flats to the east of the building. The north and north eastern boundaries are defined by 1.8 metre fencing.

1.2 The proposal is for the change of use from storage and transport to a car service and MOT station, general industry (B2).

1.3 Part 20 of the application form confirms there will be 3 full time employees; part 21 confirms that the business will operate between the hours of 8:30 – 18:00 Mon to Fri, and 8:30 – 13:00 on Saturdays, and at no time during Sundays and Bank Holidays.

1.4 The application has been reported to Members as the building is in the ownership of Huntingdonshire District Council. As the Applicant is not the owner of the building a ‘Certificate B’ was served on the District Council on the 26 November 2009.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE

2.2 PPS4: “Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth” (2009) sets out the Government’s comprehensive policy framework for planning for sustainable economic development in urban and rural areas.


2.4 PPG24: “Planning & Noise” (1994) guides planning authorities on the use of planning powers to minimise the adverse impact of noise.

For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. PLANNING POLICIES

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live

3.1 East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)

Policies viewable at http://www.go-east.gov.uk then follow links to Planning, Regional Planning then Related Documents

- ENV7: “Quality in the Built Environment” - requires new development to be of high quality which complements the distinctive character and best qualities of the local area and promotes urban renaissance and regeneration.

3.2 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003)

Saved policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 are relevant and viewable at http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk follow the links to environment, planning, planning policy and Structure Plan 2003.

- None

3.3 Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)

Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

- E7: “Small Businesses” will normally be supported subject to environmental and traffic considerations.

- H30: “Existing Residential Areas” – Planning permission will not normally be granted for the introduction of, or extension to, commercial uses or activities within existing residential areas where this would be likely to have a detrimental effect on amenities.
• **T18**: “Access requirements for new development” states development should be accessed by a highway of acceptable design and appropriate construction.

### 3.4 Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)

Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan - Then click on "Local Plan Alteration (2002)"

• None

### 3.5 Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning and then click on Planning Policy where there is a link to the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

• **CS1**: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all developments will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered including design, implementation and function of development e.g., by making best use of land, buildings and existing infrastructure.

### 3.6 Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

• **B4**: “Amenity” - developments should not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity of existing or future occupiers.

• **E2**: – Location of Industrial and Warehouse Development – A proposal for a minor industrial or warehouse development on unallocated land should be limited to, amongst others, sites within the defined limits of Market Towns.

• **T1**: “Transport Impacts” - development proposals should be capable of being served by safe convenient access to the transport network and should not give rise to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the local transport network.

• **T2**: “Car and Cycle Parking” - development proposals should limit car parking and provide cycle parking facilities to the levels set out in the Council’s parking standards.
4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 The industrial estate was constructed in the 1970’s; in 1990 the unit received consent for the change of use to storage and transport, under planning ref: 9001697FUL

5. **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 St Neots Town Council – recommend APPROVAL (copy attached).

5.2 Environmental Health – NO OBJECTIONS, subject to conditions being imposed to ensure that the operations associated with this business are carried out inside the building.

6. **REPRESENTATIONS**

6.1 One third party letter received from another business with concerns raised about other car service repair businesses in the immediate area generating rubbish and their vehicles blocking accesses. It has also been suggested that the parking is inadequate.

7. **SUMMARY OF ISSUES**

7.1 The main issues to consider in this instance are the principle of this use in the building/location; parking; neighbour amenity; and hours of operation.

**Principle**

7.2 Levellers Lane is an industrial estate with other businesses of this type in the vicinity. The principle of this type of business has been accepted in the area. The site is positioned within an established industrial estate. Policy generally supports small businesses and the principle of a B2 use in this location is acceptable. Policy E7 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan supports small businesses and the proposal accords Policy E2 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement.

**Parking**

7.3 Within Appendix 1 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement the maximum car parking provision for B2 is ‘up to 1 car space per 50m2’. Whilst the advice suggests 9 parking spaces are required for a B2 use and the application confirms 7 spaces will be available, the advice in the document is however a maximum standard. The parking proposed is considered acceptable in this instance. The proposal therefore accords with policy T2 of the Interim Planning Policy Statement.
Neighbour amenity

7.4 There is a mobile home park to the east of the site and residential flats to the north east. The common boundary is marked by fencing and planting to form an existing screen. Neighbour amenity is a consideration with this case due to the proposed use and possible noise and disturbance issues. The unit is at present vacant and the previous uses involved storage and transport. The Agent has confirmed that some B2 operations have previously taken place at the site. The Environmental Health Officers have not objected to the proposal; however this on the basis that clear conditions are appended to the decision to ensure the works associated with the B2 are carried out inside the building.

7.5 The comments received from an existing business have been noted; however a planning application cannot be refused on the basis of similar businesses in the area not operating in a considerate manner. The comments received about parking have been discussed above.

Hours of operation

7.6 It is considered that the proposed hours of operation are acceptable in terms of safeguarding residential amenity. However a condition should be appended to the decision to ensure the company operates in the time specified to ensure the use does not give rise to future problems to the residents in the vicinity.

7.7 The application, providing the conditions attached to the decision are adhered to is acceptable in terms of neighbour amenity, and the proposal accords with Policy H30 of the Local Plan 1955 and Policy B4 of the Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 and PPG24.

7.8 The principle of the use is considered acceptable for this industrial estate location. The parking at the site is considered adequate and the conditions appended to the decision notice should ensure the use does not have an undue impact on the amenities of the adjacent residents. The proposal therefore meets the requirements of Policies H30 and E7 of the Local Plan, B4, E2 and T2 of the Interim Planning Policy Statement and PPS1, PPS4, PPG13 and PPG24.

7.9 Having regard to applicable National and Local Planning Policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is recommended that planning permission should be approved in this instance.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.

8. RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE, subject to conditions to include the following:

02003 - Time Limit (3yrs)

Nonstand - Plant and works inside the building
Nonstand - Hours of operation
Nonstand - Parking

Background Papers:
Planning Application File Reference: 0901541FUL
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003
Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995
Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration, 2002
Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2009
Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

CONTACT OFFICER:
Enquiries about this report to Linda Morse Development Management Officer 01480 388411
Case No: 0901427FUL (FULL PLANNING APPLICATION)

Proposal: USE OF CONVERTED OUTBUILDING AS SEparate RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SHORT TERM HOLIDAY LETTINGS

Location: THE COTTAGE POTTON ROAD

Applicant: DR C WALSH-ADAMS AND MR C ADAMS

Grid Ref: 528903 266240

Date of Registration: 26.11.2009

Parish: HILTON

RECOMMENDATION - APPROVE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 The site is located on the main road from St Ives through Hilton and is occupied by a converted barn which has permission to be used as ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling, a Victorian/Edwardian property with a large extension to the rear. The site is located within the Hilton Conservation Area. To the north of the site adjacent to the common boundary is a garage in the ownership of No 2 Potton Road.

1.2 The proposal is for the use of the converted outbuilding as a residential unit for short term holiday lettings.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE


2.2 PPG15: “Planning and the Historic Environment” (1994) sets out Government policies for the identification and protection of historic buildings, conservation areas, and other elements of the historic environment. It explains the role played by the planning system in their protection.

For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. PLANNING POLICIES

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website:
http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live


- None relevant


- None relevant

3.3 Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995) Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

- En5: “Conservation Area Character” - development within or directly affecting conservation areas will be required to preserve or enhance their character and appearance.

- En6: “Design standards in Conservation Areas” – in conservation areas, the District Council will require high standards of design with careful consideration being given to the scale and form of development in the area and to the use of sympathetic materials of appropriate colour and texture.

- En25: "General Design Criteria" - indicates that the District Council will expect new development to respect the scale, form, materials and design of established buildings in the locality and make adequate provision for landscaping and amenity areas.

- To1 – the Council will generally support the development of tourist opportunities.

- To6 – the Council will seek to extend the amount and variety of tourist accommodation.

- To8 – new accommodation and conference centre proposals will normally be permitted subject to certain caveats and criteria.


- None relevant

3.5 Policies from the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning then
click on Planning and then click on Planning Policy where there is a link to the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

- None relevant

3.6 Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

- B1 – Design Quality - developments should demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character of the area.
- B4 – Amenity - developments should not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity of existing or future occupiers.
- B8 – Conservation Areas - states the criteria against which developments within or affecting a Conservation Area should be assessed.
- E4 – Tourist facilities – a proposal for tourist accommodation should be, amongst other locations, within the existing built up framework of smaller settlements.
- T2 – Parking – a development should limit parking provision to the levels set out in the parking standards.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 00/00976 – First floor extension to dwelling – PER(19.07.00)
4.2 0402078 – Alterations to barn to form ancillary residential accommodation. PER(20.08.04)
4.3 0900100 – Extension to dwelling – PER(17.03.09)

5. CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Hilton Parish council – Refusal (Copy attached)

6. REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 None

7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

7.1 The main issues to consider are the principle of the use in this location, the impact on the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, parking provision the design.

7.2 The site is located in the built up area of Hilton. The development of tourist accommodation therefore conforms to Policy E4.

7.3 The holiday let would share the three parking spaces to the front of the property with the occupiers of The Cottage. Pedestrian access to
the holiday let would be along the side of The Cottage. Given this close relationship and the limited amenity space for the unit, the proposed use of the building would only be acceptable if it was restricted to holiday accommodation (by condition) and the building was retained in the same ownership as The Cottage (by S.106 obligation). The S.106 would ensure that the owners of The Cottage would control the letting of the unit and thereby have control over the extent to which their amenity was affected. Ultimately, they could elect to cease the use if they felt their amenity was severely affected.

7.4 There would be no adverse impact on the neighbouring property to the north as there is only a small amenity area to the rear of the barn and there is an existing garage within the adjacent site and on the common boundary, which would screen the use of this area.

7.5 The concerns of the Parish Council are noted but the provision of 3 parking spaces for the two units, most likely to be two for the dwelling and one for the holiday unit, would be appropriate. Planning policy seeks to restrict parking provision to a maximum of an average of 2 spaces per dwelling.

7.6 The design of the converted barn is acceptable. The external changes involving the insertion of an attractive glazed element in the rear elevation and a rooflight in the south roofslope were part of the 2004 permission. The building retains the original outbuilding appearance, although it has now been painted white.

Conclusion

7.7 The proposed development is considered to be compliant with relevant national and local planning policy as it:
* Is for short term holiday letting.
* Subject to conditions and a S.106 obligation, there would be no significant adverse impact on the neighbouring properties.
* The level of parking proposed is acceptable for the dwelling and holiday let.
* The use and alterations to the barn would have no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.

8. **RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE**, subject to conditions to include the following:

02003 Time Limit (3yrs)

Nonstand Holiday use only

Nonstand Three car parking spaces maintained

BACKGROUND PAPERS:
Planning Application File Reference: 0803546FUL
East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003
Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995
Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration, 2002
Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007
Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009

CONTACT OFFICER:
Enquiries about this report to Susan Sharpe Development Management Officer 01480 388408
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Case No: 0901288OUT (OUTLINE APPLICATION)
Proposal: OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 21 DWELLINGS
Location: CAR PARK, CROMWELL ROAD, EYNESBURY
Applicant: SEALED AIR LTD
Grid Ref: 519252 259811
Date of Registration: 08.10.2009
Parish: ST NEOTS

RECOMMENDATION - APPROVE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 The site is on the western side of Cromwell Road adjacent to the Samuel Pepys School. To the north is the Bargroves Adult Education Centre and to the south are the residential properties of Naseby Gardens. The site is 0.6 hectare in size and is currently used as a car park for up to 194 vehicles by the company Sealed Air whose commercial buildings are on the other side of Cromwell Road.

1.2 This outline application proposes the residential development of up to 21 dwellings and is seeking only the approval of the access. An indicative layout and illustrative street scenes have been submitted. The layout shows a mixture of terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings and the provision of a LAP. The elevations show some two storey and some two and half storey dwellings.

1.3 The application is accompanied by a Planning Statement, Design and Access Statement, Sustainability Statement, Tree and Hedgerow Survey, and a Noise Impact Assessment.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE


2.2 Planning Policy Statement: Planning and Climate Change - Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 (2007) sets out how planning, in providing for the new homes, jobs and infrastructure needed by communities, should help shape places with lower carbon emissions and resilient to the climate change now accepted as inevitable.
2.3 **PPS3: “Housing” (2006)** sets out how the planning system supports the growth in housing completions needed in England.

2.4 **PPG13: “Transport” (2001)** provides guidance in relation to transport and particularly the integration of planning and transport.

For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. **PLANNING POLICIES**

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live

3.1 **East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)**

Policies viewable at http://www.go-east.gov.uk then follow links to Planning, Regional Planning then Related Documents

- **ENV7**: “Quality in the Built Environment” - requires new development to be of high quality which complements the distinctive character and best qualities of the local area and promotes urban renaissance and regeneration.

- **ENG1**: “Carbon Dioxide Emissions and Energy Performance” – for new developments of 10+ dwellings or 1000sqm non residential development a minimum of 10% of their energy should be from decentralised and renewable or low carbon resources unless not feasible or viable.

- **T14**: “Parking” – controls to manage transport demand and influencing travel change alongside measures to improve public transport accessibility, walking and cycling should be encouraged. Maximum parking standards should be applied to new residential development.

3.2 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003)**

Saved policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 are relevant and viewable at http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk follow the links to environment, planning, planning policy and Structure Plan 2003.

- **P6/1** – Development Related Provision – development will only be permitted where the additional infrastructure and community requirements generated by the proposal can be secured.

- **P9/8** – Infrastructure Provision – a comprehensive approach towards securing infrastructure needs to support the development strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region. The programme will encompass: transport; affordable and key
worker housing; education; health care; other community facilities; environmental improvements and provision of open space; waste management; water, flood control and drainage and other utilities and telecommunications.

- **P9/9** – Transport Strategy for Cambridge Sub-Region – to provide improvements along key transport corridors and key routes into market towns.

### 3.3 Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)

Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

- **H31**: “Residential privacy and amenity standards” – Indicates that new dwellings will only be permitted where appropriate standards of privacy can be maintained and adequate parking provided.

- **H37**: “Environmental Pollution” – housing development will not be permitted in locations where there is a known source of environmental pollution which would be detrimental to residential amenity.

- **H38**: “Noise Pollution” – development sites adjoining main highways, railways, industrial operations and other potentially damaging noise pollution sources will be required to adopt adequate design solutions to create acceptable ambient noise levels within the dwellings and their curtilage.

- **R7**: “Land and Facilities” – For new residential development of 10 dwellings or more (or 0.4 ha) should normally make provision for children’s casual and equipped play space.

- **R8**: “Land and Facilities” – consideration will be given to the acceptance of contributions from developers towards improving recreational facilities in the vicinity of the site to off set recreational requirements sets out in R7.

- **En19**: “Trees and Landscape” – will make Tree Preservation Orders where it considers that trees which contribute to the local amenity and/or the landscape are at risk.

- **En20**: Landscaping Scheme. - Wherever appropriate a development will be subject to the conditions requiring the execution of a landscaping scheme.

- **En25**: "General Design Criteria" - indicates that the District Council will expect new development to respect the scale, form, materials and design of established buildings in the locality and make adequate provision for landscaping and amenity areas.

### 3.4 Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)

Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan - Then click on "Local Plan Alteration (2002)"
• **HL6** – Housing Density - indicates that housing development shall be at a density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare

• **OB2** – Maintenance of Open Space – contributions may be sought for the maintenance of small areas of open space, children’s play space and recreational facilities, woodland or landscaping to benefit the development.

## 3.5 Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at [http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk](http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk) click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

- **G3** – Trees, hedgerows and Other Environmental Features - development proposals should minimise risk of harm to trees, hedgerows or other environmental features of visual, historic or nature conservation value.

- **B1** – Design Quality - developments should demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character of the area.

- **B2** – Street scene – development proposals should make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of streets and public spaces.

- **B3** – Accessibility, Adaptability and Security – the location and design of new development should enable ease of access, have convenient and appropriate facilities and minimise the extent to which users feel at risk of crime.

- **B4** – Amenity - developments should not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity of existing or future occupiers.

- **H2** – Housing Density - lists the minimum density standards housing developments should achieve. Within or adjacent to market towns: 40-75 dwellings per hectare.

- **H3** – Mix of Dwelling Sizes – major housing development should incorporate accommodation suitable for a range of household sizes and types, which meets the local community’s needs.

## 3.6 Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009

Policies from the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at [http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk](http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk) click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning then click on Planning Policy and then click on Core Strategy where there is a link to the Adopted Core Strategy.
• CS1: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all developments will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered including design, implementation and function of development.

• CS3: “The Settlement Hierarchy” – Identifies Huntingdon, St Neots, St Ives and Ramsey and Bury as Market Towns in which development schemes of all scales may be appropriate in built up areas.

• CS4: “Affordable Housing in Development” – 40% of all housing proposed on proposals of 15 or more homes or 0.5ha, or more in all parts of the District.

• CS10: “Contributions to Infrastructure Requirements” – proposals will be expected to provide or contribute towards the cost of providing infrastructure and of meeting social and environmental requirements, where these are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

3.7 Developer Contributions Towards Affordable Housing (SPD – Nov 2007) – requires 40% or more of the total number of dwellings to be provided on a site of 15 or more dwellings (or 0.5ha) within a settlement above 3000 population in the Cambridge Sub-Region to be affordable.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 No relevant planning history.

5. CONSULTATIONS

5.1 St Neots Town Council – OBJECTION (copy attached).

5.2 Cambridgeshire County Highways – NO OBJECTIONS.

5.3 Cambridgeshire County Education – requests that we seek financial contributions towards pre-school and primary education as there is insufficient capacity to meet the needs of this development.

5.4 Cambridgeshire Police Architectural Liaison Officer – concerns about the location of the LAP.

5.5 Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue – request more information.

5.6 HDC Environmental health – NO OBJECTIONS subject to a condition to agree noise mitigation measures.

5.7 HDC Operations – detailed comments about the location of the LAP, and requirement for financial contributions for open space and its maintenance.

6. REPRESENTATIONS
6.1 TWO letters have been received; one from a local resident concerned about overlooking and the second from the Samuel Pepys School objecting and raising the following points:

- Overlooking of classrooms and children’s play area;
- Concern about difficulties of access as all the children are transported to school;
- Creation of a traffic junction with increased potential for accidents including students with learning difficulties and users of the Bargroves centre which is soon to be opened as Young Peoples Centre;
- Construction noise and disruption;
- Increased risk of security to school site as it may be used as a natural shortcut; and,
- Possible use of the access road to the school as an overflow parking area.

7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

7.1 The main issues to consider here are the principle of the use of the land for residential development, information in the Design and Access Statement, the details of the access, whether any mitigation measures are necessary to make the proposal acceptable, Section 106 considerations and third party representations.

Principle of Residential Use

7.2 The re-use of previously developed land within urban areas is encouraged by PPS3, particularly where it would bring forward other environmental benefits. This site is not one which is proposed to be retained for employment use and therefore consideration should be given to whether the site is appropriate for residential use or whether the car parking should be retained for employment use.

7.3 The site is located within the built up area of the town and adjacent to established residential dwellings and a school. On the other side of Cromwell Road are employment uses. In this context the use of the site for a residential use would be entirely appropriate. The applicant has provided information on the numbers of employees and the use of the existing car parking spaces. This shows that Sealed Air, the company which owns the application site, has two additional car parks close to the site which have a total of 176 car parking spaces. The applicant has assessed car parking demand through a series of surveys of these other two car parks and it has been concluded that the car park, the subject of this application, is no longer needed for employees to park and its loss will not result in a parking deficiency for Sealed Air.

7.4 The location of the site adjacent to a main road will require suitable noise attenuation measures, however there is housing adjacent to the site and it is therefore considered that the noise environment is acceptable. There are therefore no planning objections to the site being developed for residential purposes.

Information in the Design and Access Statement
7.5 The Design and Access Statement includes an indicative layout and indicates that the development would provide 1 LAP and a mixture of two and two and half storey residential properties. Through the consultation process some comments have been received which would necessitate a change to the layout; so whilst approval for the layout is not being sought at this stage, it is recommended that a condition be imposed to clarify that the submitted layout is unacceptable.

Details of the Access

7.6 This outline application seeks approval of the details of the access only with all other matters being reserved. The existing access from Cromwell Road is substantial in width since it already serves the car park and two schools. The details of the access have been amended in accordance with the requirements of the highway authority and are now acceptable to accommodate the number of dwellings proposed.

Section 106 Consideration and Mitigation Measures

7.7 The Section 106 Advisory Group will consider the contributions detailed below at a meeting on 15 February and the results of this will be reported orally. The applicant has agreed to the principle of the Section 106 obligations but would like to make payments prior to the occupation of the 10th market dwelling rather than upon the commencement of the development.

Transport and Highways

7.8 The County Council as Highway Authority have requested a contribution of £2000 per dwelling towards the St Neots Market Town Strategy in order to mitigate against the impact upon transport in the surrounding area.

Education

7.9 The County Council as Education Authority have requested a sum of £2940 per dwelling on all dwellings of over 2 bedrooms, which will be divided up as £840 for pre-school and £2100 for primary education.

Open Space

7.10 The applicant is proposing a LAP on site and in addition to an on site maintenance contribution of £428.25 and an off site sum of £9291.25 an off site maintenance sum of £1162.78 will be required.

Affordable Housing

7.11 A total of 40% affordable housing should be provided to accord with the Council’s policy.

Third Party Representations
7.12 The adjacent school have raised issues about the use of the access—the details of the access have been considered by the County Council Highways engineer and considered acceptable in highway safety terms. It should also be borne in mind that the site is used at present as a car park for 194 cars and the proposed use for 21 dwellings will be likely to generate a lower level of traffic. Overlooking of classrooms or play areas will be considered when a detailed layout and siting of dwellings is considered at the reserved matters stage. Possible use of the access road as an overflow parking area would be a matter for a traffic regulation order to prevent parking on the road. Whilst construction noise and disruption would cause inconvenience, this would be a temporary factor which should not prevent the development of an appropriate site.

Conclusion

7.13 The redevelopment of this site for residential use accords with Council policy since the site is not protected for employment use, and is an appropriate use for the area. The parking is not required for the employment use and the details of the access are acceptable. Although the submitted layout is not acceptable, approval for this is not being sought at this stage and therefore acceptable details can be sought at reserved matters stage. The Section 106 obligations will ensure that the impacts of the development are mitigated against and it therefore recommended that planning permission can be granted subject to conditions and the successful resolution of a Section 106 agreement.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.

8. RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Obligation and to conditions to include the following:

- Details reserved minus access
- Plans and particulars in writing
- Reserved matters within three years
- Dates for commencement
- Layout details excluded from this permission
- Provision of LAP
- No dwelling occupied until access constructed
- Noise protection measures
- Fire hydrants
- Details of retained trees
- Tree retention, maintenance, protection
06010 - Landscape design (delete)
06011 - Soft landscape (delete)
06012 - Hard and soft landscape implementation
06015 - Boundary treatment
06019 - Protection of trees and hedges during works

Background Papers:
Planning Application File Reference: 0901288OUT
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003
Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995
Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration, 2002
Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2009
Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

CONTACT OFFICER:
Enquiries about this report to Jennie Parsons Development Management
Team Leader 01480 388409
APPLICATIONS REQUIRING REFERENCE TO
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL
(Reports by Planning Service Manager (Development Management)

Case No: 0901295FUL (FULL PLANNING APPLICATION)
Proposal: ERECTION OF A SMOKING SHELTER
Location: THE HYDE PARK, NEW STREET
Applicant: MR S PICTON
Grid Ref: 518359 260565
Date of Registration: 20.10.2009
Parish: ST NEOTS

RECOMMENDATION - APPROVE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 This application relates to a public house located to the north of the Town Centre within an area that has a mix of residential and business uses. The building is situated on a corner plot with New Street and Bedford Street and uses the majority of its plot, with a small front courtyard that gives entrance to the property.

1.2 The site is within the Conservation Area for St Neots and within an area at risk from flooding.

1.3 The application seeks the erection of a smoking shelter to be constructed in the front courtyard area. The shelter will be constructed of timber posts with polycarbonate roof sheeting and will be a maximum height of 2.7 metres.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE


2.2 PPG15: ‘Planning and the Historic Environment’ (1994) sets out Government policies for the identification and protection of historic buildings, conservation areas, and other elements of the historic environment. It explains the role played by the planning system in their protection.
2.3 PPS25 - 'Development and Flood Risk' (2006)

For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. PLANNING POLICIES

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live

3.1 East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)

Policies viewable at http://www.go-east.gov.uk then follow links to Planning, Regional Planning then Related Documents

- ENV7: “Quality in the Built Environment” - requires new development to be of high quality which complements the distinctive character and best qualities of the local area and promotes urban renaissance and regeneration.

3.2 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003)

Saved policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 are relevant and viewable at http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk follow the links to environment, planning, planning policy and Structure Plan 2003.

- None relevant

3.3 Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)

Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

- H30: “Existing Residential Areas” – Planning permission will not normally be granted for the introduction of, or extension to, commercial uses or activities within existing residential areas where this would be likely to have a detrimental effect on amenities.

- En5: “Conservation Area Character” - development within or directly affecting conservation areas will be required to preserve or enhance their character and appearance.

- En6: “Design standards in Conservation Areas” – in conservation areas, the District Council will require high standards of design with careful consideration being given to the scale and form of development in the area and to the use of sympathetic materials of appropriate colour and texture.
• **En9**: “Conservation Areas” - development should not impair open spaces, trees, street scenes and views into and out of Conservation Areas.

• **En25**: "General Design Criteria" - indicates that the District Council will expect new development to respect the scale, form, materials and design of established buildings in the locality and make adequate provision for landscaping and amenity areas.

• **CS9**: “Flood water management” – the District Council will normally refuse development proposals that prejudice schemes for flood water management.

### 3.4 Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)

Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at [www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan) - Then click on "Local Plan Alteration (2002)

• None relevant

### 3.5 Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at [http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk](http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk) click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning and then click on Planning Policy where there is a link to the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

• **CS1**: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all developments will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered including design, implementation and function of development.

### 3.6 Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at [http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk](http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk) click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

• **P10** – Flood Risk – development should: not take place in areas at risk from flooding, unless suitable mitigation/flood protection measures are agreed; not increase the risk of flooding to properties elsewhere; make use of sustainable drainage systems where feasible; be informed by a flood risk assessment where appropriate.

• **B1** – Design Quality - developments should demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character of the area.
• **B2** – Street scene – development proposals should make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of streets and public spaces.

• **B4** – Amenity - developments should not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity of existing or future occupiers.

• **B8** – Conservation Areas - states the criteria against which developments within or affecting a Conservation Area should be assessed.

• **T1** – Transport Impacts - development proposals should be capable of being served by safe convenient access to the transport network and should not give rise to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the local transport network.

3.7 **Emerging Development Management DPD policies**

• **C5**: “Flood Risk and Water Management” – development proposals should include suitable flood protection / mitigation to not increase risk of flooding elsewhere. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where technically feasible. There should be no adverse impact on or risk to quantity or quality of water resources.

• **E1**: “Development Context” – development proposals shall demonstrate consideration of the character and appearance of the surrounding environment and the potential impact of the proposal.

• **E3**: “Heritage Assets” – proposals which affect the District’s heritage assets or their setting should demonstrate how these assets will be protected, conserved and where appropriate enhanced.

• **H7**: “Amenity” – development proposals should safeguard the living conditions for residents and people occupying adjoining or nearby properties.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 No formal planning history recorded, however, a preliminary enquiry dated February 2009 gave advice to the owner of the public house about this proposal.

5. **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **St Neots Town Council** – recommend REFUSAL (copy attached).

5.2 **Police Architectural Liaison Officer** – NO OBJECTION.

5.3 **County Highways Engineer** – NO OBJECTION.
6. REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 THREE letters of OBJECTION have been received. The concerns raised include:

- Misleading information – shelter not required by law;
- Pedestrian and highway safety;
- Impact on conservation area;
- Noise & nuisance already an issue;
- Antisocial behaviour after closing hours;
- Detract from the historic environment; and,
- Private properties not allowed such extensions.

6.2 ONE letter in SUPPORT of the proposal has been received and the comments suggest the public house is mainly used by local people due to its location, out of the town centre, the owners of No 59 New Street have not suffered from any anti social behaviour from users of the public house.

7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

7.1 The main issues to consider are the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the impact on residential amenity. Highway safety and flood issues will also need consideration.

Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

7.2 While the site is located in a fairly prominent location and the timber structure will be positioned to the front of the building, it has been set back from the north elevation, reducing its visual impact on the street scene and the shelter will not become an over dominant feature. The open sided framework design reflects a late Victorian character which is evident in this part of St Neots Conservation Area. The timber and clear glazed canopy proposed also reinforce the late Victorian characteristics; however conditions should be appended to the decision notice to ensure a high quality finish. The structure is not considered to be harmful to the appearance of the building or the wider character of the Conservation Area and the proposal meets the requirements of ENV7 of the East of England Plan, EN5, EN6, EN25 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy, B1 and B8 of the Interim Planning Policy Statement and, E1 and E3 of the emerging Development Plan Document.

Highway Safety

7.3 The County Highways Officer considers the proposal not to impact on highway safety. The proposal will not be detrimental to highway safety and is in accordance with T1 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning and PPG13.

Flood Issues

7.4 The site lies within a flood zone three of the Environment Agencies matrix; the information submitted with the proposal confirms the applicant is aware of flood mitigation requirements. There is no
objection to the proposal in terms of flood risk issues and the proposal accords with CS9 of the Local Plan and P10 of the Interim Planning Policy Statement, and Policy C5 in the emerging Development Management DPD.

**Residential Amenity**

7.5 The three letters received in relation to the proposal mainly raise issues about possible anti-social behaviour from people using the shelter. The Town Council have also recommended refusal to the development due to concern about possible future anti-social behaviour and the impact this would have on the amenities of the local residents. However, the Police Liaison Officer has discussed the site with colleagues in the St Neots area and has not objected to the proposal, and it is considered that the shelter will not raise crime risk for the premises. A refusal could not therefore be sustained in relation to possible future antisocial behaviour and the impact this may have on adjacent residents, and any future issues relating to anti-social behaviour would be a matter for the police to manage.

7.6 The appearance of the structure and the concern about the impact it has will have upon the character of the Conservation Area have been discussed above. As have the comments about highway safety.

7.7 The proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy H30 of the Local Plan 1995, Policy B4 of the Interim Planning Policy Statement and H7 of the emerging Development Management DPD.

**Conclusion**

7.8 It is considered the proposed shelter will not impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation area due to its design. The flood related issues have been addressed and the structure due to its design and position should not impact on highway safety. The smoking shelter should not give rise to significant neighbour amenity issues and any future anti-social behaviour problems will be a police matter.

7.9 The proposal therefore accords with Policy Env7 of the East of England Plan, Policies H30, EN5, EN6, EN25 and CS9 of the Local Plan, Policies P10, B1, B8, B4 and T1 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement and CS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Policies E1, E3, H7 and C5 of the Emerging Management DPD, PPS1, PPG13, PPG15 and PPS25. Having regard to applicable National and Local Planning Policies, and having taken all relevant consideration into account, it is recommended that planning permission should be approved in this instance.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.

8. **RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE**, subject to conditions to include the following:

02003 - Time Limit (3yrs)
Nonstand - Colour stain
Nonstand - Chamfered details
Nonstand - Samples of roof materials to be submitted

Background Papers:
Planning Application File Reference: 0901295FUL
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003
Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995
Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration, 2002
Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2009
Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

CONTACT OFFICER:
Enquiries about this report to Linda Morse Development Management Officer 01480 388411
This page is intentionally left blank
Case No: 0901526FUL (FULL PLANNING APPLICATION)  
Proposal: SUBSTITUTION OF HOUSE TYPES FOR EXISTING APPROVED DEVELOPMENT  
Location: LAND AT AND INCLUDING 6 8 AND 8A HIGH STREET  
Applicant: BROOK HENDERSON GROUP LTD  
Grid Ref: 536486 277707  
Date of Registration: 24.11.2009  
Parish: SOMERSHAM

RECOMMENDATION - APPROVE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 This site is located at the eastern end of the village, and is, in part, the site of the former gas works. The majority of these buildings have been cleared, but the superintendent’s house has been retained, restored, and converted to two dwellings. The remainder of the site comprises two vacant detached houses and their gardens. The total site area is approximately 0.20ha.

1.2 The rear part of the application site has been made up and the land is level throughout. The existing houses are of mediocre quality and there are no features of note in their gardens, apart from a small group of mature trees on the western boundary. Boundary treatment in general is mixed, with a variety of fences and planting.

1.3 There is residential development on three sides of the site, the exception being the land to the south, which is in agricultural use. Beyond that is the Cranbrook Drain. There is a wide variety of built forms in the area.

1.4 The proposal is to vary the development approved under reference number 0802035FUL and is for the substitution of a number of approved house types. Six units are the subject of this application, and the change from the previous scheme largely involves the removal of the 2 bed flats and their replacement by three bedroom houses. As a result, there will be a total of 14 on the entire site (including the former manager’s house) compared with 17 in the previous scheme. A copy of the previously approved plan is attached to this report.

1.5 The changes can be summarised as follows:-

Units 1, 2 and 3. No change
Unit 4. Omission of the bridge link resulting in the reduction to a two bed house.
Unit 5. Omission of the bridge link
Units 6, 7, 8 and 9. No change
Units 10 and 11. Omit 2x2 bed flats. Substituted by 1x3 bed house.
Unit 12. No change
Unit 13. As 10 and 11.
Unit 14. Omit 1x1 bed flat. Substituted by 1x2 bed house.

1.6 The basic form of the development has not changed from that approved and will take the form of an open sided square of two storey buildings around a communal garden. A bin and cycle store will be located at one end of the garden. A parking area of 23 spaces will be provided at the rear of the site, and landscaping will be undertaken in various areas and along the boundaries. The finishes will be facing bricks and a mix of tiles and slates.

1.7 The site is within the built up area of Somersham and the land is liable to flood. The road is classified (B1086). The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE

2.1 PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (2005) contains advice on the operation of the plan-led system.

2.2 PPS3 – “Housing” (2006) sets out how the planning system supports the growth of housing completions needed in England.


2.4 PPS25 – Development and Flood Risk (2006) sets out Government policy on development and flood risk. Its aims are to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct development away from areas of highest risk. Where new development is, exceptionally, necessary in such areas, policy aims to make it safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, reducing flood risk overall.

For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. PLANNING POLICIES

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live

• **SS1**: “Achieving Sustainable Development” – the strategy seeks to bring about sustainable development by applying the guiding principles of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 2005 and the elements contributing to the creation of sustainable communities described in Sustainable Communities: Homes for All.

• **ENV7** – Quality in the Built Environment – requires new development to be of a high quality which complements the distinctive character and best qualities of the local area and promotes urban renaissance and regeneration


• None relevant

3.3 Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995) Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at [www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95](http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95)

• **H31**: “Residential privacy and amenity standards” – indicates that new dwellings will only be permitted where appropriate standards of privacy can be maintained and adequate parking provided.

• **H32**: “Sub-division of large curtilages” states that support will be offered only where the resultant dwelling and its curtilage are of a size and form sympathetic to the locality.

• **En5**: “Conservation area character” - development within or directly affecting Conservation Areas will be required to preserve or enhance their character or appearance.

• **En6**: “design standards in conservation areas” – in conservation areas, the District Council will require high standards of design with careful consideration being given to the scale and form of development in the area and to the use of sympathetic materials of appropriate colour and texture.

• **En25**: “General Design Criteria” – indicates that the District Council will expect new development to respect the scale, form, materials and design of established buildings in the locality and make provision for landscaping and amenity areas.

• **CS8**: “water” – satisfactory arrangement for the availability of water supply, sewerage and sewage disposal facilities, surface water runoff facilities and provision for land drainage will be required.

• **CS9**: Flooding. The Council will normally refuse development proposals that prejudice schemes for flood water management.
• R7 Land and Facilities – new residential development of 10 dwellings or more (or 0.4 ha) should normally make provision for children's casual and equipped play space.

• R8 Land and Facilities – consideration will be given to the acceptance of contributions from developers towards improving recreational facilities in the vicinity of the site to off-set the recreational requirements set out in R7.

3.4 Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002) Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan - Then click on "Local Plan Alteration (2002)"

• HL5 – Quality and density of development – sets out the criteria to take into account in assessing whether a proposal represents a good design and layout.

• HL6 – Housing Density – indicates that housing development shall be at a density of 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare.

3.5 Policies from the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning then Planning then Planning Policy and then click on Core Strategy where there is a link to the Adopted Core Strategy.

• CS1: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all development will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered, including design, implementation and function of development.

• CS3: “settlement hierarchy” – Somersham is a key service centre where moderate and minor scale development, and infilling may be appropriate within the built up area. This development is in the "moderate" category being between 10 and 59 units.

3.6 Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

• P10 – Flood Risk

• B1 – Design Quality – development should demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character of the area.

• B2 – Street Scene – development proposals should make a positive contribution to the character of streets and public spaces.

• B4 – Amenity – developments should not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing and future occupiers.
• **B8** – Conservation Areas – states the criteria against which developments within or affecting a conservation area should be assessed.

• **H2** - Housing density. Densities of between 35 and 55 dwellings per hectare would be appropriate in Somersham.

• **H3** – mix of dwelling sizes.

3.7 The SPD Design Guide and the SPG Market Housing Mix are material planning considerations.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 02/01739/FUL - erection of three new dwellings, and the conversion of the Superintendent’s house. Approved 19/08/03.

4.2 04/02760/OUT – erection of eight dwellings. Withdrawn 21/11/05.

4.3 06/01400/FUL - alterations to existing dwelling and erection of five houses. Approved 5/10/06

4.4 07/03130/FUL – erection of 14 dwellings. Refused 20/12/07. The subsequent appeal was dismissed.


5. **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 Somersham Parish Council – Refuse (copy attached)

5.2 Local Highway Authority (CCC) – No objections. Conditions recommended

5.3 Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology – Programme of archaeological work required by condition.

5.4 Environment Agency – No objections subject to conditions.

5.5 HDC Operations – comments as before. A child’s play area should be provided within the site. However, in this instance a commuted offsite contribution would be a more suitable solution. There should be adequate provision on site for bin storage.

6. **REPRESENTATIONS**

6.1 Neighbours – none received

7. **SUMMARY OF ISSUES**

7.1 This proposal is for a variation of the house types approved under the previous extant planning permission, and the considerations of the case should relate primarily to those issues which are relevant to the changes being made.
7.2 The principle of the residential use of this site has been established by the previous grant of planning. The scale of the development (14 units on the whole site) is within the parameters set for development in key service centres, and the density equates to 70 units per hectare. This figure is higher than the range quoted in the HIPPS, although there is no maximum figure given in PPS3. There are no overriding objections to this level of development, subject to other material considerations.

7.3 The dwellings are equally divided between 2 bed and 3 bed units and this mixture complies with the terms of the Market Housing Mix SPG. The number of units on the entire site is below the threshold for affordable housing.

7.4 The proposal does not conflict with policies HL6 and H2.

7.5 The issues to consider are the impact of the amended design on the character of the development and its effect on the appearance of the locality, the impact on neighbours, and the parking provision.

Character

7.6 There are no objections to the demolition of the existing dwellings, as these are of no particular merit, and do not enhance the character of the street scene. There are no features within the site worthy of retention.

7.7 The amended scheme is an improvement over the proposal already approved in that the removal of the arch allows better views into the site and through to the countryside beyond. The change of flats to houses allows for a more cohesive development in terms of its architectural treatment.

7.8 The proposal will enhance the character of both the site and the adjacent Conservation Area. It accords with the provisions of policies ENV7, En6, En25, HL5, B1 and B8.

7.9 Details, such as materials and landscaping, can be controlled by condition.

Neighbour Impact

7.10 There are no changes to the scale or height of the development and therefore no increase in the overshadowing of adjoining properties. Alterations to the fenestration of the buildings are minimal and there will be no increase in overlooking. The change from flats to houses will not increase the impact of the development on neighbours but the fewer number of units on the site may result in a slight decrease in the amount of noise and disturbance generated.

7.11 The proposal complies with policies H31 and B4.

Highway Issues

7.12 23 parking spaces are proposed for the 14 units, equating to 1.6 spaces per unit. This is a slight improvement over the previous provision (1.5 spaces per unit). The concerns of the Parish Council
are noted, but the number of spaces to be provided is consistent with
the requirements of policy T2 and this level of provision has already
been accepted with the previous scheme. A refusal of inadequate
parking grounds could not be substantiated on appeal. There are no
overall highway objections to the development, subject to the
imposition of a number of conditions.

7.13 The proposal complies with policies T1 and T2.

Other Issues

7.14 The Environment Agency has not objected to the proposal in flooding
terms, but has recommended a number of conditions be imposed on
any planning permission. One of these would refer to a contamination
survey, a point also raised by the Environmental Health Officer. The
archaeological requirement can be imposed by condition. Adequate
refuse bin storage is to be provided and the details can again be
required by condition. The applicants entered into a unilateral
agreement in respect of the previous proposal whereby they agreed
to pay a sum of £3,280 as a contribution towards the provision and
maintenance of play areas/public open space in Somersham. The
applicants have confirmed that the same undertaking will also apply
to the revised proposal.

Conclusions

7.15 The proposal is acceptable for the following reasons:
The residential use of this site has already been accepted, and the
development is consistent with the settlement policies for
Somersham.
There are no objections to the demolition of the existing buildings
The design and layout of the proposed development is acceptable
and it will enhance the character of the street scene and the area in
general.
The development will not have a significant impact on the amenities
of the immediate neighbours.
There are no overriding flooding issues.
There are no overriding highway or parking issues.
There are no other material considerations which mitigate against the
proposal.

7.16 Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and
having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is
considered that planning permission should be granted in this
instance.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio
version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate
your needs.

8. **RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE** subject to unilateral undertaking
relating to the payment of the contribution towards play areas/public
open space in Somersham and conditions to include;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02003</td>
<td>Time Limit (3yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05001</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17001</td>
<td>Levels Building/Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06010</td>
<td>Landscape design (delete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06011</td>
<td>Soft landscape (delete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06012</td>
<td>Hard and soft landscape implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06017</td>
<td>Landscape maintenance sched.(insert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03022</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstand</td>
<td>Visibility splays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11003</td>
<td>Investigation archaeology programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04008</td>
<td>Minimum floor level (insert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstand</td>
<td>Flood compensation works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04003</td>
<td>Surface water only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstand</td>
<td>Bin store details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstand</td>
<td>Play equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstand</td>
<td>Pd restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstand</td>
<td>Contamination survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:**
- East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003
- Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995
- Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)
- Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007
- Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009

**CONTACT OFFICER:**
Enquiries about this report to David Hincks Development Management Officer 01480 388406
Case No: 0901161FUL (FULL PLANNING APPLICATION)  
0901162LBC (LISTED BUILDING CONSENT)

Proposal: CHANGE OF USE OF GROUND FLOOR OF SHOP TO HOT FOOD TAKEAWAY (A5 USE CLASS) AND RESTAURANT/CAFE (A3 USE CLASS), AND INSTALLATION OF EXTRACTOR FAN DUCT IN THE FORM OF A MOCK BRICK CLAD CHIMNEY ON THE ROOF OF THE REAR OUTBUILDING.

Location: 4 CHURCH STREET PE7 3RF

Applicant: BROWNS OF STILTON

Grid Ref: 516219  289336

Date of Registration: 02.11.2009

Parish: STILTON

RECOMMENDATION - APPROVAL

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 The application relates to a 3 storey grade II listed building that is situated on the north side of Church Street, close to the junction with North Street/High Street and within the Stilton Conservation Area. The building has been extended to the rear, linking it to an outbuilding on the rear boundary. The ground floor is currently authorised for use as a Shop (A1 use class) and prior to closure traded as a food shop. The first and second floors provide a residential unit, which is currently occupied, reputedly by a tenant and is owned by the Applicant. There is a gated vehicle access along the eastern boundary. Residential properties flank the site.

1.2 The proposal is to change the use of the ground floor shop to a mixed use of Restaurant/Café (A3 use class) and Hot Food Takeaway (A5 use class) along with internal alterations to walls. Amended drawings were received on 30th November 2009 proposing a higher level flue for the kitchen extraction system, that would take the form of a 1m high brick clad false chimney on the roof of the rear outbuilding. A Trip Rate Analysis Report has been submitted. No alterations to the shop front are proposed and no off street parking is proposed.

1.3 The proposed opening hours are:
- Monday to Saturday: 10:30 – 23:00hrs
- Sundays and Bank Holidays: 10:30 – 22:30hrs

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE

2.1 PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (2005) contains advice on the operation of the plan-led system.
2.2 **PPG15 – ‘Planning and the Historic Environment’ (1994)** sets out Government policies for the identification and protection of historic buildings, conservation areas and other elements of the historic environment. It explains the role played by the planning system in their protection.

2.3 **PPG24: “Planning and Noise” (1994)** guides planning authorities on the use of planning powers to minimise the adverse impact of noise.

For full details visit the government website [http://www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk) and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. **PLANNING POLICIES**

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: [http://www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk) then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live.

3.1 **East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)** Policies viewable at [http://www.go-east.gov.uk](http://www.go-east.gov.uk) then follow links to Planning, Regional Planning then Related Documents

- None relevant


- None relevant

3.3 **Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)** Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at [www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95](http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95)

- **E7**: “Small businesses” - will normally be supported subject to environmental and traffic considerations.

- **En2**: “Character and setting of Listed Buildings” – indicates that any development affecting a building of architectural or historic merit will need to have proper regard to the scale, form, design and setting of the building.

- **En3**: “Alternative Uses for Listed Buildings” – will be considered if sympathetic and appropriate to the building where this is the only way to retain its historic or architectural character providing that the alterations do not detract from the character of the building and subject to environmental and traffic considerations.

- **En5**: “Conservation area character” - development within or directly affecting Conservation Areas will be required to preserve or enhance their character or appearance.
• **En6**: “design standards in conservation areas” – in conservation areas, the District Council will require high standards of design with careful consideration being given to the scale and form of development in the area and to the use of sympathetic materials of appropriate colour and texture.

• **En9** – development will not normally be permitted if it would impair important open spaces, trees, street scenes and views in and out of Conservation Areas.

• **En25**: “General Design Criteria” – indicates that the District Council will expect new development to respect the scale, form, materials and design of established buildings in the locality and make provision for landscaping and amenity areas.

• **H30** – consent will not normally be granted for the introduction of commercial uses into residential areas where there would be an adverse impact on residential amenities.

• **S14** – applications for A3 uses will be judged against a number of criteria, including impact on residential amenities, highway safety and whether opening hours can be controlled by condition. (Following changes to the Use Classes Order, a take away use is now classified as an A5 use rather than A3).


- None relevant

3.5 Policies from the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at [http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk](http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk) click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning then click on Planning Policy and then click on Core Strategy where there is a link to the Adopted Core Strategy.

- **CS1**: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all development will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered, including design, implementation and function of development.

3.6 Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 007 are relevant and viewable at [http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk](http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk) click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

- **B1** – Design Quality – development should demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character of the area.

- **B4** – Amenity – developments should not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing and future occupiers.
• **B7** – Listed Buildings – lists the criteria against which development proposals affecting the fabric or setting of a listed building should be assessed.

• **B8** – Conservation Areas – states the criteria against which developments within or affecting a conservation area should be assessed.

• **T1** – Transport Impacts – development proposals should be capable of being served by safe convenient access to the transport network and should not give rise to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the local transport network.

• **T2** – Car and Cycle Parking – development proposals should limit car parking and provide cycle parking facilities to the levels set out in the Council’s parking standards.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 Relevant planning history:

0901162LBC – Installation of extraction fan duct in the form of a mock chimney on the roof of the rear outbuilding and internal alterations, pending consideration.

0300607FUL – Extension and alterations to shop, flat and outbuilding to form shop store and retention of fence, permitted April 2003.

0300585LBC - Extension and alterations to shop, flat and outbuilding to form shop store, consented April 2003.

0000363FUL – Change of use from shop to dwelling, permitted April 2000.

5. **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Stilton Parish Council** – recommend refusal (copy attached)

5.2 **Cambridgeshire County Council Highways** – No objection, based on the Trip Rate Analysis Report it is considered that on street parking is sufficient to cope with the parking demand that would be generated by the proposal. Parking restrictions on the junction are in place via an existing traffic regulation order (i.e. yellow lines).

5.3 **HDC Environmental Health** – No objection, subject to condition to secure detailed design of the extraction system.

6. **REPRESENTATIONS**

6.1 9 letters have been received objecting to the proposal for the following reasons.

- No off-street parking is provided for customers.
- Traffic and parking is already a problem in this part of Stilton, with queues building up around the North Street/Church Street Junction,
and cars parked on both sides of the road, often on the pavements, which will hinder the movement of buses and emergency vehicles.
- Planning permission granted for houses on land to the rear of the site, will only add to the traffic volumes on Church Street.
- The Trip Rate Analysis Report which compares traffic volumes with a similar takeaway in Sawtry is not a fair comparison, because the Sawtry Takeaway is situated within a shopping arcade with off road parking.
- Takeaways are not suited to villages like Stilton and would degrade the character and appearance of the village.
- Will create litter and cooking fumes, which will encourage vermin.
- Will create noise and disturbance particularly at night given the proposed opening hours.
- Will encourage youths to loiter and result in anti-social behaviour, which the Police have been called to deal with.
- Stilton already has 3 Public Houses/Restaurants, a members club and an Indian Takeaway and to allow another, would have a detrimental impact on already struggling businesses.
- It is appalling that a listed building should be considered for use as a takeaway.
- Increase fire risk.
- Will devalue nearby properties, making them difficult to sell.
- Double yellow lines should be placed along South side of Church Street from the High Street to Church Close to stop double parking.

7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

7.1 The main issues to consider are the principle of the proposed change of use, whether the proposal would preserve (leave unharmed) the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, whether the proposal would adversely affect the fabric and character of the listed building and its setting, whether the proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties, and whether the proposal would be detrimental to highway safety.

Principle

7.2 This is an existing commercial/retail building that is located with the built up area of the village and close to existing residential properties, and commercial/retail uses. In this regard, the proposed change of use is acceptable in principle in accordance with policies E7 and S14 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, subject to other material planning considerations.

Impact on the Conservation Area and Street Scene

7.3 The proposed brick clad false chimney on the roof ridge of the rear outbuilding to provide a high level extraction flue would be tucked well back within the site and screened in longer distance views by the surrounding buildings. The proposed external changes and use would not be detrimental to the street scene and would preserve the character and appearance of the Stilton Conservation Area in accordance with policies En5, En6 and En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 and policies B1 and B8 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning policy Statement 2007. A sample of the brick would be secured by condition.
Impact on the fabric and character of the listed building

7.4 The current internal layout of the ground floor of the building was derived from the alterations and extensions that were permitted in 2003. The proposed internal alterations, consisting of the erection and removal of a number of walls, would not significantly harm the historic fabric of this listed building or its setting, and neither would the erection of the brick clad false chimney extraction flue on the roof ridge of the listed outbuilding. In comparison to the existing use, the proposal would not detract from the character of this listed building. As such the proposal would be consistent with policies En2 and En3 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 and policy B7 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007.

Neighbour amenities

7.5 The main sources of noise/disturbance would emanate from customers visiting the proposed site, such as the movement of vehicles, opening/closing of vehicle doors, and the general movement of pedestrians. While these sources would be similar to the existing use, the main difference is the proposed opening hours, which are longer in duration and extend into the night.

7.6 The stated opening hours of the proposed use are not considered excessive, and broadly follow the guidance contained in PPG24 “Planning & Noise”, which states that noise sensitive development should not normally be permitted where high levels of noise will continue throughout the night, especially during the hours when people are normally sleeping, i.e. 23:00 to 07:00hrs.

7.7 Although it is difficult to estimate the likely number of customers who would visit the site, it is reasonable to conclude that demand would be relatively localised, given the presence of existing food outlets in the nearby villages of Sawtry and Yaxley, and that demand would peak at main meal times rather than continue strongly late into the night. The site is flanked by residential properties, but it is also close to the centre of the village and within relatively close proximity to established commercial premises, where a higher level of noise and disturbance would be expected in comparison to a solely residential area. There is no reason why the site would be used as a meeting place to congregate given that it fronts the pavement, and the outside space is gated off from the public. The impact of noise and disturbance on the amenities of the occupiers of the residential unit on the upper floors of the building would not be unacceptable in comparison to the existing use.

7.8 The exact specification of the proposed kitchen ventilation/extraction system has not be provided, however the Environmental Health Team are satisfied that a mechanical extraction system with the proposed high level extraction flue, can be designed so as to prevent noise and cooking odours from having a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties. There is sufficient space within the curtilage of the property for the storage of refuse/waste.

7.9 Overall, it is considered that the proposed use would be compatible with the surrounding uses within this location. Providing that the stated opening hours and the detailed design of the mechanical
extraction system are secured by condition, it is considered that the proposal would not be unduly detrimental to neighbour amenities in accordance with policies E7, S14 and H30 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 and policy B4 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007.

Highway safety

7.10 The submitted Trip Rate Analysis Report uses two methods of analysis in the form of the TRICS database and a manual survey of a similar use in the nearby village of Sawtry. It shows that demand for on street parking will equate to approx. 2 parking spaces at any one time and will be evenly spread throughout the day and for a relatively short duration of time (approx. 4-8 minutes) as customers collect their food. No parking will be provided on site.

7.11 While concerns have been raised over the impact of the proposal on highway safety, there is no objection to the proposal from the County Council Highways Officer, owing to the fact that the conclusions of the Trip Rate Analysis are reasonable and the existing use would have generated a certain level of parking demand during its opening hours. Parking restrictions are already in place around the highway junction in the form of double yellow lines, and any shortfall in parking outside the site could be catered for on North Street/High Street.

7.12 For these reasons, it is considered that the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety and it would accord with policies E7 and S14 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 and policies T1 and T2 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007.

Other issues

7.13 The Parish Council's concern regarding Building Regulations, type of fuel to be used in the fryers, details of an electrical isolator box, fire exits and lighting are not material planning considerations and can be addressed through Building Regulations. English Heritage is not a statutory consultee in respect of this application.

7.14 The concerns of the objectors and Parish Council regarding car parking, highway safety, noise/disturbance and impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and on the Listed Building are addressed above. The need for additional double yellow lines along Church Street, is a matter for CCC highways.

7.15 The impact of the proposal on similar existing uses are noted but it is not the function of the planning system to inhibit competition amongst retailers or among methods of retailing nor to preserve existing commercial interests as such.

7.16 Concern regarding litter is noted, but mitigation measures could not reasonably be secured through planning legislation. Public bins are provided within the locality and arrangements could be put in place for the disposal of public waste.

7.17 Concerns that the proposal will devalue nearby properties, rendering them difficult to sell are not material planning considerations.
Reasons for approval

7.18 The proposed development is considered to be compliant with relevant national and local planning policy as it:

- is acceptable in principle in accordance with policies E7 and S14 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, subject to other material planning considerations.

- would not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and it would preserve the character and appearance of the Stilton Conservation Area in accordance with policies En5, En6 and En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 and policies B1 and B8 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning policy Statement 2007.

- would not significantly harm the historic fabric or the character of the listed building in accordance with policies En2 and En3 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 and policy B7 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007.


- would not be detrimental to highway safety and it would accord with policies E7 and S14 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 and policies T1 and T2 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.

8. **RECOMMENDATION – PLANNING APPLICATION APPROVE**, subject to the following conditions.

02003 Time Limit (3yrs)
Nonstand Hours of use
Nonstand Extraction
Nonstand Materials of Chimney

**RECOMMENDATION – LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPROVE**, subject to the following conditions.

12004 Listed building (3yrs)
Nonstand Internal works
Nonstand Chimney materials
BACKGROUND PAPERS:
East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003
Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995
Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)
Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007
Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009

CONTACT OFFICER:
Enquiries about this report to Mr Gavin Sylvester Assistant Development Management Officer 01480 387070
Case No: 0901578FUL (FULL PLANNING APPLICATION)
Proposal: EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO SUB-DIVIDE LIGHT INDUSTRIAL UNIT 5. ERECTION OF NEW OFFICE UNIT AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ACCESS
Location: LAND AT BLACKWELL FARM STATION ROAD
Applicant: C AND K WATSON
Grid Ref: 508835 270686
Date of Registration: 23.12.2009
Parish: TILBROOK

RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 The site relates to the existing Blackwell Farm Industrial estate, located on the east of the B660, between Catworth and Tilbrook in the open countryside. The site is landscaped to the highway and the boundary to the north is defined by a wire fence and additional tree planting. To the rear of the site lies a poultry farm and associated buildings. There are a number of single storey buildings on the site, no formal parking arrangement existing and there is one access point into the site, which can be gated.

1.2 The proposal seeks the following:

- External alterations to sub-divide light industrial unit 5 into 3 smaller units approximately 112.5 m sq (4a), 73 m sq (4b) and 73.75 m sq (5). External alterations to include erection of three lean to canopies to the south elevation, single and double door and single window to unit 4b and single and double door to unit 5. Two new fire exits are also proposed to units 4a and 4b.

- Erection of new office unit, with an approximate floor area of 345m sq split into 4 units. Approximately 6 metres in height at the highest point, including two front projections and timber clad. The building measures approximately 17.365 metres in depth at the furthest point and has an approximate overall width of 31.705 metres

- Construction of new access to the northern corner of the site to allow a one-way system to operate on the site and includes the addition of new gates to the access point
2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE


2.2 PPS4: “Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth” (2009) sets out the Government's comprehensive policy framework for planning for sustainable economic development in urban and rural areas.

2.3 PPS7: “Sustainable Development in Rural Areas” (2004) sets out the Government’s planning policies for rural areas, including country towns and villages and the wider, largely undeveloped countryside up to the fringes of larger urban areas.


For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. PLANNING POLICIES

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live

3.1 East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)

Policies viewable at http://www.go-east.gov.uk then follow links to Planning, Regional Planning then Related Documents

- SS1: “Achieving Sustainable Development” – the strategy seeks to bring about sustainable development by applying: the guiding principles of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 2005 and the elements contributing to the creation of sustainable communities described in Sustainable Communities: Homes for All.


- ENV7: “Quality in the Built Environment” - requires new development to be of high quality which complements the distinctive character and best qualities of the local area and promotes urban renaissance and regeneration.
3.2 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003)

Saved policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 are relevant and viewable at http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk follow the links to environment, planning, planning policy and Structure Plan 2003.

• None relevant

3.3 Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)

Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

• E1: “Economic and Employment Growth” – will be promoted, commensurate with the planned residential and population growth and the Council’s aims to provide a range of employment opportunities and reduce commuting.

• E7: “Small Businesses” will normally be supported subject to environmental and traffic considerations.

• E13: “Industry, Warehousing or high technology and office developments” – will not be permitted where it would cause serious traffic noise or pollution problems or other damage to the environment.

• En17: "Development in the Countryside" - development in the countryside is restricted to that which is essential to the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, permitted mineral extraction, outdoor recreation or public utility services.

• En18: “Protection of countryside features” – Offers protection for important site features including trees, woodlands, hedges and meadowland.

• En20: Landscaping Scheme. - Wherever appropriate a development will be subject to the conditions requiring the execution of a landscaping scheme.

• En25: "General Design Criteria" - indicates that the District Council will expect new development to respect the scale, form, materials and design of established buildings in the locality and make adequate provision for landscaping and amenity areas.

3.4 Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)

Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan - Then click on "Local Plan Alteration (2002)

• None relevant
3.5 Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2009

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning and then click on Planning Policy where there is a link to the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

- **CS1**: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all developments will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered including design, implementation and function of development.

3.6 Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

- **P8** – Development in the Countryside – Outside the existing built framework of the Smaller Settlements development will be restricted to: that which is essential to the efficient operation of agriculture, horticulture or forestry, or required for the purposes of outdoor recreation; the alteration, replacement or change of use of existing buildings in accordance with other policies; limited and specific forms of housing, business and tourism development, as provided for within the Local Development Framework; or land allocated for particular purposes.

- **G2** – Landscape Character - development proposals should respect and respond appropriately to the distinctive qualities of the surrounding landscape

- **G3** – Trees, hedgerows and Other Environmental Features - development proposals should minimise risk of harm to trees, hedgerows or other environmental features of visual, historic or nature conservation value.

- **B1** – Design Quality - developments should demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character of the area.

- **B3** – Accessibility, Adaptability and Security – the location and design of new development should enable ease of access, have convenient and appropriate facilities and minimise the extent to which users feel at risk of crime.

- **B4** – Amenity - developments should not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity of existing or future occupiers.

- **E1** – States proposals for office developments (of less than 500m2 gross floorspace, or a site area of less than 0.5ha) will be allowed within the defined limits of the Market Towns and
Key Centres (Potential and Limited Growth), and within the existing built-up framework of Smaller Settlements.

- **T1** – Transport Impacts - development proposals should be capable of being served by safe convenient access to the transport network and should not give rise to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the local transport network.

- **T2** – Car and Cycle Parking - development proposals should limit car parking and provide cycle parking facilities to the levels set out in the Council’s parking standards.

3.7 **Policies from the Development Management DPD: Proposed Submission 2010**

- **C1**: “Sustainable Design” – development proposals should take account of the predicted impact of climate change over the expected lifetime of the development.

- **E1**: “Development Context” – development proposals shall demonstrate consideration of the character and appearance of the surrounding environment and the potential impact of the proposal.

- **E4**: “Biodiversity and Protected Habitats and Species” – development proposals should not harm or cause adverse impact on statutorily designated areas and non-statutory designated areas such as CWS. They should prevent harm to protected habitats and species, including direct and indirect impacts.

- **E5**: “Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows” – proposals shall avoid the loss of, and minimise the risk of, harm to trees, woodland or hedgerows of visual, historic or nature conservation value and these should be incorporated effectively within the landscape elements of the scheme wherever possible.

- **E8**: “Sustainable Travel” – proposals must demonstrate how the scheme maximises opportunities for the use of sustainable travel modes, particularly walking, cycling and public transport.

- **E10**: “Parking Provision” – car and cycle parking should accord with the levels and layout requirements set out in Appendix 1 ‘Parking Provision’. Adequate vehicle and cycle parking facilities shall be provided to serve the needs of the development.

- **H7**: “Amenity” – development proposals should safeguard the living conditions for residents and people occupying adjoining or nearby properties.

- **P2**: “Small Businesses” - Proposals for minor development of industrial or warehouse uses (All ‘B’ uses other than B1a) will be considered favourably, subject to environmental and travel considerations, where:
  - the site is within the built-up area of a Market Town, Key Service Centre, or Smaller Settlement, an identified
Established Commercial Area or a site specifically allocated for that type of use; or
- the proposal is for the expansion of an established business within its existing site; or
- the proposal is for the conversion or redevelopment of suitable existing buildings in the countryside in accordance with Policy P 8 Rural Buildings.
- Proposals for minor office development involving less than 1000m² floorspace or 1ha of land should be located in accordance with Policy P 4 Town Centre Uses and Retail Designations.

- P7: “Development in the Countryside” – development in the countryside is restricted to those listed within criteria.

3.8 Huntingdonshire Design Guide - Section 5 (2007)
3.9 Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment (2007)
3.10 SPG External lighting

4. PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 0703358FUL – alterations including sub-division of industrial unit (B1) – permission granted (unit 5A).

4.2 0212677FUL – alterations and rebuilding of wall following demolition of extension – permission granted (unit 5B).

4.3 9600072FUL – extension and alterations to provide toilet facilities and office space - permission granted (unit 2A).

4.4 9000083FUL – conversion of loft storage space to offices – permission granted (unit 1).

4.5 8900324REM – refurbishment of light industrial units – approved.

4.6 8800165FUL – change of use of outbuildings to light industrial units – permission granted.

5. CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Tillbrook Parish Council – recommend APPROVAL (copy attached).

5.2 Highway Authority – NO OBJECTIONS to the proposal, following comments are made:

- Unit 5 already exists along with the usage associated with it and therefore already acceptable, unit 6 will increase the amount of vehicles likely to visit the site but the majority will be standard saloon vehicles;
- The access as it stands at the moment is below the standard that would be expected for heavy vehicle usage and should two vehicles meet entering / exiting the site would result in manoeuvring conflict and possible delay / waiting on the public highway;
• The proposed one-way system therefore represents a benefit with regards to the standardisation of the access with the removal of the possible conflict and as such is acceptable;
• Should check that parking is in accordance with LPA’s policies;
• Amended plan required including both accesses width radii changes; and,
• Details should be provided on how the one way system shall be enforced.

6. REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 None received

7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

The main issues to consider are:

1. The principle
2. Design
3. Impact on the character and appearance of the rural landscape and existing landscape features
4. Amenity
5. Highway safety and parking

7.1 There are three aspects to this planning application and each shall be considered separately.
• New office building
• Alterations to building 5
• New access route

Principle of development

New Office building

7.2 The site lies in the open countryside and is an established industrial estate, although not within an existing industrial estate identified on the proposals map. This proposal seeks a new building for 4 offices and equates to a total floor area of 345 m2. Planning policy indicates that a new office building under 500m sq will be allowed within the defined limits of the Market Towns and Key Centres (Potential & Limited Growth), and within the existing built-up framework of Smaller Settlements. This site does not fall within these criteria being in a rural location and as such the principle of the development is not acceptable. It would not result in a sustainable form of development, but development in the countryside.

Alterations to building 5

7.3 There are no in principle objections to the alterations to the existing building No. 5, this is subject to the alterations proposed being of a suitable scale and design. This is an existing building in the countryside and the alterations are only external, there are no extensions proposed.
Design

New Office Building

7.4 The proposed building measures 6 metres in height to the ridge and 8.5 metres to the finial detail. Two gable projections are proposed to the front of the building, at approximately 5 metres in height. The building shall be timber clad.

7.5 The building does not represent a high quality design, appearing squat with disproportionately wide front projections to the building. The addition of the finial detail does little to enhance the appearance of the building, appearing as a prominent addition to the roof. The existing buildings on the site are of simple functional appearance; the design of this proposal seems overly fussy and results in a building greater in height than those existing, which measure approximately 5.8 metres in height.

Alterations to building 5

7.6 The alterations to the existing building, no. 5, to facilitate its subdivision are acceptable and in keeping with the existing building.

Impact on the character and appearance of the rural landscape and existing landscape features

New building

7.7 The proposed building shall be sited between the built form of the poultry sheds, to the rear of the application site and the existing industrial buildings on the site. The building is slightly greater in height than the existing buildings on site (not including the finial detail).

7.8 The siting of the building brings the built form closer to the boundary to the north. This side elevation is approximately 17.36 metres in depth and includes 6 double windows. Views of this building would be gained from public viewpoints, particularly when the existing trees are not in leaf and if these trees were to be removed and replaced with new planting. The Design Guide indicates that ‘in locating buildings and roads, existing trees and hedges should be retained wherever possible…they can help to settle the development into its surroundings…provide screening for new structures and offer valuable habitats for local wildlife’.

7.9 Based on the information submitted including the lack of clarity in terms of whether the trees can be retained (discussed below) the building would be intrusive in this rural landscape, given the size and siting of the building closer to the northern boundary, the finial detail proposed (forming a prominent addition) and potential removal of the existing landscaping on the northern boundary.

Alterations to building 5

7.10 The alterations to the proposed subdivided units are not considered to harm the character of the area. The main alterations to the elevation face into the site, with the exception of the new fire doors to
the north elevation and the alteration to include a lean to canopy area replicates that already on the building.

Access and associated route

7.11 The provision of the second access to the site, adjacent the northern boundary would result in the loss of a section of the frontage hedgerow and also an area of land at the north western corner of the site, which could be used for the replanting of some of the smaller, newer trees at the eastern end of the site. The new access road also puts further pressure on the existing, important, line of trees on the northern boundary and at present it appears that some materials are stored up to the trunk of these trees.

7.12 It is considered that the line of trees on the northern boundary should be retained and enhanced by additional planting. This would reinforce this existing tree belt, which is visually important in this landscape.

7.13 The applicant has indicated that ‘should removal of the trees be an issue they can be retained, the proposed access way being on the edge of the root zone’. However, this has not been verified through the submission of the application and associated Arboricultural documents. The applicant has therefore failed to demonstrate that this may be successfully achieved and the trees retained.

7.14 In addition, whilst a landscape plan and Arboricultural Implications Assessment has been submitted it is not explicitly clear in terms of where some of the existing trees are to be relocated should the application be approved and the full details of new planting.

7.15 The submitted details do not adequately detail the applicant’s intentions in terms of landscaping to be retained or landscaping to be planted.

7.16 It is considered that the proposed alterations would result in the development becoming more intrusive in this rural landscape. Whilst mitigation measures are proposed in the form of additional landscaping, these are not sufficient in comparison to the arrangement which currently exists. The current planting provides effective screening to the site, when the trees are in leaf. The application, whilst indicating that the existing boundary could be retained, has not successfully demonstrated that this can be achieved.

Amenity

7.17 There are a few residential dwellings to the south of the site beyond the existing industrial buildings. The addition of a new building, alterations to existing buildings and new access are not considered to have any undue harm on residential amenity, by reason of overshadowing or through noise and disturbance of the new building and associated vehicle movements.
Highways

7.18 The Highway Authority has not raised any objections to the proposed new access. The existing access is substandard for heavy vehicle usage, should two vehicles meet, and this may result in manoeuvring conflict and possible delay or waiting on the highway. The proposed one way system standardizes the access and may remove this potential conflict.

7.19 Whilst no objections have been raised, additional information would be required by the Highway Authority if the application were to be recommended for approval, in terms of detailed dimensions for the access width radii changes on a new plan, as well as details of how the one way system would be enforced, for instance unidirectional flaps or other direction control measures. This may then necessitate subsequent conditions to be imposed.

Parking

7.20 The present parking situation on site is very informal and there does not appear to be any marked out bays; however at the time of the site visit there did not appear to be any issues with parking on site. This application seeks the provision of 11 new spaces. In excess of 32 spaces were shown in application 8900324REM (see green paper) although not adhered to on site.

7.21 The maximum parking standards require 1 car parking space per 30m sq for a B1 Use and 1 cycle space per 100m sq. The provision of 11 spaces is therefore in accordance with the maximum parking standards. However, no cycle parking details have been provided, therefore if the application is approved a condition should be imposed requiring cycle parking details to be provided.

Conclusion

7.22 In conclusion the proposal is not acceptable. There is an in principle objection to the building of new offices in this countryside location, as this would not result in a sustainable form of development. Elements of the development would be prominent in this rural landscape, compared to the existing buildings due to the design and siting. The applicant has failed to successfully demonstrate that the development would not harm the existing landscape features or that appropriate mitigation measures could overcome this harm and associated harm to the local landscape character. The development is not considered to have any undue harm on residential amenity. The Highway Authority has not objected to the application; however it has requested additional information. Whilst the proposed alterations may standardise the vehicular access and result in an improved arrangement to the site, this does not justify setting aside the other concerns raised with the application. The application is deemed contrary to PPS1, PPS4, PPS7, PPG13, policies SS1 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan, policies En17, En18 and En25 of the Local Plan, policy CS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy, draft policies E1, E5, P2 and P7 of the Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010, the Huntingdonshire Design Guide and the Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment.
7.23 It is therefore recommended that the application is refused for the reasons outlined.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.

8. RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE for the following reason:

8.1 There is an in principle objection to the building of new offices in this countryside location, as this would not result in a sustainable form of development. The new building and access would be prominent in this rural landscape, compared to the existing buildings due to the design and siting. The applicant has failed to successfully demonstrate that the development would not harm the existing landscape features or that appropriate mitigation measures could overcome this harm and associated harm to the local landscape character. The application is deemed contrary to PPS1, PPS4, PPS7, PPG13, Policies SS1 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan, policies En17, En18 and En25 of the Local Plan, Policy CS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy, draft policies E1, E5, P2 and P7 of the Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010, the Huntingdonshire Design Guide and the Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment.

Background Papers:

Planning Application File Reference: 0901578FUL
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003
Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995
Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration, 2002
Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2009
Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

CONTACT OFFICER:
Enquiries about this report to Michelle Nash Development Management Officer 01480 388405
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RECOMMENDATION - APPROVE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 This site is in open countryside, approximately 1.5km south of the village, on the main A141 road between Huntingdon and March. It was formerly a petrol filling station, but is now occupied by a car sales business and car washing. The filling station canopy is still in place. The rear boundaries are screened by a series of fences and hedges, but the front of the site is open. There are dwellings to the north east and north west of the site, and a single dwelling on the opposite side of the road. Development is generally of a low density, although there is a warehouse and distribution centre to the north west, on the other side of the B1040.

1.2 The proposal is for a car wash bay, workshops to be used for MOT testing station, new pitched roof incorporating first floor storage, cladding and rear extension to office. Repositioning of existing container.

1.3 Hours of opening for the existing car sales and car wash would be Monday to Saturday 9am to 6pm and Sunday 10am to 5pm.

1.4 MOT testing would be Monday to Friday 9am to 6pm, Saturday 9am to 1pm and closed on Sunday.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE

2.1 PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (2005) contains advice on the operation of the plan-led system.

2.2 PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Growth (2009) contains advice on the role of the planning system in relation to industrial and commercial development.
2.3 PPS7 – Sustainable development in rural areas (2004). Sets out the Government’s planning policies for rural areas, including country towns and villages and the wider, largely undeveloped countryside up to the fringes of larger urban areas.

For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. PLANNING POLICIES

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live.


- None relevant


- None relevant

3.3 Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995) Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

- En17 “Development in the countryside” – development in the countryside will be restricted to that which is essential to the efficient operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, permitted mineral extraction, outdoor recreation or public utility services.

- E7: “Small businesses” - will normally be supported subject to environmental and traffic considerations.

- E10: “Re-use of buildings in rural areas” – will normally be allowed to create employment subject to: buildings being of a bulk, form, general design in keeping with its surroundings, of substantial construction requiring no major adaptation or addition for employment purposes; no overriding objection on traffic or environmental grounds.

- E11 “Expansion of existing firms” – will normally be allowed providing the scale and location of the development does not conflict with other Local Plan policies.

- En25: “General Design Criteria” – indicates that the District Council will expect new development to respect the scale, form,
materials and design of established buildings in the locality and make provision for landscaping and amenity areas.

3.4 Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002) Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at [www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan) - Then click on "Local Plan Alteration (2002)

- None relevant

3.5 Policies from the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at [http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk](http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk) click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning and then click on Planning Policy where there is a link to the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

- **CS1**: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all development will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered, including design, implementation and function of development.

3.6 Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at [http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk](http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk) click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

- **P8** – Development in the Countryside – Outside the existing built framework of the Smaller Settlements development will be restricted to: that which is essential to the efficient operation of agriculture, horticulture or forestry, or required for the purposes of outdoor recreation; the alteration, replacement or change of use of existing buildings in accordance with other policies; limited and specific forms of housing, business and tourism development, as provided for within the Local Development Framework; or land allocated for particular purposes.

- **B6** – Re-use and Redevelopment of Buildings in the Countryside – subject to certain criteria, a proposal to re-use or redevelop an existing building in the countryside for economic purposes will be preferable to the re-use of an existing building for residential purposes.

- **B1** – Design Quality - developments should demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character of the area.

- **B4** – Amenity - developments should not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity of existing or future occupiers.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 Most recent

0102290FUL. Change of use to car sales. Approved (11/12/2001)
0800193FUL. Change of use of part of site to hand car wash. Approved (12/03/2008)
0802646FUL Erection of an additional workshop, extension to the office. Approved (11.11.2008) (copy green paper attached).
0901376 – Erection of additional workshop and covered car wash bay, altered roof to previously approved workshop and extended office – Withdrawn.

5. CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Warboys Parish Council – Recommends approval subject to conditions. (Copy enclosed)

5.2 Environmental Agency – No objections - guidance notes.

5.3 CCC Transport – No objections

6. REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 Two third party representations – concerns regarding overlooking, possible noise, and pollution, drainage, signage, position of container, times of opening.

7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

7.1 The main issues to consider are the principle of the development, the impact on the neighbouring properties and character of the countryside and the design.

Principle of development and the impact on the character of the countryside

7.2 The workshop, internal car wash and the approved workshop and office would not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the locality. Although in the open countryside within which policies seek to limit development, support is given to the expansion of small businesses in other policies. Work on the approved development, and this proposal commenced some time ago but has now been suspended pending the outcome of the application.

7.3 The design and materials of the proposal are intended to give the structures a barn-like appearance, and there are no objections to this overall approach. It is considered that it would be an improvement to the site.

7.4 There are mature hedges between the site and the properties to the rear and hedging and fencing between the site and the property to the north east.

Impact on neighbouring properties

7.5 There have been problems regarding the outdoor car wash and the spray and the internal car wash is to mitigate any further problems for the occupier of the adjacent dwelling. There would be no work or vehicular access to the rear of the building. There is a small window on the rear of the first floor storage area but given the boundary planting and distance to the neighbouring property, there would be no
significant loss of privacy. It is considered that the hours of opening are acceptable. The storage container to the rear is used for storage and is screened by small trees on the north east boundary.

Conclusion

7.6 The proposed development is considered to be compliant with relevant national and local planning policy as it:

* Would have no significant impact on the character of the open countryside.
* Would have no significant adverse impact on the neighbouring properties.

7.7 Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies and having taken all relevant material consideration into account, it is therefore recommended that planning permission should be granted.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.

8. RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE, subject to conditions to include the following:

Nonstand  Rear wall to be installed to car wash
Nonstand  Hours of opening
Nonstand  Noise levels
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Case No: 0901485FUL (FULL PLANNING APPLICATION)

Proposal: ERECTION OF 4 APARTMENTS WITH ASSOCIATED WORKS INCLUDING ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS AND HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING

Location: 21 HIGH STREET

Applicant: AWJ USHER AND SONS

Grid Ref: 519066  267442

Date of Registration: 13.11.2009

Parish: BUCKDEN

RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 The site once comprised a two-storey cottage with a smaller rear wing having its front elevation abutting the back edge of the pavement. The site is now cleared following the demolition of the cottage by reason of it being deemed a dangerous structure. The site lies on the western side of High Street, immediately north of the A1 roundabout and south of the pedestrian underpass and backs onto the A1(T) a strategic transport highway. The site is very exposed having three sides to view in a prominent location at the entrance to the village. The site lies within the Buckden Conservation Area.

1.2 The proposal is for the erection of four one-bedroom flats with associated parking and landscaping. The initial proposals included an application for demolition within a Conservation Area but subsequently it has proven that the building was in a dangerous condition and with the agreement of the Building Control Manager it has now been demolished.

1.3 A 2 metre high (approximately) acoustic fence has already been erected to the west and south of the site adjacent to the A1 (T). The former building did make an attractive, positive contribution to the Conservation Area with a design of a double fronted two storey scale cottage having its ridge parallel to High Street and having a lower rear wing again with a parallel ridge creating a valley between the two elements.
2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE


2.2 PPS3: “Housing” (2006) sets out how the planning system supports the growth in housing completions needed in England.


2.4 PPG15: “Planning and the Historic Environment” (1994) sets out Government policies for the identification and protection of historic buildings, conservation areas, and other elements of the historic environment. It explains the role played by the planning system in their protection.

2.5 PPG24: “Planning & Noise” (1994) guides planning authorities on the use of planning powers to minimise the adverse impact of noise.

For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. PLANNING POLICIES

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live

3.1 East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)

Policies viewable at http://www.go-east.gov.uk then follow links to Planning, Regional Planning then Related Documents

- ENV7: “Quality in the Built Environment” - requires new development to be of high quality which complements the distinctive character and best qualities of the local area and promotes urban renaissance and regeneration.

3.2 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003)

Saved policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 are relevant and viewable at http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk follow the links to environment, planning, planning policy and Structure Plan 2003.

- None
3.3 Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)

Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

- **H31**: "Residential privacy and amenity standards" – Indicates that new dwellings will only be permitted where appropriate standards of privacy can be maintained and adequate parking provided.

- **H32**: "Sub-division of large curtilages" states support will be offered only where the resultant dwelling and its curtilage are of a size and form sympathetic to the locality.

- **H33**: "Sub-division of large curtilages affecting protected buildings or features" states the subdivision of curtilages will not be supported where development will adversely affect the qualities of a Conservation Area or affect trees worthy of protection.

- **H37**: "Environmental Pollution" – housing development will not be permitted in locations where there is a known source of environmental pollution which would be detrimental to residential amenity.

- **H38**: "Noise Pollution" – development sites adjoining main highways, railways, industrial operations and other potentially damaging noise pollution sources will be required to adopt adequate design solutions to create acceptable ambient noise levels within the dwellings and their curtilage.

- **En5**: "Conservation Area Character" - development within or directly affecting conservation areas will be required to preserve or enhance their character and appearance.

- **En6**: "Design standards in Conservation Areas" – in conservation areas, the District Council will require high standards of design with careful consideration being given to the scale and form of development in the area and to the use of sympathetic materials of appropriate colour and texture.

- **En9**: "Conservation Areas" - development should not impair open spaces, trees, street scenes and views into and out of Conservation Areas.

- **En18**: "Protection of countryside features" – Offers protection for important site features including trees, woodlands, hedges and meadowland.

- **En20**: “Lanscaping Scheme”. - Wherever appropriate a development will be subject to the conditions requiring the execution of a landscaping scheme.

- **En25**: "General Design Criteria" - indicates that the District Council will expect new development to respect the scale, form,
materials and design of established buildings in the locality and make adequate provision for landscaping and amenity areas.

3.4 Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)

Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan - Then click on “Local Plan Alteration (2002)

- **HL5**: “Quality and Density of Development” - sets out the criteria to take into account in assessing whether a proposal represents a good design and layout.

3.5 Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2009

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning and then click on Planning Policy where there is a link to the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

- **CS1**: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all developments will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered including design, implementation and function of development e.g., by making best use of land, buildings and existing infrastructure.

- **CS3**: “The Settlement Hierarchy” – Identifies Buckden as a ‘Key Service Centre’ in which development schemes of moderate and minor scale and infilling may be appropriate within the built up area.

3.6 Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

- **G3**: “Trees, hedgerows and Other Environmental Features” - development proposals should minimise risk of harm to trees, hedgerows or other environmental features of visual, historic or nature conservation value.

- **B1**: “Design Quality” - developments should demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character of the area.

- **B4**: “Amenity” - developments should not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity of existing or future occupiers.

- **B8**: “Conservation Areas” - states the criteria against which developments within or affecting a Conservation Area should be assessed.
• **H2**: “Housing density” – lists the minimum density standard housing developments should achieve. Within Key Centres 35-55 dwellings per hectare.

• **T1**: “Transport Impacts” - development proposals should be capable of being served by safe convenient access to the transport network and should not give rise to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the local transport network.

• **T2**: “Car and Cycle Parking” - development proposals should limit car parking and provide cycle parking facilities to the levels set out in the Council’s parking standards.

3.7 **SPD – Huntingdonshire Design Guide 2007 Parts 3 & 4** on housing sites, house design and detailing.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 0802818FUL & 0803317CAC – permission refused for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of four flats due to the design, layout, form, bulk and detailing of the scheme within the Conservation Area; noise exposure category D unsuitable for residential.

4.2 0900743FUL & 0900744CAC – permission refused following consideration by the Panel on 12th October 2009 (copy attached) for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of four flats due to design, layout, form, bulk and detailing.

4.3 During the course of the application a structural inspection report undertaken. This report concluded that the building was unsafe and uneconomic to repair and was a dangerous structure with its collapse likely to endanger public safety. The Building Control Manager concurred with the conclusion and as a consequence agreed to demolition as a dangerous structure. The building was demolished on 11th January 2010. Given this circumstance the concurrent application for demolition in a Conservation Area 0901486CAC is no longer necessary.

5. **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Buckden Parish Council - APPROVE** (copy attached).

5.2 **HDC Environmental Health Consultation – NO OBJECTION** as long as the mitigation recommendations contained in the noise report - acoustic double glazing and ventilation for habitable rooms and open plan kitchens - are implemented. The air quality is not good but there are no meaningful recommendations that can be made to mitigate and which can be justified.

5.3 **CCC Highways Consultation – NO OBJECTION** subject to conditions requiring the existing access to be permanently closed; no gates without prior approval; provision of visibility splays prior to first occupation and maintenance thereof; provision of turning and parking space.
5.4 CCC Archaeologist – the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation and recommend work undertaken at the expense of the developer. This can be secured through the use of a condition.

5.5 Highways Agency – directs conditions to be attached to any planning permission which may be granted, i.e. the new access to be made operational before construction begins and a demolition method statement and access provision before occupation (this clearly is no longer necessary).

6. REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 TWO representations received:

- would wish for an approved scheme before building is demolished; access onto a blind bend and is dangerous; restoration is more appropriate.

- the existing house makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

7.1 This land is ‘previously developed’ within the meaning of PPS3 and, notwithstanding the recent demolition of the former cottage, can be considered to be within the built up area. Thus its more efficient use for residential purposes would be supported by some of the provisions of this guidance and by a number of policies referred to above. However, although Government advice encourages the best use of land by re-using previously developed land this should not be to the detriment of other planning issues, which in this case are the design and impact of the proposal in relation to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; highways issues; noise, air quality; refuse; landscaping; and impact of the development on the neighbouring properties.

7.2 Due to the exposed and prominent location at the entrance to the village it is imperative that any development on the site must be of high quality. Regard must also be taken of the character of the locality and the need to preserve and enhance the character of the street scene, the Conservation Area and also to maintain views in and views out of that Conservation Area.

Design

7.3 The proposal seeks to replace the recently demolished cottage and replace it with a much larger two storey building with a rear wing which fronts the High Street and is set slightly back from the present back edge of the pavement. Beyond the frontage the pavement merges onto a grassed/planted highway verge.

7.4 General design characteristics along the High Street include dwellings with a shallow gable, as was the previous cottage on the site, although it must be noted that the dwellings to the north have wide gables (an unusual characteristic of historic dwellings) and siting at the back edge of the pavement. These elements are reflected in
the design as is the rear wing although the proportions are greater and the building is not quite at the back edge of the pavement. However, beyond that the design is a poor reflection of the character of buildings in the street scene.

7.5 Whilst the design detail of the building has improved from that of previous applications the building is still too large. Unfortunately the proportions of the proposed subservient extensions do not complement the proportions of what is a perceived pair of semi detached dwellings. The side wing is proportionally not in scale with the main build being of a wider plan and the rear wing has given an unfortunate horizontality to the whole project and introduced an unfortunate asymmetric roof line to a prominent end elevation. Detailing to windows doors etc is acceptable. The fenestration is better than previous schemes but is still lacking in rigour. The proportion of the ground floor windows seems arbitrary and alien to the terrace language they have adopted.

7.6 Given the exposed nature of the site, the one pleasing aspect of the scheme is that the building tries to give a frontage to the rear, the cat slide roof of the subservient extension element helps to reduce the bulk of the building at this end. However the asymmetrical roof of the rear element is not a common feature with the eaves being too low and the first floor windows lacking detail.

7.7 There is an issue with the uncharacteristic siting of the building in that it is still not located at the back edge of the pavement. Rather the building is being placed at the back of the vehicular visibility splay from the access point with the pavement effectively being increased in width coming up to the new building. In character terms this is undesirable and with a widened pavement being out of character with the area. A tighter frontage should be created. However, to do this would create a conflict with highway safety and notwithstanding other design concerns the siting can in this instance be accepted.

7.8 The rear of the site contains parking for the flats and it is essentially all hard landscaped with little space for soft landscaping or amenity space with the cycle parking area located in an area of left over space and somewhat insecure.

7.9 Minor changes to the design appearance of the building could be made but this would not fundamentally address the principles of developing the site and creating a satisfactory relationship with the dwellings to the north nor enhancing this end of the High Street. The simple proportions of the former cottage and other historical dwellings within Buckden should be used to inform any development proposal on the site. The current proposal does go some way to meeting criteria but as a design concept its proportions should be pared back to a more simple approach by for example reducing the plan depth and the side wings. The rear wing should be entirely omitted. The design problems result in part from the insistence of four units. Consideration should also be given to reducing the number of units which in turn would open up the opportunity for a better design.

7.10 Nevertheless as it stands the overall design and layout fails to preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area.
Impact of the proposal in relation to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

7.11 The existing cottage was an attractive traditionally built property which retained many historic features. It complemented the modest scale of the properties at this end of the High Street and by reason of its scale and form was considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

7.12 Notwithstanding that the building has been demolished, any scheme within a Conservation Area must be of a good quality, make a positive contribution and create enhancement. The proposed scheme fails to achieve this objective as it is not of sufficiently good quality and would not make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

7.13 The site is highly visible within the approach to the village and was marked by the presence of a building which reflects the character of the Conservation Area. The house sat in an open and green space which creates a soft boundary to the road. The 2 metre high acoustic barrier, whilst visually unattractive, is Permitted Development and therefore does not need planning permission.

7.14 The large utilitarian vehicular access is still an issue particularly as it is partnered by the entrance to the pedestrian underpass. This creates a wide gap in the street scene. In the terms of character this wide gap in the street scene is unacceptable and the lack of visual containment will result in views of the unattractive parking court. This however is a consequence of highway safety requirements and in this context a judgement call must be made. Clearly highway safety is paramount and if the site is to be developed then in this circumstance highway safety must prevail.

7.15 The massing of the building is still unacceptable. The previous building formed an effective gateway to the village core by being positioned opposite the pair of semis on the opposite side of the High Street. This proposal will extend the building form further towards the corner unbalancing the relationship.

7.16 The scale of the building is considered to be unacceptable. One of the reasons that the previous building contributed to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, was the narrowness and scale of the primary gable and building which was clearly seen when approaching the village. The design of the end elevation is poor and will be particularly prominent as will the rear elevation which is poorly conceived and emphasizes the massing of the building and these do not preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area.

7.17 It should be possible to design a stand-alone building that is of sufficient quality to enhance the appearance and character of both the street scene and the conservation area and which addresses the perceived concerns. Regrettably, this has not been achieved.
Highways

7.18 The existing highway access further south along the site is proposed to be closed. It is appreciated that for highway safety the access into the site has to be at the northern end of the site. With regard to the submitted plan and speed survey supplied the previous concerns of CCC Highways have been addressed. The provision of six parking spaces as proposed is considered adequate.

Noise

7.19 Noise issues have been addressed in the report submitted with the current application. It concludes that with suitable screening, double glazing, acoustically treated ventilation and orientation of sensitive rooms facing away from the A1 internal noise levels in habitable rooms are within reasonable standards defined in BS 8233:1999 such that residents would not be caused harm to their amenity by road traffic noise.

Impact on the neighbouring properties

7.20 The proposed scheme has been designed with bedroom and lounge windows looking towards Nos.6 and 8 High Street across the road at ground and first floor level. This is not uncommon in a residential situation such as this and with the distance of approximately 18 metres (the proposed buildings will be set marginally further back from the footpath than the existing building), there will not be an unacceptable loss of amenity for the neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

7.21 Due to the design, scale and form of the proposed development it is considered that the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is unacceptable and would be contrary to policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy 2008; policies En5, En6, En9, En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995; HL5 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration 2002; policies B1 and B8 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007; and policy CS1 from the adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009.

7.22 Having regard to applicable National and Local Planning Policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is recommended that planning permission should be refused in this instance.

8. **RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE**, for the following reason:

8.1 The proposed residential development by reason of its layout, design, form and scale would appear out of keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene and would result in an unduly prominent and inharmonious development which would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This would be contrary to policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy 2008; policies En5, En6, En9, En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995; HL5 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration 2002;
policies B1 and B8 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007; and CS1 of the adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.
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RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 The site is located on the northern side of Huntingdon Road immediately to the north of the roundabout with Church Road. The character of development on this side of the road is mainly comprised of small groups of dwellings with large open spaces between, compared to the more densely developed land within the village to the south.

1.2 The existing dwelling of No.1 Huntingdon Road is a large Victorian double fronted dwelling which sits adjacent to a small group of terraced dwellings and the modern development of Bell Field to the east. To the north and west of the site are open fields.

1.3 The site consists of a large garden which serves the 19th century unlisted property set within the Conservation Area of Brampton. The existing dwelling takes access from the roundabout on Huntingdon Road. The outbuilding known as the ‘coach house’ sits at the north eastern corner of the site. The site has a number of large established trees within the curtilage.

1.4 The application proposes the erection of three dwellings (one detached and two cottages) with garaging and amenity space, following the demolition of the outbuilding to the rear. The access is proposed to be altered.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE


2.2 PPS3 - Housing (2006) sets out how the planning system supports the growth in housing completions needed in England.
2.3 **PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (2004)** sets out the Government's planning policies for rural areas, including country towns and villages and the wider, largely undeveloped countryside up to the fringes of larger urban areas.

2.4 **PPG13 – Transport (2001)** provides guidance in relation to transport and particularly the integration of planning and transport.

2.5 **PPG15: “Planning and the Historic Environment” (1994)** sets out Government policies for the identification and protection of historic buildings, conservation areas, and other elements of the historic environment. It explains the role played by the planning system in their protection.

2.6 **PPS25: “Development and Flood Risk” (2006)** sets out Government policy on development and flood risk. Its aims are to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct development away from areas of highest risk. Where new development is, exceptionally, necessary in such areas, policy aims to make it safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, reducing flood risk overall.

For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. **PLANNING POLICIES**

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live

3.1 **East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)**

Policies viewable at http://www.go-east.gov.uk then follow links to Planning, Regional Planning then Related Documents

- **ENV7**: “Quality in the Built Environment” - requires new development to be of high quality which complements the distinctive character and best qualities of the local area and promotes urban renaissance and regeneration.

3.2 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003)**

Saved policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 are relevant and viewable at http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk follow the links to environment, planning, planning policy and Structure Plan 2003.

- No relevant policies.
3.3 Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009

Policies from the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning then click on Planning Policy and then click on Core Strategy where there is a link to the Adopted Core Strategy.

- **CS1**: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all developments will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered including design, implementation and function of development.

- **CS3**: “The Settlement Hierarchy” – Identifies Brampton, Buckden, Fenstanton, Godmanchester, Kimbolton, Little Paxton, Sawtry, Somersham, Warboys, Yaxley as ‘Key Service Centres’ in which development schemes of moderate and minor scale and infilling may be appropriate within the built up area.

3.4 Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)

Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

- **En5**: “Conservation Area Character” - development within or directly affecting conservation areas will be required to preserve or enhance their character and appearance.

- **En6**: “Design standards in Conservation Areas” – in conservation areas, the District Council will require high standards of design with careful consideration being given to the scale and form of development in the area and to the use of sympathetic materials of appropriate colour and texture.

- **En9**: “Conservation Areas” - development should not impair open spaces, trees, street scenes and views into and out of Conservation Areas.

- **En17**: “Development in the Countryside” - development in the countryside is restricted to that which is essential to the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, permitted mineral extraction, outdoor recreation or public utility services.

- **En18**: “Protection of countryside features” – Offers protection for important site features including trees, woodlands, hedges and meadowland.

- **En25**: “General Design Criteria” - indicates that the District Council will expect new development to respect the scale, form, materials and design of established buildings in the locality and make adequate provision for landscaping and amenity areas.

- **H31**: “Residential privacy and amenity standards” – Indicates that new dwellings will only be permitted where appropriate
standards of privacy can be maintained and adequate parking provided.

- **H32**: "Sub-division of large curtilages" states support will be offered only where the resultant dwelling and its curtilage are of a size and form sympathetic to the locality.

- **H33**: "Sub-division of large curtilages affecting protected buildings or features" states the subdivision of curtilages will not be supported where development will adversely affect the qualities of a Conservation Area or affect trees worthy of protection.

- **T18**: “Access requirements for new development” states development should be accessed by a highway of acceptable design and appropriate construction.

3.5 **Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)**

Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan - Then click on "Local Plan Alteration (2002)

- **HL5**: “Quality and Density of Development” - sets out the criteria to take into account in assessing whether a proposal represents a good design and layout.

3.6 **Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007**

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

- **P8**: “Development in the Countryside” – Outside the defined limits of the Key Centres (limited or potential growth) development will be restricted to: that which is essential to the efficient operation of agriculture, horticulture or forestry, or required for the purposes of outdoor recreation.

- **G2**: “Landscape Character” - development proposals should respect and respond appropriately to the distinctive qualities of the surrounding landscape.

- **G3**: “Trees, hedgerows and Other Environmental Features” - development proposals should minimise risk of harm to trees, hedgerows or other environmental features of visual, historic or nature conservation value.

- **B1**: “Design Quality” - developments should demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character of the area.

- **B4**: “Amenity” - developments should not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity of existing or future occupiers.
• **B8**: “Conservation Areas” - states the criteria against which developments within or affecting a Conservation Area should be assessed.

• **P10**: “Flood Risk” – development should: not take place in areas at risk from flooding, unless suitable mitigation/flood protection measures are agreed; not increase the risk of flooding to properties elsewhere; make use of sustainable drainage systems where feasible; be informed by a flood risk assessment where appropriate.

• **T1** – Transport Impacts - development proposals should be capable of being served by safe convenient access to the transport network and should not give rise to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the local transport network.

### 3.7 Development Management DPD: Proposed Submission 2010

• **C1**: “Sustainable Design” – development proposals should take account of the predicted impact of climate change over the expected lifetime of the development.

• **C5**: “Flood Risk and Water Management” – development proposals should include suitable flood protection / mitigation to not increase risk of flooding elsewhere. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where technically feasible. There should be no adverse impact on or risk to quantity or quality of water resources.

• **E1**: “Development Context” – development proposals shall demonstrate consideration of the character and appearance of the surrounding environment and the potential impact of the proposal.

• **E2**: “Built-up Areas” – development will be limited to within the built-up areas of the settlements identified in Core Strategy policy C3, in order to protect the surrounding countryside and to promote wider sustainability objectives.

• **E3**: “Heritage Assets” – proposals which affect the District’s heritage assets or their setting should demonstrate how these assets will be protected, conserved and where appropriate enhanced.

• **E5**: “Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows” – proposals shall avoid the loss of, and minimise the risk of, harm to trees, woodland or hedgerows of visual, historic or nature conservation value and these should be incorporated effectively within the landscape elements of the scheme wherever possible.

• **E8**: “Sustainable Travel” – proposals must demonstrate how the scheme maximises opportunities for the use of sustainable travel modes, particularly walking, cycling and public transport.

• **E10**: “Parking Provision” – car and cycle parking should accord with the levels and layout requirements set out in Appendix 1.
‘Parking Provision’. Adequate vehicle and cycle parking facilities shall be provided to serve the needs of the development.

- **H7**: “Amenity” – development proposals should safeguard the living conditions for residents and people occupying adjoining or nearby properties.

- **P7**: “Development in the Countryside” – development in the countryside is restricted to those listed within criteria.

### 3.8 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

- Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment (2007)


- Huntingdon West Area Action Plan 2009 - The Huntingdon West Area Action Plan is an area where significant change is expected. It will help deliver planned growth, stimulate regeneration, protect areas particularly sensitive to change, and resolve potentially conflicting objectives in this area. This document has no material impact on the proposed development or site.

### 4. PLANNING HISTORY

#### 4.1 0803034FUL – Erection of 4 dwellings and garages REFUSED 17/12/2008

This application was reported to Development Control Panel (as referred to at the time) on 15th December 2008. The application was refused for 5 reasons:

1) site is outside of the built-up area of the village
2) poor design
3) highway safety
4) noise and disturbance from additional vehicle movements
5) threat to continued well being of trees

A copy of the plan and decision notice are attached to this report for reference.

### 5. CONSULTATIONS

#### 5.1 Brampton Parish Council - APPROVE with condition that the cycleway / footpath must be clearly marked as it crosses the new access. Concerns raised about the access and risks posed by the access (copy attached).

#### 5.2 CCC Highways – NO OBJECTIONS subject to conditions.

#### 5.3 HDC Environmental Health Officer - NO OBJECTIONS
5.4 Alconbury and Ellington Internal Drainage Board - NO OBJECTIONS. However, ground conditions should be investigated, condition recommended.

6. REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 FOUR neighbour representations have been received in OBJECTION to this proposal, the issues raised are:

- Although reduced from 4 to 3 dwellings, still constitutes development of the countryside and is outside village boundaries;
- Could set a precedent for further development already recognized as part of the West Huntingdon Area Action Plan;
- Junction crosses a busy cycleway used by Hinchingbrooke students and other commuters to and from Huntingdon, cyclist and pedestrian safety could be jeopardised;
- Access point is madness for traffic flows round the roundabout at such a speed – questions whether additional speed enforcement or warnings should be considered;
- Removal of row of mature Leylandii is unacceptable due to traffic noise and pollution from Huntingdon Road. Any new planting would take years to establish and form a similarly effective barrier;
- Overlooking and loss of privacy;
- Concerned at no plans to restore the Coach House which has been allowed to fall to ruin;
- Construction disturbance and traffic.

7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

7.1 The main issues to consider are the principle of development, design, the impact on the Conservation Area, impact on residential amenity, highway safety, trees and drainage.

Principle of development

7.2 PPS1 encourages sustainable development on previously developed land and PPS3 encourages all Local Planning Authorities to provide a better mix of housing, giving priority to re-using previously development land. It is recognized though that PPS3 does state ‘that there is no presumption that land that is previously developed, is necessarily suitable for housing, nor that the whole of the curtilage should be developed’. PPS7 clearly states that development outside areas allocated for development should be strictly controlled.

7.3 The Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 restricts new residential development to that which is within the ‘built-up area’ of existing settlements and focuses on
sustainable locations for development. Paragraph 5.15 of the document defines this as:

5.15 The definition of the built-up area will be set out in more detail in the Development Management DPD but for the purposes of the Core Strategy it is considered to be the existing built form excluding:

- buildings that are clearly detached from the main body of the settlement;
- gardens and other undeveloped land within the curtilage of buildings at the edge of the settlement, where these relate more to the surrounding countryside than they do to the built-up parts of the village; and
- agricultural buildings where they are on the edge of the settlement.

7.4 Huntingdonshire Core Strategy 2009 policy CS3 provides a framework for new housing development and identifies Brampton as a Key Service Centre in which development schemes of moderate and minor scale and infilling may be appropriate within the built-up area.

7.5 Policy E2 of the Draft Submission Development Management Policies provides further clarification of the built-up area and the built form of settlements. This excludes from the built form individual buildings and groups of dispersed or intermittent buildings that are clearly detached from the continuous built-up area of the settlement, and gardens, paddocks and other undeveloped land in the curtilage of buildings on the edge of the settlement where the land relates more to the surrounding countryside than to the built-up area of the settlement.

7.6 In the context of the application site, the built form would be considered to fall closely around the existing detached dwelling and would not include the ‘coach house’ or the gardens and remaining area of the site. It is considered that the remaining land relates more to the surrounding countryside. The site provides a more rural, undeveloped appearance which is not domestic or built-up in character with a well landscaped and rural feel as opposed to the more built up parts of the village.

7.7 Whilst the site could be considered to be sustainable in terms of the good public transport, cycle and pedestrian links and routes to Huntingdon this does not outweigh the policy objection in principle as detailed.

7.8 The proposal is considered to be contrary to PPS7, policy CS3 of the Huntingdonshire Core Strategy 2009, policy P8 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 and policies E2 and P7 of the Draft Development Management policies DPD 2010.

Design

7.9 The proposed dwellings have been located away from the major trees on the site and take into account their root protection areas. This has in effect pushed the dwellings towards the edges of the site. This is unfortunate as the existing perimeter planting will have to be
removed, making the site very exposed. Proposed new planting is noted however given the relationship of the dwellings to the perimeter of the site there will be continued pressure for the boundary planting to be kept low to afford light into habitable rooms. Within the wider landscape the 2 storey dwelling will be very exposed.

7.10 Whilst the layout of the proposed development has taken account of the trees on the site, plots 2 and 3 have been placed at angles oblique to the site boundaries. The area is characterised by dwellings with a strong relationship to the boundaries, often being parallel. This random placement of buildings is out of keeping with the established pattern of development in the area.

7.11 Plot 1 has been designed as a detached house, whilst the other 2 dwellings have been designed as one and a half storey. All of the dwelling are considered to be of a poor quality architectural design and fail to embrace any characteristics of the existing dwelling or local vernacular. They fail to relate to the character of the area which is predominantly small Victorian cottages.

7.12 Plot 1 has a hipped roof and the local character in the area is of strong gables, with deep sliding sash windows and chimneys, which these dwellings fail to embrace. The forward projecting wing does not enhance the dwelling with a large brick mass and lack of front door.

7.13 The one and a half storey dwellings are again out of keeping to the locality with a dominant forward projecting gable and lack of front door. The ridge height of the garage appears very tall.

7.14 The double garage is dominated by the gable on the front elevation. It would be better if the roof profile was re-orientated with the ridge running along the width of the garage rather than the length. Up and over doors are not generally in keeping with the existing historical house and the Conservation Area. Open cart sheds or double hinged wooden doors would be more appropriate.

7.15 There is no mention of how the scheme responds to or embraces sustainability or sustainable construction.

7.16 The upgrading of the access onto the roundabout in effect creating a fourth arm will urbanise this semi-rural edge of the road.

7.17 Overall the design and layout does not represent good design and the development appears cramped and does not relate to the surrounding pattern of development in the area. The proposed dwellings have been poorly design and do not respond appropriately to the qualities of the site or reflect those in the area. They fail to form an attractive coherent group and do not in any way improve the character and quality of the area. The development would be detrimental to the visual appearance of the immediate area and longer distance views.

7.18 In this regard the proposed development is considered to be contrary to PPS1, policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan 2008, policy CS1 of the Core Strategy 2009, policies En5, En6, En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policy HL5 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations 2002, policies G2, B1 and B8 of the
Impact on the Character of the Conservation Area

7.19 The site is located within the Conservation Area for Brampton where any development is expected to enhance and protect the area. The applicant has tried to reduce the impact of the development (from that previously submitted under 0803034FUL) on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area by locating the dwellings towards the rear of the site and retaining the majority of existing trees, screening the potential development. The development does however have a detrimental impact upon views into and out of the Conservation Area as it extends the line of development along Huntingdon Road.

7.20 The site is currently undeveloped land on the edge of the village, relating more to the adjacent countryside. It is considered that the proposal would remove this characteristic and would fail to enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

7.21 The application also fails to provide justification for the demolition of the 'coach house'. This structure has an ancillary relationship with the existing dwelling, providing a hierarchy within the site. The 'coach house' has its own architectural and historical merit and unless the applicant can provide evidence that the building is beyond repair should be incorporated into any proposed development.

7.22 The design of the proposed dwellings in light of the setting within the Conservation Area are considered to be of inappropriate design, uncharacteristic of dwellings in the locality. The size, scale and materials of the proposed dwellings should compliment No.1 Huntingdon Road and follow the design of adjacent properties, in particular the ‘coach house’.

7.23 In this regard, the proposal is considered to be contrary to PPG15 and policies En5, En6 and En9 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policy B8 of Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 and draft policy E3 of the Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010.

Residential Amenity

7.24 The proposal seeks to upgrade the existing access to serve the new dwellings. For what appears to be tree reasons, this access is located immediately adjacent to the existing dwelling and adjacent to a large bay window. The intensification of this access by users of other dwellings will create undue noise and disturbance to the occupiers of the existing dwelling and especially the habitable rooms adjacent to the access drive. This is an unacceptable relationship.

7.25 The main concern from neighbours relates to highway safety and the rural appearance of the area being urbanised. The owner of No 4 Bell Field has also expressed concern about overlooking and loss of privacy. However, due to the separation distance and orientation of
the properties the proposal would not give rise to undue loss of
privacy to the owners of the neighbouring properties.

7.26 For reasons of the access noise and disturbance the proposal is
contrary to policy H31 of the Huntingdon Local Plan 1995, policy B4
of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 and
draft policy H7 of the Development Management DPD.

Highways

7.27 The existing access from the roundabout is a simple crossover and of
a historical nature related to the existing house. It is not ideal in terms
of current highway safety. The proposed access becomes more of a
fourth arm to the roundabout and would be more obvious to drivers.
The proposed changes to the amount of proposed use, geometry,
signage and good all round visibility provide for a much better
scheme than previously proposed. The improvements provided would
need to be subject to a detailed safety audit, technical checks and
form part of a Highways 106 agreement. Conditions are
recommended by the Highway Authority for off-site highway works,
vehicular crossing details, no gates across the access, retaining
sufficient space for turning, parking and manoeuvring and provision of
construction facilities.

7.28 As such the Highway Authority have raised no objection to the
proposal on grounds of highway safety for all users and the proposed
development is acceptable in this regard.

Trees

7.29 The tree survey submitted with the proposal is accurate and
reasonable; however the main issue here is the layout and design of
the proposed dwellings and the overall landscape details on the site.

7.30 The loss of perimeter vegetation and the internal hedges will leave
the site very exposed to views into the site especially from the west
and north, their loss will detract from the character and appearance of
the Conservation Area.

7.31 In this regard the proposal would be detrimental to the wider
appearance of the site and landscape character of the area contrary
to Huntingdonshire Core Strategy 2009 policy CS1, policies En9 and
En18 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policies G2 and G3 of
the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 and
draft policies E1 and E5 of the Development Management DPD
Proposed Submission 2010.

Drainage

7.32 Alconbury and Ellington drainage board have confirmed that it is
essential that ground conditions should be investigated at the site to
ensure satisfactory soakaways are constructed.
Parish Council comments

7.33 Whilst recommending approval of the application, the Parish Council recommends a condition that the cycleway / footpath must be clearly marked as it crosses the new access.

7.34 The Parish Council are still concerned about the risks posed by the access onto a busy roundabout, especially as the access is across a well used footpath/cycleway used by children attending Hinchingbrooke School. Existing adequate lighting levels need to be maintained when the street column is relocated. In particular at the point where the footpath/cycleway crosses the access as there is potential for conflict between vehicles and vulnerable road users. Lighting levels must meet the approval of the street lighting engineers. These lighting conditions should also apply during the construction work on the site.

7.35 The Parish have also commented that they would expect the Local Planning Authority officers to monitor the protection of the trees.

Response to representations

7.36 The comments raised in the representations have been addressed in the report.

Conclusion

7.37 The proposal is considered to be contrary to planning policy by virtue of:

- The site being outside the built form of Brampton and therefore within the open countryside

- Poor design not in-keeping with the local character and does not enhance or protect the character or appearance of the Conservation Area

- The layout resulting in noise and disturbance to existing occupiers through vehicle movements

As such the officer recommendation is one of refusal on these grounds.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.

8. RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE for the following reasons:

8.1 The proposed dwellings, by reason of their siting outside the built-up area of Brampton would cause harm through the introduction of built form into the countryside and would be detrimental to the rural character of the area without justification of a rural need. As such the proposal would be contrary to PPS7, policy CS3 of the Huntingdonshire Core Strategy 2009, policy P8 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 and policies

8.2 The proposed dwellings, by virtue of their poor design and detailing including their relationship with existing landscape features, would introduce a built form of development that does not reflect the existing pattern of development and which would harm, and not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such the proposal would be contrary to PPS1 and PPG15, policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan 2008, policy CS1 of the Huntingdonshire Core Strategy 2009, policies En5, En6, En9, En18, En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policy HL5 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations 2002, policies B1, B8 G2 and G3 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007, draft policies E1, E3 and E5 of the Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010 and the Huntingdonshire Design Guide 2007.

8.3 The proposed vehicular access and the additional vehicle movements generated through the proposed development would create an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance to the occupiers of No.1 Huntingdon Road. This would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupiers. As such the proposal would be contrary to policy H31 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policy B4 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 and draft policy H7 of the Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010.

Background Papers:

Planning Application File Reference: 0901628FUL
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003
Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995
Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration, 2002
Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2009
Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

CONTACT OFFICER:
Enquiries about this report to Ms Louise Platt Development Management Officer 01480 388460
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AGENDA ITEM NO.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL 22 FEBRUARY 2010

Case No: 0901645FUL (FULL PLANNING APPLICATION)
Proposal: CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FROM AGRICULTURE TO OUTSIDE STORAGE WITH ROADS AND LANDSCAPE PLANTING
Location: LAND AT NORTH END OF PARK RIDDEY
Applicant: KINGSPAN OFF-SITE LTD
Grid Ref: 526728  256201
Date of Registration: 17.12.2009
Parish: GREAT GRANSDEN

RECOMMENDATION - APPROVE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 The application relates to an area of agricultural land to the north west of the ‘Kingspan off-site’ commercial property (formerly known as ‘Potton Homes’) and directly south of an existing open storage area at the ‘Highbury Fields’ site. The site forms a triangular parcel of land which extends to approximately 0.35 hectares, the boundaries to the north and south west are open. The site boundary to the south east is defined by an approx 4m high hedge.

1.2 The application seeks to change the use of this piece of agriculture land to open storage which will allow for the expansion of ‘Kingspan off-site’.

1.3 The site is located in the open countryside for the purposes of the Development Plan, but is directly adjacent to the previously approved open storage at ‘Highbury Fields’.

1.4 The information submitted with the proposal confirms that ‘Potton Homes’ now forms part of the ‘Kingspan Off-Site’ operation after the business was acquired by ‘Kingspan Group PLC’ in December 2006. The show house complex still operates in St Neots which offers examples of the house ranges.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE

2.1 PPS4: “Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth” (2009) sets out the Government’s comprehensive policy framework for planning for sustainable economic development in urban and rural areas.

2.2 PPS7: “Sustainable Development in Rural Areas” (2004) sets out the Government’s planning policies for rural areas, including country
towns and villages and the wider, largely undeveloped countryside up to the fringes of larger urban areas.

2.3 **PPG13: “Transport” (2001)** provides guidance in relation to transport and particularly the integration of planning and transport.

For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. **PLANNING POLICIES**

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live.

3.1 **East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)**

Policies viewable at http://www.go-east.gov.uk then follow links to Planning, Regional Planning then Related Documents.

- **ENV7**: “Quality in the Built Environment” - requires new development to be of high quality which complements the distinctive character and best qualities of the local area and promotes urban renaissance and regeneration.

3.2 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003)**

Saved policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 are relevant and viewable at http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk follow the links to environment, planning, planning policy and Structure Plan 2003.

- None relevant

3.3 **Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)**

Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

- **E11**: “Expansion of Existing Firms” – will normally be allowed providing the scale and location of development does not conflict with other Local Plan policies.

- **En17**: “Development in the Countryside” - development in the countryside is restricted to that which is essential to the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, permitted mineral extraction, outdoor recreation or public utility services.

- **En20**: Landscaping Scheme. - Wherever appropriate a development will be subject to the conditions requiring the execution of a landscaping scheme.
3.4 Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)

Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan - Then click on "Local Plan Alteration (2002)"

- None relating to this proposal

3.5 Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009

Policies from the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning then click on Planning Policy and then click on Core Strategy where there is a link to the Adopted Core Strategy.

- CS1: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all developments will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered including design, implementation and function of development.

3.6 Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

- P8 – Development in the Countryside – Outside the existing built framework of the Smaller Settlements development will be restricted to: that which is essential to the efficient operation of agriculture, horticulture or forestry, or required for the purposes of outdoor recreation; the alteration, replacement or change of use of existing buildings in accordance with other policies; limited and specific forms of housing, business and tourism development, as provided for within the Local Development Framework; or land allocated for particular purposes.

- G2 – Landscape Character - development proposals should respect and respond appropriately to the distinctive qualities of the surrounding landscape

- B1 – Design Quality - developments should demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character of the area.

- B3 – Accessibility, Adaptability and Security – the location and design of new development should enable ease of access, have convenient and appropriate facilities and minimise the extent to which users feel at risk of crime.

- B4 – Amenity - developments should not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity of existing or future occupiers.
• **E2** – Location of Industrial and Warehouse Development – A proposal for a large industrial or warehouse development on unallocated land should be limited to amongst others, situations where an existing firm requires additional space to expand; the conversion or redevelopment of suitable existing buildings in the countryside, as provided for elsewhere in the core strategy.

• **T1** – Transport Impacts - development proposals should be capable of being served by safe convenient access to the transport network and should not give rise to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the local transport network.

• **T2** – Car and Cycle Parking - development proposals should limit car parking and provide cycle parking facilities to the levels set out in the Council’s parking standards.

3.7 Development Management DPD - Proposed Submission 2010

• **E1**: “Development Context” – development proposals shall demonstrate consideration of the character and appearance of the surrounding environment and the potential impact of the proposal.

• **E2**: “Built-up Areas” – development will be limited to development within the built-up areas of the settlements, in order to protect the surrounding countryside and to promote wider sustainability objectives.

• **H7**: “Amenity” – development proposals should safeguard the living conditions for residents and people occupying adjoining or nearby properties.

• **P2**: “Small Businesses” – Proposals for minor development of industrial or warehouse uses will be considered favourably, subject to environmental and travel considerations in specified locations.

• **P7**: “Development in the Countryside” – development in the countryside is restricted, the policy sets out the limited circumstances in which development outside settlements will be allowed taking into account the particular characteristics of Huntingdonshire’s rural economy. It seeks to protect the countryside’s quality and distinctiveness whilst making reasonable allowance to facilitate the growth of rural businesses.

3.8 SPD – Huntingdonshire Landscape Character Statement 2007

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 Whilst this particularly site has no recorded planning history, the application is associated with the larger site formally known as ‘Potton Homes’ which has an extensive history under ‘Potton Homes’.

4.2 A planning application was submitted in 2009 for a large storage area to the south west of the existing ‘Kingspan’ site and parallel with the
public footpath. The agent has confirmed that the application is likely to be withdrawn, after officers indicated that they could not support the application in this location due to the concern about visual impact on the surrounding countryside when viewing the site from the public footpath.

4.3 A retrospective 3 year temporary consent is due to be determined for the marquee structure at the ‘Kingspan’ site allowing for the business to organise there operations within the site.

5. **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Great Gransden Parish Council - Recommend REFUSAL**, due to concern about the encroachment into the open countryside. *(copy attached).*

6. **REPRESENTATIONS**

6.1 No third party representations have been received in response to the proposal

7. **SUMMARY OF ISSUES**

7.1 The main issues here are the principle of the development, the impact the proposed development would have on the character and views of the open countryside and any highways related issues.

7.2 The information submitted with the application suggests Kingspan have recently consolidated there business operation to Great Gransden following the closure of their three other sites in the UK. It also confirms that the company have introduced an insulated panel system to their production which helps achieve a high code in terms of sustainable homes requirements. However, this has lead to pressure for more storage at the site, particularly for storage of the insulated panels.

7.3 The prime aim of PPS7 is to ensure that the quality and character of the wider countryside is protected, based on sustainable development principles. PPS4 also suggests that the countryside should be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty. The new and emerging policy P7 of the Development Management DPD, which is in line with recent Government Guidance also seeks to protect the countryside from unnecessary development, however it also suggests that a reasonable allowance should be given to facilitate the growth of rural businesses.

7.4 The information within the design and access statement confirms the area of land is for an open storage area similar to the recently approved open storage area to the north. The statement also confirms that storage at the site would ensure the products will remain within the single centralised premises that will assist the company to operate effectively and efficiently. Alternative off site arrangements would result in unnecessary vehicular movements and double handling of the goods.
7.5 Whilst the above policies seek to restrict new development in the open countryside, Paragraph 3.33 of the Local Plan states that development will be allowed on the periphery of the villages where no suitable sites exist within the built up area. Policy E11 of the Plan which allows for the expansion of existing firms, acknowledges at paragraph 3.38 that existing firms at the edge of villages may need to expand, and clearly states that the expansion beyond the village limits will be acceptable where the case for protecting existing employment uses is stronger than any environmental, amenity or other issues. Policy E2 of the Interim Planning Statement 2007 also suggests that a more flexible approach should be given to small industrial schemes that provide jobs in rural areas, providing that the impact upon the rural road network is considered. Policy P2 of the new and emerging Development Management DPD, supports the expansion of businesses, albeit within existing sites, and suggests a flexible approach for the supply of land is essential to meet the needs of existing businesses wishing to expand, providing the economic growth needs will have no adverse impact on, amongst other things, the countryside and the rural road network.

7.6 The application is considered to meet the aims of Policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan, E11 of the Local Plan, Policy CS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy, policy E2 of the Interim Planning Policy Statement, Policy P2 of the emerging Development Management DPD, and PPS1, PPS7 and PPS4.

Impact on the open countryside

7.7 The site is situated at the edge of the village, and at present has no defined boundaries to the west. The information submitted within the design and access statement confirms that the storage associated with the use will be no higher than 4 metres. The development mainly consists of land being turned over to a narrow road ways with gravel storage areas. The information submitted with the proposal suggests a landscape scheme will be provided to screen the storage area. Whilst new planting has been indicated on the plan provided with the application, a condition will be required to ensure a robust landscape scheme is submitted to form a strong soft boundary to the village.

7.8 A landscape scheme is due to be submitted for the recent approval for open storage to the north of this site, and it is proposed that officers will offer advice for both landscape schemes.

7.9 A condition should also be appended to control unnecessary light spillage at the site to ensure the protection of the wider countryside. The development accords with Policy En20 of the Local Plan and G2 of the Interim Planning Policy and the SPD - Landscape Character Statement.

Highway safety and access

7.10 The County Highways Authority have confirmed the information in the submitted transport statement suggests the proposal will result in the amount of vehicular activity from the site being reduced if this area is available for storage. The access arrangements are considered adequate to cope with the vehicle movements and the type of vehicle accessing the site. An alternative off-site storage has been
considered in the transport statement and this information confirms that alternative sites will increase the vehicles movements at the site. Whilst the loading bays at the site will increase from 6 to 15, the information submitted on the 2nd February 2010 confirms the extra bays are not required for additional vehicles, but to remove congestion from the lay-by outside the site, which is thought to improve the current situation.

7.11 The Highways Authority have no objection to the proposal, however, a condition has been suggested to ensure the parking and turning areas within the site are made available before the use commences at the site.


Parish Comments

7.13 The Parish Council have recommended the application is refused due to concern about the encroachment into the countryside. While the comments from the Parish Council have been noted, as discussed above the site lies directly adjacent to (south of) an area of land to be used for open storage, which was recommended for approval by the Parish Council and consequently approved by the District Council. As confirmed previously while policy generally seeks to protect the open countryside from unnecessary development, policy also suggests a reasonable approach should be taken for the expansion of businesses at the edge of settlements.

In conclusion

7.14 The principle of this development to allow for the expansion of an existing company in the village is considered to accord with policy and the economic benefits of the development outweigh the limited visual harm in this instance. The submission of a landscape scheme should safeguard the long distance views of the open storage at the site from surrounding areas and the on site storage will prevent unnecessary additional vehicles movements to and from the site, therefore contributing to the aims of sustainability. The application is considered for approval as the development accords with policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan, Policies E11 and EN20 of the Local Plan, Policy CS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy, Policies G2, B3, E2, T1 and T2 of the Interim Planning Policy Statement, and policy E1 of the emerging Development Management DPD, and PPS1, PPS4, PPS7 and PPG13 and the SDP – Huntingdonshire Landscape Character Statement 2007.

Therefore having regard to applicable National and Local Planning Policies, and having taken all relevant considerations into account, it is recommended that planning permission should be granted in this instance.
8. **RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE** subject to conditions to include the following:

- **02003** - Time Limit (3 yrs)
- **Nonstand** - Landscape scheme to be submitted
- **Nonstand** - Light scheme to be submitted to LPA
- **Nonstand** - No storage of over 4 metres
- **Nonstand** - Parking and turning

**Background Papers:**

- Planning Application File Reference: 0901645FUL
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003
- Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995
- Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration, 2002
- Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2009
- Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

**CONTACT OFFICER:**

Enquiries about this report to **Linda Morse Development Management Officer 01480 388411**
RECOMMENDATION - REFUSAL

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 This site is located immediately to the south of the A14, a short distance from the village. It has been developed as a 9 hole golf course, and includes a club house, storage shed and a large gravelled car park. The course itself extends southwards from the club house and car park. The boundaries are largely defined by mature hedges and, although the site is reasonably well screened from the A14, it is clearly visible from the adjacent flyover. There is a limited amount of development in the vicinity, and this includes a recently extended golf driving range complex, and a series of smaller buildings, used for a variety of purposes. The A14 effectively forms the northern boundary of the site.

1.2 The proposal is to erect an ancillary golf chalet accommodation block. This will be located on an open area between the two existing structures (the practice green), and will have ground dimensions of 37.2m by 9.2m. There will be two floors of accommodation with a total of 18, one bedroom, units, each of which having a bathroom and a small kitchenette. The building will have an eaves height of 5.2m and a ridge height of 8.6m. It will be of brick and tile construction.

1.3 The application states that the proposal is intended to provide accommodation for customers of the existing golf club, and also to attract new members thereby improving the viability of the entire business. It states that there has been a high demand for accommodation, especially for groups of players, who require simple, on-site accommodation, and is intended to provide facilities which the application states are not presently available either on the site or in the nearby towns or villages. The design of the building has been kept relatively simple so that it will relate well to the existing clubhouse and the site in general.

1.4 The site is in the open countryside, and the A14 is a trunk road.
2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE

2.1 PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (2005) contains advice on the operation of the plan-led system.

2.2 PPS4 – Planning for Sustainable Economic Development (2009) requires a sequential assessment as part of applications for town centre uses, which includes tourism development, that are not in an existing town centre and are not in accordance with an up to date development plan unless they are ancillary to other uses.

2.3 PPS7 – Sustainable development in rural areas (2004). Sets out the Government’s planning policies for rural areas, including country towns and villages and the wider, largely undeveloped countryside up to the fringes of larger urban areas.

2.4 PPG13 Transport (2001) provides guidance in relation to transport and particularly the integration of planning and transport.

2.5 PPG17 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation (2002) – considers matters relating to the provision of recreational facilities in towns and the countryside.


For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. PLANNING POLICIES

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live


- SS1: “Achieving Sustainable Development” – the strategy seeks to bring about sustainable development by applying the guiding principles of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 2005 and the elements contributing to the creation of sustainable communities described in Sustainable Communities: Homes for All.
- ENV7 – Quality in the Built Environment – requires new development to be of a high quality which complements the distinctive character and best qualities of the local area and promotes urban renaissance and regeneration.

follow the links to environment, planning, planning policy and Structure Plan 2003.

- None relevant

3.3 Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995) Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

- En17 “Development in the countryside” – development in the countryside will be restricted to that which is essential to the efficient operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, permitted mineral extraction, outdoor recreation or public utility services.

- En25: “General Design Criteria” – indicates that the District Council will expect new development to respect the scale, form, materials and design of established buildings in the locality and make provision for landscaping and amenity areas.

- To1 – the Council will generally support the development of tourist opportunities.

- To2 – new or improved tourist facilities will normally be encouraged.

- To6 – the Council will seek to extend the amount and variety of tourist accommodation.

- To8 – specifies the criteria by which proposals for new accommodation and conference centres will be assessed.

- R2 – applications for recreational facilities will be assessed against a number of factors.

- E7: “Small businesses” - will normally be supported subject to environmental and traffic considerations.

3.4 Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002) Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan - Then click on “Local Plan Alteration (2002)"

- None relevant

3.5 Policies from the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning then click on Planning Policy and then click on Core Strategy where there is a link to the Adopted Core Strategy.

- CS1: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all development will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered, including design, implementation and function of development.
3.6 Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

• **P8** – development in the countryside is restricted to specific developments.

• **B1** – Design Quality – development should demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character of the area.

• **B4** – Amenity – developments should not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing and future occupiers.

• **E4** – location of tourist facilities will be limited to situations where, amongst others, an existing facility requires additional space within which to expand.

• **T1** – Transport Impacts – development proposals should be capable of being served by safe convenient access to the transport network and should not give rise to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the local transport network.

• **T2** – Car and Cycle Parking – development proposals should limit car parking and provide cycle parking facilities to the levels set out in the Council’s parking standards.

3.7 Policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Development Management DPD Draft Submission 2010 are relevant

• **P7** – Development in the countryside will be restricted to the listed specific forms of development including development required for existing outdoor leisure recreation where a countryside location is justified.

• **P12** – Proposals for other tourist accommodation will be acceptable where the proposal, amongst others, provides accommodation of an appropriate nature and scale to meet the needs of an existing tourist facility or attraction.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 There is a long history of applications relating to this site, and consent for the initial change of use was granted in 1990. The most recent one (0301861FUL) was for an extension to the club house and was approved on the 3rd September 2003.

5. **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Hemingford Abbots Parish Council – Approve** (copy attached)

5.2 **Highway Agency** – no objections subject to a condition restricting the occupation of the accommodation to clients of the golf complex.
6. REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 Neighbours – none received.

7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

7.1 The main issues in this case relate to the principle of the development, highway matters and its impact on the appearance and character of the local landscape.

7.2 This site is in the open countryside for the purposes of the Development Plan, and other statements of policy, wherein the policies are restrictive, and will normally allow only that development which is essential to the efficient operation of agriculture and other rural activities. However, limited forms of tourist development are acceptable subject to the specific policies relating to such development.

7.3 Policy To8 of the Local Plan 1995 will normally permit new tourist accommodation subject to environmental, amenity, access and parking considerations, and the following criteria:-

1. Accommodation should be within the built up area of a settlement or in a converted rural building;
2. Accommodation should be located in roadside service areas;
3. Accommodation for people using outdoor recreational facilities in the countryside should be located in close proximity to the facility, but only where there is a strong functional relationship between the facility and the accommodation.

7.4 In the case of 3. a need for the accommodation must be demonstrated. This is to avoid sporadic development in the countryside, and to protect it for its own sake. Paragraph 8.33 of the Local Plan states that golf courses in the countryside do not need accommodation for users to enjoy their recreation and accommodation associated with golf courses will not normally be acceptable.

7.5 Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 policy E4 states that large tourist proposals (over 500 sq. m.), on unallocated land, will only be acceptable where, amongst others, in a situation where an existing facility requires additional space within which to expand. The supporting text of this policy refers to limited development in the countryside if it is associated with farm diversification, strategic green space or waterways, although, on a general level, it recognises that benefits can accrue if existing facilities are allowed to expand, and that flexibility is appropriate for small developments which can help to provide jobs in rural areas. The more recent Submission Draft Development Management DPD policy P12 states that proposals for tourist accommodation will be acceptable where the proposal, amongst others, provides accommodation of an appropriate nature and scale to meet the needs of an existing tourist facility or attraction.

7.6 Taken with Core Strategy policy CS1, Local Plan policy En17, Interim Planning Policy Statement policy P8 and Submission Draft Development Management DPD policy P7, these policies would only support tourism development on this site of a nature and scale to
meet the needs of the golf course. Whilst the application is presented as ancillary accommodation and the Planning Statement refers to a high demand from golf course customers for the proposed accommodation, the applicants have not submitted any quantitative evidence to support the proposal, nor have presented evidence of the scale of any such demand. It should be noted that the location of the site, despite its proximity to the A14, is not readily accessible by means other than the car. The increased use of the site which an unrestricted proposal would generate would not minimise the need to travel, as required by policy CS1 of the Core Strategy and general guidance on sustainable development.

7.7 It is considered that the applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated the need for residential accommodation of the scale proposed on the site. Given the limited extent of the existing golf course, it is difficult to see that the proposed accommodation would be taken up fully by players. If it was approved and built and not fully taken up by golfers, there could be pressure for it to be used as general tourist accommodation, a position which would not be supported by present policy.

7.8 It should also be noted that the Highways Agency, in considering the impact of the development on the A14, has directed that a condition is attached to any planning permission stating that only clients of the Golf Complex shall be permitted to use the overnight accommodation.

7.9 Policy R2 of the 1995 Local Plan considers recreational as opposed to tourist development but identifies five criteria which are helpful in setting out the other matters to be taken into consideration:-

1. Advice from sporting authorities
2. The effect on adjacent residential areas
3. The effect on the landscape, visual amenity, nature conservation and archaeology
4. Access, parking and traffic generation
5. The siting, design and materials of any building.

7.10 In respect of these factors, the following comments can be made:-

1. Advice from sporting bodies has not been sought in this instance.
2. The proposal will have little effect on the amenities of the immediate neighbours.
3. Whilst any new building in the countryside will have some impact, the proposal will not have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the locality. The building will be well related to the existing structures, and will not be viewed in isolation. There are no known concerns relating to nature conservation or archaeology.
4. If the development was only used by golfers, there should be no undue access, parking or traffic generation issues. There is a large gravelled parking area close to the club house which should be sufficient for the needs of the development.
5. This is a large building, and its bulk is emphasised by the unbroken ridge line and the repetitive nature of the elevations. However, it will be reasonably well screened from the A14 by the existing vegetation, and additional planting could be required by condition. It will be clearly visible from the road into the site, and from the flyover, but it will be set against the large buildings on the golf driving range site.
This setting will reduce its effective impact, and it should not be unduly detrimental to the overall character of the area.

7.11 The key policies in this case are those that seek to restrict development in the countryside. Tourism accommodation may be acceptable in the countryside in certain circumstances, with the most relevant in this instance being where it provides accommodation of an appropriate nature and scale to meet the needs of an existing tourist facility or attraction. Despite information on the need for the accommodation being requested during pre-application discussions, no overriding evidence has been provided to demonstrate the need for 18 units for golfers at this site.

7.12 Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is considered that planning permission should not be granted in this instance.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.

8. **RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE**, for the following reason:

8.1 The proposal would be contrary to the provisions of PPS1, PPS7, Huntingdonshire Core Strategy 2009 policy CS1, Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 policy En17, Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 policy P8 and Huntingdonshire LDF Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010 policy P7 which seek to exercise strict control over development in the countryside. Whilst Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 policy To8, Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 policy E4 and Huntingdonshire LDF Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010 policy P12 provide some support for accommodation of an appropriate nature and scale to meet the needs of an existing tourist facility or attraction, no evidence has been provided to substantiate the need for 18 accommodation units for golfers at this site. The site of the proposed development is in an unsustainable location for unrestricted accommodation.
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East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)
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Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009
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AGENDA ITEM NO.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL 22 FEBRUARY 2010

Case No: 0901664S73 (RENEWAL OF CONSENT/VARY CONDITIONS)

Proposal: VARIATION OF CONDITION 3 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 0400316FUL TO PERMIT B1 USE (PICTURES, PHOTOGRAPHS, POSTERS AND PAINTINGS) SALES COUNTER. VARIATION OF CONDITION 6 TO ALLOW THE SALE OF PICTURE FRAMES, PICTURES AND POSTERS.

Location: MILK DEPOT PARK LANE STONELY

Applicant: MR AND MRS RENKIN

Grid Ref: 510480 267420

Date of Registration: 13.01.2010

Parish: KIMBOLTON & STONELY

RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 This application relates to a single-storey building and small forecourt fronting onto Park Lane Stonely: a classified road (B660) on the outskirts of Kimbolton. The site is flanked by residential gardens and lies opposite the grounds of Kimbolton School.

1.2 Although there is a small forecourt in front of the building, it does not benefit from a complete dropped kerb and therefore it is likely that most cars visiting the site will park in Park Lane and the adjacent short layby.

1.3 The authorised use of the building is for framing pictures (Class B1): permission 0400316FUL refers.

1.4 This application is to vary conditions 3 and 6 of the permission in order to permit a sales counter in the front reception area. The floor area affected measures approximately 2.93m x 7.1m = 20.8sqm internally, leaving approximately 2.93 x 12.3 = 36sqm for the remainder of the workshop use including the workshop and wc.

1.5 Condition 3 states: ‘The premises shall be used for the framing of pictures and no other purpose, including any use within Class B1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes Order) 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification’.

1.6 Condition 6 states: ‘The premises shall not be used for the sale of picture frames, pictures or posters’.
1.7 The application suggests that the retail use has not begun. However, the retailing has commenced: customers already visit the premises and the sign over the front of the premises and a free-standing ‘A-board’ advertise the showroom. The applicants have therefore been asked to regularise the description: any response will be reported to Panel.

1.8 Both applicants work in the business at the site although they also own a retail unit selling gifts, including pictures, cards and chocolates at 18 High Street, Kimbolton.

1.9 The site is in Stonely Conservation Area, near several listed buildings (1, 3 and 5 Main Road) and adjoins Kimbolton Conservation Area and the grounds of the listed Kimbolton Castle.

1.10 The site is in an area of medium flood risk according to the Huntingdonshire SFRA and medium or high risk according to the Environment Agency models.

1.11 The application has been accompanied by a Design and Access statement which notes that the previously approved plans show a reception area for the display of goods and where orders for work and payment is made. It advises that previously some orders were taken from their shop in High Street but they are now separate enterprises.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE


2.2 PPS4: “Planning for sustainable growth” (2009) confirms that the Government’s overarching objective is sustainable economic growth and that to help achieve such growth, two of the Government’s objectives for planning are to deliver more sustainable patterns of development, reduce the need to travel, especially by car, and promote the vitality and viability of town and other centres as important places for communities.

• Policy EC6.2: confirms that in rural areas, local planning authorities should, amongst other matters, identify local service centres (and locate most new development in or on the edge of existing settlements where employment, housing, services and other facilities can be provided close together).

• Policy EC.10.2: requires applications for economic development to be assessed against impact considerations including accessibility by a choice of means of transport and the impact on local employment.

• Policy EC.11: requires Local Planning Authorities to consider, amongst other matters, whether the proposals help to meet the wider objectives of the development plan.

• Policy EC.12: In considering the re-use of buildings for economic development in rural areas, Local Planning Authorities should:
• support development which enhances the vitality and viability of market towns and other rural service centres;
• support small-scale economic development where it provides the most sustainable option in villages, or other locations that are remote from local service centres, recognising that the site may be an acceptable location for development even though it may not be readily accessible by public transport;
• approve planning applications for the conversion and re-use of existing buildings in the countryside for economic development, particularly those adjacent or closely related to towns or villages, where the benefits outweigh the harm.

2.3 Planning for Town Centres: Practice Guidance on need, impact and the sequential approach (2009): Part 6 seeks a sequential approach to selecting sites and means ‘wherever possible seeking to focus new development within, or failing that on well located sites on the edge of existing defined centres. Only if town centre or edge of centre sites are not available will out of centre locations be likely to be appropriate in policy terms, provided that they are well served by alternative means of transport and are acceptable in all other respects including impact’. The objective is to reduce the need to travel and allow customers to undertake linked trips thus allowing new development to serve to reinforce the vitality and viability of the existing centre.

2.4 PPG13: Transport (2001) encourages more sustainable transport choices and promotes accessibility to jobs and shopping facilities by public transport, walking and cycling and aims to reduce the need to travel especially by car.

2.5 PPG15: “Planning and the Historic Environment” (1994) sets out Government policies for the identification and protection of historic buildings, conservation areas, and other elements of the historic environment. It explains the role played by the planning system in their protection.

2.6 PPG18: “Enforcing Planning Control” (1991) outlines the general approach to enforcement, including the primary responsibility of LPAs in the matter and the decisive issue of whether a breach of planning control would unacceptably affect public amenity or the existing use of land and buildings meriting protection in the public interest.

2.7 PPS25: “Development and Flood Risk” (2006) sets out Government policy on development and flood risk. Its aims are to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct development away from areas of highest risk. Where new development is, exceptionally, necessary in such areas, policy aims to make it safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, reducing flood risk overall.

For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.
3. PLANNING POLICIES

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live

3.1 East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)

Policies viewable at http://www.go-east.gov.uk then follow links to Planning, Regional Planning then Related Documents

- **ENG1**: “Carbon Dioxide Emissions and Energy Performance” – new developments should be located and designed to optimise carbon performance.
- **ENV6**: “The Historic Environment” - Within plans, policies, programmes and proposals local planning authorities and other agencies should identify, protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the historic environment of the region including Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings.
- **SS1**: “Achieving Sustainable Development” – the strategy seeks to bring about sustainable development by applying; the guiding principles of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 2005 and the elements contributing to the creation of sustainable communities described in Sustainable Communities: Homes for All.

3.2 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003)

Saved policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 are relevant and viewable at http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk follow the links to environment, planning, planning policy and Structure Plan 2003.

- None relevant.

3.3 Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)

Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

- **H30**: “Existing Residential Areas” – Planning permission will not normally be granted for the introduction of, or extension to, commercial uses or activities within existing residential areas where this would be likely to have a detrimental effect on amenities.
- **E7**: “Small Businesses” will normally be supported subject to environmental and traffic considerations.
- **E8**: “Small Scale Employment Generating Development” – will normally be permitted within defined environmental limits,
subject to: demonstrated employment need; likely impact on character, amenities and infrastructure.

- **E11**: “Expansion of Existing Firms” – will normally be allowed providing the scale and location of development does not conflict with other Local Plan policies.

- **E13**: “Industry, Warehousing or high technology and office developments” – will not be permitted where it would cause serious traffic noise or pollution problems or other damage to the environment.

- **En2**: “Character and setting of Listed Buildings” - indicates that any development involving or affecting a building of architectural or historic merit will need to have proper regard to the scale, form, design and setting of that building.

- **En5**: “Conservation Area Character” - development within or directly affecting conservation areas will be required to preserve or enhance their character and appearance.

- **En9**: “Conservation Areas” - development should not impair open spaces, trees, street scenes and views into and out of Conservation Areas.

- **S16**: “Local Shopping Facilities” – proposals for new shops or the partial conversion of existing buildings or dwellings within existing built up areas or in the villages will be considered on their individual merits.

- **S17**: “Retention of Existing Shopping Facilities in Villages” – will be supported and where necessary will encourage the dual or multi-use of commercial or other premises in order to secure some local shopping provision.

### 3.4 Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)

Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at [www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan) - Then click on "Local Plan Alteration (2002).

- None relevant.

### 3.5 Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009

Policies from the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at [http://www.huntsc.gov.uk](http://www.huntsc.gov.uk) click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning then click on Planning Policy and then click on Core Strategy where there is a link to the Adopted Core Strategy.

- **CS1**: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all developments will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered including design, implementation and function of development.
• **CS3**: “The Settlement Hierarchy” – Identifies Kimbolton as a ‘Key Service Centre’ and Stonely as a smaller settlement.

### 3.6 Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

- **E7** – Location of retail development: Minor retail developments within Market Towns, Key Service Centres and Smaller Settlements will be allowed where there is: i) no adverse impact on range of shopping in the settlement and ii) potential for maximising accessibility.

- **P10** – Flood Risk – development should: not take place in areas at risk from flooding, unless suitable mitigation/flood protection measures are agreed; not increase the risk of flooding to properties elsewhere; make use of sustainable drainage systems where feasible; be informed by a flood risk assessment where appropriate.

- **B4** – Amenity - developments should not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity of existing or future occupiers.

- **T1** – Transport Impacts - development proposals should be capable of being served by safe convenient access to the transport network and should not give rise to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the local transport network.

- **T2** – Car and Cycle Parking - development proposals should limit car parking and provide cycle parking facilities to the levels set out in the Council’s parking standards. Appendix One: sets out car parking requirements.

- **G2** – Landscape Character - development proposals should respect and respond appropriately to the distinctive qualities of the surrounding landscape

- **B7** – Listed Buildings - lists the criteria against which development proposal affecting the fabric or setting of a listed building should be assessed.

- **B8** – Conservation Areas - states the criteria against which developments within or affecting a Conservation Area should be assessed.

- **E8** – Retention of key local services and facilities: re loss of retail units in Key centres such as Kimbolton.
3.7 Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010

Policies from the Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning then click on Planning Policy and then Development Management DPD where there is a link to the Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010.

- **C1**: “Sustainable Design” – development proposals should take account of the predicted impact of climate change over the expected lifetime of the development.

- **Policy C5**: “Flood Risk and Water Management” – development proposals should include suitable flood protection / mitigation to not increase risk of flooding elsewhere. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where technically feasible. There should be no adverse impact on or risk to quantity or quality of water resources.

- **Policy E1**: “Development Context” – development proposals shall demonstrate consideration of the character and appearance of the surrounding environment and the potential impact of the proposal.

- **Policy E3**: “Heritage Assets” – proposals which affect the District’s heritage assets or their setting should demonstrate how these assets will be protected, conserved and where appropriate enhanced.

- **Policy E8**: “Sustainable Travel” – proposals must demonstrate how the scheme maximises opportunities for the use of sustainable travel modes, particularly walking, cycling and public transport.

- **Policy E10**: “Parking Provision” – car and cycle parking should accord with the levels and layout requirements set out in Appendix 1 ‘Parking Provision’. Adequate vehicle and cycle parking facilities shall be provided to serve the needs of the development.

- **Policy H7**: “Amenity” – development proposals should safeguard the living conditions for residents and people occupying adjoining or nearby properties.

- **Policy P2**: “Small businesses” – proposals for minor development of industrial uses will be considered favourably subject to environmental and travel considerations.

- **Policy P5**: “Local Shopping and Services” – seeks to support the provision of local shopping and other town centre uses as defined in PPS4, within existing built up areas of Key Service Centres, Smaller Settlements and predominantly neighbourhood centres of Market Towns, subject to environmental, safety and amenity considerations where it can be demonstrated that the proposal is directly related to the role
and function of the locality; contributes towards the provision of a safe environment and would enhance the existing provision.

- **Appendix 1**: Parking provision suggests:
  - The authorised B1 use 57m² generates a requirement for up to 2 car spaces and a minimum of 2 cycle spaces.
  - The proposed uses generate a total requirement of up to 2/4 car spaces and a minimum of 2/4 cycle spaces based on 20.8sqm of A1 (non-food) use, which generates a requirement for up to 1/2 car spaces and a minimum of 1 cycle space and 36sqm of B1 use, which generates a requirement for up to 1/2 car spaces and a minimum of 1/2 cycle spaces.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**


4.2 901057FUL: change of use to office and studio permitted 1994.


4.4 0001933FUL: continued use as milk depot given permanent planning permission on 10th January 2001.

4.5 04000316FUL: In 2004, the applicants proposed that the unit would be connected to their 'existing framing and art shop' at 18 High Street, Kimbolton e.g. orders to be taken from High Street, as well as the internet and post. 2 members of staff were to be employed.

4.6 Permitted hours of activity are 8am-19.00 hours Monday-Saturday and excluding Bank Holidays and Sundays. Deliveries are restricted to 7am-19.00 hours.

4.7 At the time of the officer site visit in January 2010, it was noted that 18 High Street was not used for framing and, although some retailing of framed pictures, sourced from the site the subject of the current application took place, other items were predominantly being sold such as gifts, cards and chocolates.

4.8 0901186FUL: An application to change the use of a mixed retail and residential unit at 18 High Street, Kimbolton to a dwelling was withdrawn.

5. **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 Kimbolton and Stonely Parish Council - Recommend APPROVAL (copy attached).

5.2 Cambridgeshire County Council Transportation - Any response will be reported to Panel.
5.3 **Cambridgeshire County Council Footpaths Officer** – Any response will be reported to Panel.

5.4 **Environment Agency** – NO OBJECTIONS.

6. **REPRESENTATIONS**

6.1 None received to date: any response will be reported to Panel.

7. **SUMMARY OF ISSUES**

7.1 The main issues are the principle of permitting retailing of pictures, photographs, posters and paintings from a picture framing unit in this location, in terms of sustainability/generating motor journeys, the impact on the local centre of Kimbolton and the impact on residential amenity, the adequacy of the parking provision, the impact on highway safety, the character and appearance of Stonely Conservation Area and the setting of Kimbolton Conservation Area and the setting of the nearby listed buildings and the flood implications.

The principle of permitting retailing in this location

7.2 The reason quoted for preventing sales with condition 6 is policy S10 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995. This policy aims to maintain and enhance the vitality of the established town centres, by maintaining an appropriate mix of uses in established town centres. Whilst Kimbolton is a key centre and not a town centre, it does offer a range of facilities expected of a larger settlement. The Council seeks to retain existing shops in centres such as Kimbolton and generally discourages retailing in the more isolated locations such as Park Lane in order to:

- maintain retailing in the most accessible locations, such as the centre of High Street, Kimbolton, where there is a chance of multi-trip journeys and to
- minimise motor journeys in accordance with policies ENG1 and CS1.

7.3 It is accepted that Policy P5 and other policies seek to promote Town Centre uses within Key Service Centres and Smaller Settlements, however, this site is considered to fall outside the built form of either Kimbolton or Stonely and as such would constitute a retail development in the open countryside.

7.4 Since 2004, when the last application was approved, guidance and policies have continued to seek to restrict motor journeys and steer most development into less isolated locations.

7.5 It is relevant to note that when 0400316FUL was permitted, the B1 picture framing use was intended to support the retail use at the applicants existing shop in High Street, Kimbolton and that the applicants have recently sought to change the use of the retail element of that property to residential. Although there was no condition to require the two properties to remain inter-related, it is considered that to approve the retail use at Stonely is likely to make it
more likely that there will be further pressure for the change of use of the retail unit in Kimbolton contrary to the aims of Policy S17.

7.6 The statement accompanying the application advises that although the applicants propose to ‘concentrate’ on the internet trade, the current proposal is to allow the public to visit the site. However, the applicants advised the case officer, that they had limited internet trade and found the main contacts were word of mouth and over-the-shop-threshold.

7.7 The Applicants have suggested verbally that the nature of the goods and service they provide (where a customer is likely to wish to see the range of products, such as frames and mounts, available in order to make a selection) means that it is most practicable for customers to visit the workshop, where the full range of materials is accessible. It is also acknowledged that a shop premises in a central location is more likely to be more expensive to rent/acquire than an out of town location. However, other picture shops and framers are often found in, and are suitable for, key centre and town centre locations.

7.8 Additionally, to approve the application would increase the number of motor journeys beyond those generated by the authorised use. Permitting a retail use in a rural location would be likely to set an unfortunate precedent for other retailing in unsustainable rural locations and, as stated above, may also encourage the applicants to apply again to change the use of their retail unit in Kimbolton to residential, thus potentially harming the viability and vitality of the centre, contrary to the policies and guidance.

7.9 The application as submitted is considered to be contrary to Development Plan policies in which we seek to restrict retail uses to core centres and thereby restrict retailing in more isolated settings. Full regard has been given to the applicants’ opinions such as, the proposal is not for retailing of items other than those specified in the application and that the proposal would not impact on the retention of other retail units. However, it is evident that an alternative facility is available to the applicants within Kimbolton High Street, which could serve their purpose. A refusal would be in accordance with PPS4, which assesses alternative sites in respect of availability, suitability and viability. Clearly No. 18 High Street meets these tests. Accordingly, the principle of the proposed retail use at this site is considered to be unacceptable.

Residential amenity

7.10 The permission for the Class B1 (picture framers) use was granted on the basis that the business would not generate undue noise disturbance or harm to the amenities of the residents in the area, particularly since the hours of operation were restricted.

7.11 Retailing would be likely to increase the traffic and activity at the site above that generated by the modest authorised B1 use. However, it is anticipated that the small floor area and scope for limiting the goods sold to those specified in the application, as opposed to groceries for example, and repeating the hours of operation condition would mean that no undue disturbance or loss of amenity to the nearby residents would ensue. It is anticipated that customers are likely to use the
adjacent access to the residential property to the south-west for turning in Park Lane but this is unlikely to cause significant disturbance to the residents outside of reasonable hours.

7.12 The proposal would therefore be consistent with the provisions of policies H30 of the Local Plan 1995 and H7 of the Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010.

**Adequacy of parking and the impact on highway safety**

7.13 When the permission 0400316FUL was granted, it did not require the provision of on-site parking. However, a space for a car, albeit without a full dropped kerb is available on the forecourt.

7.14 The proposal is likely to increase the customers visiting the site compared to the authorised B1 use. The proposal is therefore likely to exacerbate on-street parking. Although the advice of CCC Highways is awaited, it is anticipated that the on-street parking in the classified road and the lack of a convenient turning space, would not be to the serious detriment of highway safety. If the application were to be approved, it would, however, be reasonable to seek the provision of a dropped kerb for the parking space within a specified timescale and to consider securing a cycle rack on the forecourt.

**Impact on character and appearance**

7.15 The proposal entails no physical changes to the building, which already has shop windows.

7.16 The proposed use is consistent with the provisions of Policy En5, En6 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995.

**Flooding**

7.17 There is no objection to the proposal in terms of flood implications and this has been confirmed by the Environment Agency.

**Conclusion**

7.18 In conclusion, the proposal would result in the provision of a retail use in an unsustainable location where most customers are likely to have to travel by motor vehicle, with customers unlikely to be able to undertake linked trips, and the proposal would, unlike a location in the applicants’ existing shop in the nearby key centre, Kimbolton, not serve to reinforce the vitality and viability of the existing centre. Additionally, the applicants have not assessed the availability of other more suitable locations for this proposed use.

7.19 The proposal is therefore contrary to PPS1, PPS4, PPG13, and to policies SS1 of the East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008) as the proposal fails to maximise the potential for people to form more sustainable relationships between their homes and concentrations of regularly used services and facilities and the means of travel between them; Policy ENG1, as the location does not optimise its carbon performance since the probability is that most customers would have to travel by motor vehicle to the site; and Policy S2 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan.
1995 and policy CS1 of the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 as the proposal does not minimise the need to travel. Furthermore, the proposal appears to have potential to conflict with the aims of Policy S17 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 as it may contribute to pressure for the loss of the applicants’ retail unit at 18 High Street Kimbolton.

7.20 In light of the above, it is recommended that the application should be refused.

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs.

8. RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE for the following reason:

8.1 The proposal would result in the provision of a retail use in an unsustainable location where most customers are likely to have to travel by motor vehicle, with customers unlikely to be able undertake linked trips, unlike a location in the applicants’ existing shop in the nearby key centre, Kimbolton. As such the proposed use would not serve to reinforce the vitality and viability of the existing centre. Additionally, the applicants have failed to provide an assessment of other more suitable and available sites within the locality.

The proposal is therefore contrary to PPS1, PPS4, PPG13 and to policies SS1 of the East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008) as the proposal fails to maximise the potential for people to form more sustainable relationships between their homes and concentrations of regularly used services and facilities and the means of travel between them; Policy ENG1, as the location does not optimise its carbon performance since the probability is that most customers would have to travel by motor vehicle to the site; and Policy S2 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 and policy CS1 of the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 as the proposal does not minimise the need to travel. Furthermore, the proposal appears to have potential to conflict with the aims of Policy S17 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 as it may contribute to pressure for the loss of the applicants’ retail unit at 18 High Street Kimbolton.

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Planning Application File Reference: 0901664S73, 0400316FUL.
East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)
Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995
Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007
Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009
Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010

CONTACT OFFICER:
Enquiries about this report to Sheila Lindsay Development Management Officer 01480 388247
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RECOMMENDATION - APPROVE

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 This site is located within the existing linear row of properties that extend along the western side of Herne Road, within the built up area of Ramsey St Marys. It is the former side garden of no. 131 and benefits from extant planning permission for a single storey bungalow, which was granted in April 2008, but has not been implemented. The site is generally flat and has been cleared of any features and has been subdivided from No. 131 by a close boarded timber fence. A dwarf wall marks the front boundary. The site is situated within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and a Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted.

1.2 The proposal is for the erection of a pair of two storey semi detached dwellings that would be sited towards the front of the site and midway between the front elevations of the adjacent dwellings. The dwellings would be gabled in form, with a single storey wing projecting centrally from the rear elevation. They would cover a footprint that measures approximately 9.5 metres and 6 metres. The height to the eaves would be approximately 4.8 metres and the ridge approximately 6.9 metres. The external walls would be constructed from buff brick with the roof covered in natural slate, and softwood windows. Separate vehicle accesses off the B1040 are proposed, with driveways surfaced in gravel and leading to the proposed garages at the rear of the site.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE

2.1 PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (2005) contains advice on the operation of the plan-led system.
2.2 **PPS3 – ‘Housing’ (2006)** sets out how the planning system supports the growth of housing completions needed in England.

2.3 **PPS25 – Development and Flood Risk (2006)** sets out Government policy on development and flood risk. Its aims are to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct development away from areas of highest risk. Where new development is, exceptionally, necessary in such areas, policy aims to make it safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, reducing flood risk overall.

For full details visit the government website http://www.communities.gov.uk and follow the links to planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Policy.

3. **PLANNING POLICIES**

Further information on the role of planning policies in deciding planning applications can also be found at the following website: http://www.communities.gov.uk then follow links Planning, Building and Environment, Planning, Planning Information and Guidance, Planning Guidance and Advice and then Creating and Better Place to Live

3.1 **East of England Plan - Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008)**

Policies viewable at http://www.go-east.gov.uk then follow links to Planning, Regional Planning then Related Documents

- **ENV7** – Quality in the Built Environment – requires new development to be of a high quality which complements the distinctive character and best qualities of the local area and promotes urban renaissance and regeneration

3.2 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003)**

Saved policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 are relevant and viewable at http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk follow the links to environment, planning, planning policy and Structure Plan 2003.

- None relevant

3.3 **Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)**

Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan95

- **En25**: “General Design Criteria” – indicates that the District Council will expect new development to respect the scale, form, materials and design of established buildings in the locality and make provision for landscaping and amenity areas.
• **En20**: landscape scheme – wherever appropriate a development will be subject to the conditions requiring the execution of a landscaping scheme.

• **H31**: “Residential privacy and amenity standards” – indicates that new dwellings will only be permitted where appropriate standards of privacy can be maintained and adequate parking provided.

• **H32**: “Sub-division of large curtilages” states that support will be offered only where the resultant dwelling and its curtilage are of a size and form sympathetic to the locality.

• **CS8**: “water” – satisfactory arrangement for the availability of water supply, sewerage and sewage disposal facilities, surface water runoff facilities and provision for land drainage will be required.

3.4 **Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)**

Saved policies from the Huntingdon Local Plan Alterations 2002 are relevant and viewable at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/localplan - Then click on “Local Plan Alteration (2002)

• **HL5** – Quality and density of development – sets out the criteria to take into account in assessing whether a proposal represents a good design and layout.

3.5 **Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009**

Policies from the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning then click on Planning then click on Planning Policy and then click on Core Strategy where there is a link to the Adopted Core Strategy.

• **CS1**: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all development will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered, including design, implementation and function of development.

• **CS3**: “The Settlement Hierarchy” – Identifies Ramsey St Marys as a smaller settlement where residential infilling will be appropriate within the built up area.

3.6 **Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007**

Policies from the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007 are relevant and viewable at http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk click on Environment and Planning, then Planning then Planning+Policy then Informal policy statements where there is a link to Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007
• **B1** – Design Quality – development should demonstrate a high quality of design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character of the area.

• **B4** – Amenity – developments should not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing and future occupiers.

• **P10** – Flood Risk. Development should not take place in areas of flooding or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Flood risk assessments are required where appropriate. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate.

• **T1** – Transport Impacts – development proposals should be capable of being served by safe convenient access to the transport network and should not give rise to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the local transport network.

• **T2** – Car and Cycle Parking – development proposals should limit car parking and provide cycle parking facilities to the levels set out in the Council’s parking standards.

3.7 *Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD 2007 parts 2 and 4* are also relevant.

### 4. PLANNING HISTORY


### 5. CONSULTATIONS

5.1 *Ramsey TC* – recommend **REFUSAL**, because of overdevelopment of the site (*copy attached*).

5.2 *CCC Highways* – **NO OBJECTION**, subject to conditions.

5.3 *HDC Projects Officer* – **NO OBJECTION** with respect to flood risk.

5.4 *Middle Level Commissioners* – advise that the use of soakaways may not be effective and that further information is required to prove that the surface water system will work effectively in the long term. The requirements of the Land Drainage Act should be complied with.

### 6. REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 Occupier of the adjacent property No. 123 Herne Road has no objection to the proposal but draws attention to the following points:

• Laurel hedge on the southern boundary referred to in the Design & Access statement has been removed.

• Site Survey drawing does not accurately reflect the configuration of the ditch along the southern boundary. This boundary has been partially fenced, but should continue to the western extent of the site along the south side of the ditch.
The proposal appears to conform to the general appearance and feel of the area.

7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

7.1 The main issues to consider are whether the principle of the development is acceptable, whether it would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene, whether it would be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, whether it would be detrimental to highway safety, and whether it would be subject to an unacceptable risk of flooding.

Principle

7.2 Ramsey St Marys is defined as a smaller settlement by policy CS3 of the Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009, where residential infilling of up to 3 dwellings will be acceptable within the built form of the village. This site, being situated within the continuous linear row of built development that extends through Ramsey St Marys, along the western side of Herne Road, is considered to be within the built up area of the village, and as such, the principle of the development is acceptable subject to other material considerations. It is also noted that the site benefits from extant planning permission for a dwelling which could be implemented.

Visual amenity

7.3 There is considerable variance in architectural styles between the existing dwellings along Herne Road, which is reflected by the flanking dwellings. In this context, the design of the proposed dwellings does not need to conform to any particular style, but it nevertheless reflects the simple gabled form of the terrace to the south, and it is considered to be well proportioned and broadly in keeping with the scale of the existing dwellings within the locality. The position of the proposed dwellings - mid way between the two flanking dwellings - would form a gradual step in the building lines, and would enable the proposal to integrate well into the street scene. Sufficient open space would be provided around the proposed dwellings to prevent them from appearing cramped or hemmed in.

7.4 Traditional style detailing, such as around the eaves, arches above openings and chimney stacks, that add visual interest and contribute to a high standard of overall design are proposed. The proposed garages are suitably modest in scale and set back within the site. The proposed materials for the proposed dwellings and garages are considered to be acceptable and would be secured by condition. Despite raising the finished floor level by 300mm above existing ground level to mitigate against flood risk, the ridgeline of the proposed dwellings would not be unduly high in comparison to the flanking terrace. Landscaping to enhance the appearance of the site would be secured by condition.
For these reasons, the proposed dwellings would not be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene in accordance with policy En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policy HL5 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration 2002 and policy B1 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007.

**Neighbour amenities**

The proposed dwellings would not have an overbearing relationship or result in an unacceptable loss of light to the adjacent properties, because of the space around the dwellings and distances of separation from the flanking properties. The position of window openings would not lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring properties through overlooking. For these reasons the proposal would not be detrimental to neighbour amenities in accordance with policy H31 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 and policy B4 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007.

**Highway safety**

Given the length of the driveways, parking provision is likely to exceed the maximum parking standard of 2 spaces per dwelling, as set out in the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007. However reducing parking provision would not be desirable in terms of design and the parking area also contributes to providing workable on-site turning space. The speed limit along Herne Road at this location is posted at 30mph, and appropriate visibility can be achieved. Conditions would secure parking and surfacing of the proposed accesses. For these reasons the proposal would not be significantly detrimental to highway safety and as such it would be consistent with policy H31 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995 and policies T1 and T2 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007.

There is a street lighting column (No. CCC15) within the footway and outside of the site, but this would not require relocating to provide vehicle accesses.

**Flood Risk**

Setting the finished floor level at 300mm above existing ground level is considered to be satisfactory mitigation against flood risk. A satisfactory means of surface water disposal will be secured by condition. For these reasons the proposal would not be subject to an unacceptable risk of flooding and it would not significantly increase flood risk within the wider catchment in accordance with policy P10 of the Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007.

**Other issues**

The neighbour’s comments regarding the boundaries have been relayed to the applicant’s agent, who confirmed that the submitted drawings are correct and the ditch is in the applicants land ownership.
8. **RECOMMENDATION – APPROVE**, subject to conditions to include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02003</td>
<td>Time Limit (3yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstand</td>
<td>Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstand</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstand</td>
<td>Parking and turning area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04003</td>
<td>Surface water only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstand</td>
<td>Finished Floor Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background Papers:**

- Planning Application File Reference: 0901235FUL
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003
- Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995
- Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration, 2002
- Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2009
- Huntingdonshire Interim Planning Policy Statement 2007

**CONTACT OFFICER:**

Enquiries about this report to **Mr Gavin Sylvester Assistant Development Management Officer 01480 387070**
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DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL

February 2010

APPEAL DECISIONS
(Report by Planning Services Manager (Development Management))

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

1. **Appellant:** BSV Construction
   **Agent:** Alison Harker

   Erection of two dwellings
   9 and 11 Parkway
   St Ives

   **Dismissed**
   **14.12.09**

2. **Appellant:** Mrs Taylor
   **Agent:** Barker Storey Matthews

   Erection of dwelling
   Tennis Court
   Hemingford Grey House
   Church Street
   Hemingford Grey

   **Dismissed**
   **14.12.09**

3. **Appellant:** Mr D King
   **Agent:** R West

   Erection of new dwelling
   35 and 35A High street
   Stilton

   **Dismissed**
   **14.12.09**

4. **Appellant:** Great Oak Holdings Ltd
   **Agent:** Barker Storey Matthews

   24 Elton Road
   Wansford

   **Dismissed**
   **18.12.09**

5. **Appellant:** Mrs Beard and Miss Beard
   **Agent:** Andrew S Campbell Associates

   **Appeal ‘A’** Alterations and extension to form new dwelling, access and parking
   **Appeal ‘B’** Alterations and extension to form new dwelling, access, parking and garaging

   28 and 30 Kisby Avenue
   Godmanchester

   **Both Appeals Dismissed**
   **14.01.10**
WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

1. 0900162FUL  Erection of two dwellings
     9 and 11 Parkway
     St Ives
     BSV Construction Ltd

Planning permission was refused under delegation agreement in accordance with the recommendation of the Town Council for the following reason:

1. The development would result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjoining residential properties by reason of increased loss of privacy, increased noise and disturbance and overbearing impact contrary to Policies H31 and H35 of the Local Plan 1995 and B4 of the HIPPS 2007.

The Inspector's Reasons

- Access to the dwellings would be between houses 9 and 11. The Inspector considered that no. 9 would suffer harm from the noise of passing cars. Both houses would be unacceptably disturbed by the manoeuvring of vehicles close to their small but private area at the rear. In addition, there would be a sense of intrusion arising from the potential for peering down into gardens from the windows of the main bedrooms at the front of the proposed dwellings. The Inspector thought that she may have found differently if only one of these adverse impacts would arise but in combination they render these two–storey dwellings unacceptable.

The appeal was dismissed.

The link to this planning application in Public Access is:

2 0900581FUL  Erection of a dwelling
     Tennis Courts
     Hemingford Grey House
     Church Street
     Hemingford Grey
     Mrs T Taylor

Planning permission was refused under delegation agreement in accordance with the recommendation of the Parish Council for the following reason:

1. The proposed development does not constitute an appropriate or sensitive form of infill development and is therefore detrimental to the character and appearance of the locality, contrary to Policy HL8 of the HLP Alteration 2002.

2. The site is outside of the built up area of Hemingford Grey and in the open countryside where new housing will be restricted to that which is essential for agriculture or other exempted categories. The proposal does not fall within any of these exemptions and is contrary to HIPPS 2007, and Policy CS3 of the SCS 2009.

3. The position of the proposed dwelling within the grounds of the grade II* listed Hemingford Grey House would significantly erode the setting and historic interest of the grounds of the listed building that make a
significant contribution to the Conservation Area. The modern design would not be in keeping with, or provide a successful contrast to, the form, materials and details that are characteristic of the historic and architectural quality of this part of the Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve the setting of the grade II* listed building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and is contrary to PPG15, Development Plan Policy, HIPPS 2007 and SCS 2009.

4. The loss of the sycamore trees would create a gap in the continuity of the substantial tree cover in the area which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and as such the proposal would be contrary to Development Plan Policy and the HIPPS 2007.

The Inspector's Reasons

- The Inspector considered that the high wall that divides the appeal site is seen as clearly signalling the change in character from the open meadows to the edge of the village. She considered that whilst part of the appeal site should be considered part of the built up area, part of the appeal site to its north east should not and residential use would be contrary to current policy. The house would extend into open land, it would be seen from the public footpath and glimpsed from the river.

- The listed building is about 100m from the appeal site and separated by a variety of trees and hedging, these would ensure that even the upper part of the house is unlikely to be seen from the main house and any glimpses would have no significant effect on either the special architectural or historic interest of the house or on its setting. However, a substantial part of the historic wall would be lost and not replaced. The wall contributes positively to the special interest of the principal house and is the last remaining element of the walled garden. The Inspector found that this loss would harm the special interest and setting of the listed building and its contribution to the Hemingfords Conservation area.

- The loss of mature sycamores would have a modest, harmful impact in the short term on this part of the Conservation Area but the character of the Conservation Area as a whole would be preserved subject to imposition of a condition requiring replanting.

- The Inspector saw houses in Madeley Court are all of varied appearances, the only common theme being their spacious plots. The appeal site is a considerable distance from the listed building and well screened from it. None of the vernacular building types shown in the Conservation Area Character Assessment is close to the appeal site. The Inspector could see no reason to prescribe a particular style or design here. She considered it an acceptable complement to other dwellings nearby and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as a whole.

The appeal was dismissed.

The link to this planning application in Public Access is:
3. 0900887FUL  
Erection of a new dwelling  
Between 35 and 35A High Street  
Stilton  
Mr D King

Planning permission was refused under delegation agreement, the Parish Council made no observations. The reason for refusal was as follows:-

1. The design of the proposed dwelling with its relatively wide forward projecting gable, integral garage and random arrangement of window/door openings would result in the front elevation of the dwelling appearing poorly proportioned, overly complicated and unbalanced. It would therefore be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene and as such is contrary to Development Plan Policy, HIPPS 2007.

The Inspector's Reasons

- The Inspector found that whilst the LPA has no objections in principle to the development of this side garden land, that given the very different appearance of the modern detached house at No. 35a High Street and the late C19/early C20 short terrace of cottages abutting the footway, the design of an "infill" dwelling here needs particular care. She found the width of the projecting gable is disproportionate to the rest of the dwelling and the integral garage would have undue emphasis in the overall composition.

The appeal was dismissed.

The link to this planning application in Public Access is:  

4. 0900186FUL  
Change of use from builders yard and  
Erection of a detached dwelling  
24 Elton Road  
Wansford  
Barker Storey Matthews

Planning permission was refused by Development Management Panel at its meeting held on 15 June 2009 in accordance with officer advice but contrary to the recommendation of the Parish Council for the following reasons:

1. Notwithstanding the presence of semi-derelict buildings on the site, the site is considered to be outside of the built-up area of the settlement. The proposal would be contrary to Development Plan Policy and to the SCS 2009.

2. The proposal would be detrimental to the open character of the site which is an important part of the transition between the built-up village and the surrounding countryside and River Nene. As such its development in the manner proposed would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of
The Inspector’s Reasons

- The Inspector noted that the emerging Huntingdonshire Submission Core Strategy has been examined and was adopted by the Council in September 2009. It supersedes the environmental limits defined in the HLP alteration 2002 and she dealt with the appeal on this basis.

- The appeal site is located behind a number of small terraced cottages which front onto the road and are listed buildings. It also lies within the Conservation Area. The Inspector found that the site is beyond the ‘built-up area’ of Wansford and would not constitute infilling because of the open, undeveloped nature of the land to the south. The large footprint of the building and its overall mass would result in a harmful incursion into this area of land.

- Extensive views of the dwelling would be afforded from the public footpaths on the opposite side of the river, which are within the Conservation Area. The Inspector considered that the impact of the proposed dwelling and its domestic curtilage would be much greater and have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- Historically, the appeal site formed garden/allotments to the listed terrace of cottages with enclosed rear yard areas. Views of the terrace are available from the other side of the River Nene. The proposed dwelling would block these views to a far greater degree than the current smaller buildings. In addition, the proposed dwelling would become the dominant feature and thus detract from the small simple listed buildings. Therefore, in the Inspector’s opinion the proposed dwelling would unduly harm the setting of the listed buildings.

The appeal was dismissed.

The link to this planning application in Public Access is:

5. 0900058FUL ‘A’  Extension and alterations to form new Dwelling, access and parking
     0900926FUL ‘B’  Extension and alterations to form new dwelling, access, parking and garaging
     28 and 30 Kisby Avenue
     Godmanchester
     Mrs Beard and Miss Beard

Appeal ‘A’ was determined by Development Management Panel at its meeting held on 16 March 2009 contrary to recommendation of Town Council. Appeal ‘B’ was refused under delegation agreement in accordance with the recommendation of the Town Council. Both applications were refused for the following reason:

1. The siting, design and layout of the new dwelling, associated cycle and refuse stores will result in a visually cluttered appearance that will be
dominant within the street scene and out of keeping with the scale and form of the buildings in the locality. This overdevelopment would be contrary to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Development Plan Policy, HIPPS 2007 and Huntingdonshire Design Guide (2007).

The Inspector’s Reasons (Appeals ‘A’ and ‘B’)

- The site is adjacent to an existing semi-detached house and, in both appeals, the proposed new dwelling would take the form of an extension to the side of the existing building of No 28 up to the boundary of the adjoining property, No 30.

Appeal ‘A’

- The Inspector considered that the two front doors adjacent to each other would clearly define that this is a new house and not an extension, with the narrow front not reflecting the character and appearance of other dwellings in the area. The long unrelieved side elevation, would be prominent in views from the road and the two bin stores within the front gardens would intrude into the pleasant open front garden character that is typical of the area. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would lead to an overall form of development that would not reflect the character or appearance of the area.

Appeal ‘B’

- A revised proposal was submitted that included a revised front elevation with the placing of the front door in a side position. Both garages for No’s 28 and 30 would be demolished and a new garage for No 30 would be erected alongside the new side elevation. The Inspector considered that the revised side elevation with additional windows and garage for No 30 would overcome his concerns in respect of the long unrelieved elevation in Appeal A, but as with Appeal A, he considered that the proposed narrow house would not reflect the form and nature of development in the locality. In addition, the locking cycle frame, would prevent adequate access to the front door, the double bin store to cater for the six large waste bins would be a dominant feature on the frontage within a garden that would contain little landscaping because of the provision of three parking spaces. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would lead to a form of development of cluttered and contrived appearance that would not reflect the character or appearance of the area.

The appeals were dismissed.

The link to this planning application in Public Access is: http://planning.huntsdc.gov.uk/publicaccess/tdc/DcApplication/application_detailview.aspx?caseno=IU9IJ9IKS0000

Background Papers:
Relevant Appeal Files

CONTACT OFFICER - enquiries about this Report to Mrs J Holland, Administrative Officer, ☎ 01480 388418.
FORTHCOMING APPEALS

Informal Hearing

30 March 2010        New Farm, Alconbury Weston
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Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL – 22 February 2010

I attach changes that have been made to the agenda for your information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item No.</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Amendment Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1(a)</td>
<td>Development of an urban extension comprising up to 5350 residential dwellings; a district centre (with up to 9200 square metres (99031 square feet) retail floor space) and two neighbourhood centres (with up to 2300 square metres (24758 square feet) retail floor space) comprising district/neighbourhood retail (A1-A5); community and health (C2, D1); leisure(D2); residential (C3) and commercial (B1) uses. Provision for education facilities (sites for three primary and one secondary school); sports and recreational facilities; site for 5 gypsy and traveller pitches; a range of strategic open spaces including new landscaping, woodland and allotments; and cemetery provision. Associated highway infrastructure (including pedestrian, bridleway and cycle routes), public transport infrastructure and car parking for all uses. Utilities and renewable energy infrastructure; foul and surface water drainage.</td>
<td>Additional information submitted by the applicants agents attached as word document above. Letters from Yaxley Parish Council giving their comments attached as PDF’s above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
networks (including SuDS and lakes), land to the north of Norman Cross, East of the A1(M) and west of London Road (A15), Peterborough.

3.2(b) Outline Application For Residential Development of up to 21 Dwellings Car Park Cromwell Road Eynesbury St Neots

Paragraph 7.9 of the report should refer to dwellings of 2 or more bedrooms and not over 2 bedrooms.

Paragraph 7.10 of the report should refer to £11672.78 for the off site maintenance contribution and not £1162.78.

Additional Information Relating To Car Parking

Application site – 194 spaces

Car park 1 – 145 spaces

Car Park 2 at Clifton House – 131 spaces – 110 staff work at this building and 70% arrive by car.

Sealed Air employ 353 staff – 109 work 9-5; and 244 on varying 12 hour shift patterns (5 shift groups) which means 27 shift workers at any one time.

Demand estimate of 136 staff car parking spaces, assuming all staff drive – as 70% drive this demand is reduced to approximately 102. Also estimate demand for 10 visitor spaces.

Therefore total demand for car parking spaces is 112.

276 spaces left in remaining 2 car parks.

3.2(a) Use of converted outbuilding as separate residential unit term holidays lettings. The Potton, Hilton

Corrections to report:

- There is not a garage in the ownership of No 2 Potton Road adjacent to the common boundary as stated in paragraphs 1.1 and 7.4 of the report, but it is still considered that the proposal would not have a significant effect on the occupiers of
neighbouring properties.

- The recommendation is APPROVE, subject to the prior completion of a S.106 obligation requiring the building to be retained in the same ownership as The Cottage and to conditions to include those listed in the report.

3.3(b) Substitution of house types for existing approved development – land at and including 6, 8 and 8A High Street Somersham.

Letter from applicant – confirm their acceptance that the previously agreed Unilateral Planning Obligation made in respect of planning permission 0802035FUL will be carried forward and will apply to the amended proposal, ref no 0901526FUL.

3.3(c) Change of use of ground floor of shop to hot food takeaway (A5 use class) and restaurant/cafe (A3 use class), and installation of extractor fan duct in the form of a mock brick clad chimney on the roof of the rear outbuilding, 4 Church Street, Stilton

Corrections to report:

- The first sentence of paragraph 1.1 should state “These applications relate …” (not “The application relates …”)
- The fourth bullet point of paragraph 7.18 should state “would not be unduly detrimental to neighbour amenities …” (not “would be unduly detrimental to neighbour amenities …”)

Third party representation received from the occupier of 4 Mondela Place, Stilton, objecting to the application on the grounds that the proposal will:

- worsen existing problems with car parking along Church Street, access for public service and emergency vehicles, and access to Mondela Place.
- dramatically increase existing noise, odour and litter problems.

3.3(f) Erection of 4 Apartments 21 High Street Buckden

A letter has been received from the applicant’s agent giving additional information about the previous and proposed buildings, and including photographs of development in the surrounding area to support his case.

3.3 (g) Erection of three

- Please see the attached
| 3.3(i) | Erection of ancillary golf chalets accommodation block, Fairways Lodge, Cambridge Road, Hemingford Abbots | Letter from agent: points out that other golf clubs in the area have accommodation on their sites and are comparable to this proposal. Additional commercial facilities have been approved on the adjoining golf driving range, illustrating the fact that the Council continues to grant planning permission for ancillary facilities to support existing businesses in this location. |
| 3.3 (j) | Variation of condition 3 of planning permission 0400316FUL to permit B1 use (pictures, photographs, posters and paintings) sales counter. Variation of condition 6 to allow the sale of picture frames, pictures and posters. Milk Depot, Park Lane, Stonely, St Neots, | The application has been WITHDRAWN by the applicant. |

Yours sincerely,

Steve Ingram  
Head of Planning Services  
Environment and Community Services
Dear Nigel

GREAT HADDON: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL 22 FEBRUARY 2010

We note the planning application for the Great Haddon urban extension is to be considered at Huntingdonshire District Council’s Development Management Panel on 22 February 2010.

Having read your Report we consider it would be helpful to Members if they received a copy of an article which will appear in the Yaxley Gazette on 26 February 2010. The article has been prepared by David Lock Associates (DLA), in response to the consultation already undertaken with the residents of Yaxley by Peterborough City Council, to explain in a little more detail the implications of the proposed bus gate along the A15.

Therefore I would be grateful if you would forward the article to Members as a late representation in time for Monday’s meeting. I enclose x20 copies for distribution. Heather Pugh a Director of DLA is also registered to speak on Monday when she will provide further comment on the other issues raised in your report.

Please call me if you require any further information or clarification at this stage.

Kind regards

Yours sincerely

JENNIFER THOMAS
Principal Planner

Email jthomas@davidlock.com

01908 666276
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25th January 2010

Your Ref: North Team Consultation/NS

Huntingdon District Council
Planning Services Manager
Huntingdon District Council
Pathfinder House
St Mary’s Street
Huntingdon PE29 3TN

Dear Sirs

Parish Council comments to District Council on Neighbouring Application – Land to the North of Norman Cross, East of the A1(M) and West of London Road (A15) Peterborough

We thank you for letter of the 7th January 2010. Following the open day on the 7th January 2010 held at Queen’s Park it would seem that a campaign has been started against the planned closure of the A15 London Road out of Yaxley. The plan is to make this a bus route and take the traffic around the back of Yaxley effectively creating a bypass. A local resident called Adrian Watt has written to every house in the village and sent out a ballot sheet asking for residents to vote for or against the development.

The Parish Council has also been bombarded with emails and letters with regard to the development and the proposed road closure. As you can appreciate the Parish Council are here to represent their parishioners and therefore we propose that further consultation should take place bearing in mind the obvious strong feeling towards this development by our parishioners.

We have written to Peterborough City Council as asked if an urgent review of the plans could take place with a further period of public consultation.

Obviously as you are attending a consultation on the 22nd February 2010 it would be helpful if you could pass on our parishioner’s views. If it would assist I could send a copy of every email and letter we have received. I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

Lesley Tibble
Parish Clerk for and on behalf of Yaxley Parish Council
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Your Ref: North Team consultations/NS

Nigel Swaby
Planning Services Manager
(Development Management)
Pathfinder House
St Mary's Street
Huntingdon
PE29 3TN

Dear Sir

Parish Council Comments to District Council on Neighbouring Application
Land to the North of Norman Cross, East of the A1(M) and West of London Road (A15)

The Finance and General Purpose committee have been studying the current application for Great Haddon and have met with our three District Council members, the Developers David Lock Associates, Huntingdon District Council Officers Richard Probyn and Nigel Swaby, Peterborough City Council officers Lee Collins and Vicki Hurrell and lastly but not least members of our Community.

We consider the report submitted to the Development Management Panel dated 22nd February 2010 to be a well considered report and one with which we agree totally.

However, we would like to add that we have been involved with the “Brick Pit” development since its conception and have always been promised a viable bypass on the western edge of our Parish. This promise was converted into a Section 106 agreement (S-26/S-27) but like so many Section 106 agreements the nitty gritty is in the interpretation. We now have the developers using the terminology Western Peripheral/Yaxley Bypass (next they will say A1M/Yaxley Bypass) and now they have submitted an estate road as a bypass.

Shortly we will have to start taking southern flowing traffic from Hampton Leys (some 3,400 houses) on the East of the A15 and there are already two junctions from Hampton Hargate on the West side of the A15 which then makes an attractive option to use the A15 to access the A1M South.

We need an easy attractive to use bypass to take traffic away from the historic London Road (A15) as we see no reason whatsoever why our residents should be deprived of travelling in both directions as is their historic right and feel this is our last chance to focus the developers minds on providing their promise.

Please note this is a preliminary report prepared by a working party and a final report will be voted on by the Council on 9th March 2010 and submitted to your Development Management Team Nigel Swaby.
Councillor Thorne will be attending the meeting on the 22nd February 2010 to give a brief statement.

Yours faithfully

Lesley Tibble
Parish Clerk