

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 21st NOVEMBER 2022

Case No: 21/02394/FUL (FULL PLANNING APPLICATION)

Proposal: DEMOLITION OF 7 GARAGES AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO 2 BED DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED EXTERNAL WORKS

Location: ADJACENT 28 SPRINGBROOK EYNESBURY

Applicant: CHORUS HOMES GROUP

Grid Ref: 518803 259579

Date of Registration: 11.11.2021

Parish: ST NEOTS

RECOMMENDATION - APPROVE

This application is referred to the Development Management Committee (DMC) in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation as the ward member for the area has 'called in' the application and the officer recommendation of approval is contrary to that of the Town Council

This application was presented to Development Management Committee on the 21st of February 2022. Members resolved to defer the application pending further detail from the applicants in the form of parking surveys and consultations with Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue, Cambridgeshire Constabulary, East of England Ambulance Service and HDC Operations (Waste and Recycling).

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

- 1.1 The application site is an area of land housing garages on a 1960's Council housing development in St Neots. Some of the dwellings have since transferred to the ownership of Places for People (previously HHP, Luminus & Chorus Homes) following the transfer of the District Council's housing stock in the year 2000. This site is adjacent to number 28 Springbrook.
- 1.2 In terms of constraints the site is not within a Conservation Area, there are no Listed Buildings in the immediate vicinity and no protected trees. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 though does have a greater than 75% risk of surface water flooding.

- 1.3 This application seeks permission to demolish seven garages and to erect two, 2-bedroom semi-detached dwellings.
- 1.4 Officers have scrutinised the plans and have familiarised themselves with the site and surrounding area.
- 1.5 During the lifetime of the application revised plans have been received, re-consultations have been carried out with the Town Council, relevant consultees, neighbours and other interested parties accordingly.
- 1.6 Given the nature of the development, though not specifically required, officers have taken the cautious approach of displaying a site notice in the vicinity of the site to ensure that any interested parties were fully aware of the proposals.
- 1.7 The application is one of 14 similar applications in this area which have been submitted to the District Council for consideration.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE

- 2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (20th July 2021) (NPPF 2021) sets out the three objectives - economic, social and environmental - of the planning system to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF 2021 at paragraph 10 provides as follows: 'So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11).'
- 2.2 The NPPF 2021 sets out the Government's planning policies for (amongst other things):
 - delivering a sufficient supply of homes;
 - building a strong, competitive economy;
 - achieving well-designed, beautiful and safe places;
 - conserving and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment
- 2.3 Planning Practice Guidance and the National Design Guide 2021 are also relevant and material considerations.

For full details visit the government website [National Guidance](#)

3. PLANNING POLICIES

- 3.1 St Neots Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029 (February 2016) Policies:
 - A3 – Design
 - PT1 – Sustainable Travel

- PT2 – Vehicle Parking Standards for Residential Development
 - P4 – Flooding
- 3.2 Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 (Adopted 15th May 2019)
- LP1: Amount of Development
 - LP2: Strategy for Development
 - LP5: Flood Risk
 - LP4: Contributing to Infrastructure Delivery
 - LP6: Waste-Water Management
 - LP7: Spatial Planning Areas
 - LP11: Design Context
 - LP12: Design Implementation
 - LP14: Amenity
 - LP15: Surface Water
 - LP16: Sustainable Travel
 - LP17: Parking Provision and Vehicle Movement
 - LP25: Housing Mix
 - LP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- 3.3 Supplementary Planning Documents
- Huntingdonshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017
 - Developer Contributions SPD 2011
 - Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment (2022)
 - Huntingdonshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017)
 - Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD 2017
 - LDF Developer Contributions SPD (2011)
 - Annual Monitoring Review regarding housing land supply (2020)
 - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021)
- 3.4 The National Design Guide (2021)
- * C1 - Understand and relate well to the site, its local and wider context
 - * I1 - Respond to existing local character and identity
 - * I2 - Well-designed, high quality and attractive
 - * B2 - Appropriate building types and forms
 - *M3 - Well-considered parking, servicing and utilities infrastructure for all users
 - * H1 - Healthy, comfortable and safe internal and external environment
 - * H2 - Well-related to external amenity and public spaces
 - * H3 - Attention to detail: storage, waste, servicing and utilities

Local For full details visit the government website [Local policies](#)

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 None relevant

5. CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 As detailed above, St Neots Town Council have been consulted a number of times during the lifetime of the application following receipt of revised plans and details. They maintain their position of refusal. Their comments are summarised below but are also available to view on HDC's Public Access Site.

- 5.2 St Neots Town Council recommend refusal: This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de-facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.

*Further reasons were summarised as:

*Overlooking/loss of privacy

*Adequacy of parking/loading/turning

*Highway safety

*Traffic congestion

*Layout and density of building

*Road access

*Local, strategic, regional and national planning policies

*Disabled persons access

*Contrary to the Development Plan/NPPF and the St Neots Neighbourhood Plan

*Proposals in the development plan

*Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions)

*Demonstratable harm to the amenity of residents

*Loss of important open spaces or physical features

*Overdevelopment

*Lack of future provision for electric vehicle charging

*Lack of communication with the Town Council

Officer comment: Officers are unaware of any recent, previous proposals relating exclusively to this site and so are unable to comment or confirm the presence of any previous planning decisions or appeal decisions. Given the consultations which have taken place it is considered that the Town Council have had input into the decision-making process throughout the lifetime of the application. The remaining matters including the principle of the development and considered adherence to local and national planning policies are addressed in the proceeding sections of this report.

- 5.3 HDC Urban Design Team - broadly have no objections - details of this consultation is referenced in para 7.10.
- 5.4 HDC Environmental Health - no objections subject to conditions relating to site investigation detail, the reporting of unexpected contamination and the implementation of an approved remediation scheme.
- 5.5 HDC Operations Team (Waste & Recycling) – no objection, further details in para 7.19.
- 5.6 Cambridgeshire Constabulary – no objections in terms of parking. Suggestions made to general design enhancements (for security purposes) which are addressed in para 7.12.
- 5.7 Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue – no objections – further details in para 7.24.
- 5.8 East of England Ambulance Service – no objections – further details in para 7.24.
- 5.9 Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) – no objections – further details in para 7.34.
- 5.10 Cambridgeshire County Council Local Highways Authority - raise no objections in terms of highway safety – further details in para 7.23.
- 5.11 Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Team – no objections – further details in para 7.23.

6. REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.1 At the time of preparing the original report 39 objections had been received, two of these were from local Councillors. Since the application was presented to DMC in February a further six have been received, two of these were from the Ward Councillor.

These are available to view on HDC's Public Access Site but broadly relate to the following concerns:

- Potential that local residents may be unaware of the proposals and so may not have had the opportunity to comment
- Loss of highway safety/emergency vehicle access
- Loss of parking with make an existing bad situation much worse
- Increase in congestion, accidents, frustration and arguments and general highway safety concerns
- Parking spaces for existing residents should be provided on-street

- Plans contrary to Government document 'A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment' and loss of green spaces and trees
- Increased population density
- Increased density of houses in the locality
- Design and impact upon visual amenity
- Overshadowing
- Overdevelopment
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of light
- Noise
- Contrary to Government Policy (NPPF)
- Contrary to the Development Plan and St Neots Neighbourhood Plan
- Disabled persons access
- Bin storage (both for new dwellings and impact in terms of existing waste collection methods)
- Potential for increased criminal activity
- Query on the re-allocation of parking (by Chorus Homes)
- Out of date and misleading information submitted (parking)
- In the evenings and weekends the site is often filled with parked cars
- Lack of EV charging points
- Existing garages are not used as they are too small to put a car in and because Chorus charge too much rent and do not maintain the garages
- Some garages are used as storage due to problems with overcrowding
- Perceived lack of communication with the Town Council
- Quality of the detail provided in the submitted parking surveys and suggestions contrary to Highway Code

Officer comments in relation to the above:

As stated in the preceding section of this report, though not specifically required officers did arrange for a site notice to be displayed in the vicinity of the application site in an attempt to ensure that any interested parties were made aware of the proposals. The comments regarding density both of the immediate locality and in Huntingdonshire are noted, however, given that St Neots is identified as a Spatial Planning Area under Policy LP7 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 (2019) which supports housing development where it is appropriately related to the built-up area (and where it accords with other appropriate policies), the proposal and principle of further residential development is supported in this location in line with this Policy of the Local Plan. This and other policies matters are addressed later in this report.

Officers note the comments regarding green spaces and impact on trees, however, in this case the application form states that no

trees will be removed such to facilitate the development and, as this utilises an area of hardstanding/garage court there is no significant loss of green space as a result of the development. The document referenced above 'A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment' does not impose direct restrictions on new development. It is noted that HDC have been guided by this document and the ambitions within it will eventually form the renewed Environment and Climate Strategy. However, at present there is no policy in place which restricts development of this nature, especially given the existing built-up location of the area concerned.

In terms of EV (Electric Vehicle) charging points, officers are aware that there is a proposed change in law mandating this addition but there is no requirement for this at present. Further, whilst the concerns regarding the remoteness of the proposed parking is noted this does not prevent the future addition of EV charging 'upstand points' and so the fact that the parking areas are not directly adjacent to the new dwellings does not necessarily result in a barrier in this regard.

The other matters raised are dealt with under the relevant headings elsewhere in this report.

7. ASSESSMENT

- 7.1 When determining planning applications, it is necessary to establish what weight should be given to each plan's policies in order to come to a decision. The following legislation, government policy and guidance outline how this should be done.
- 7.2 As set out within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Section 38(6)) and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Section 70(2)) in dealing with planning applications the Local Planning Authority shall have regard to have provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. This is reiterated within paragraph 47 of the NPPF (2019). The development plan is defined in Section 38(3)(b) of the 2004 Act as "the development plan documents (taken as a whole) that have been adopted or approved in that area".
- 7.3 In Huntingdonshire the Development Plan consists of:
- Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 (2019)
 - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021)
 - St Neots Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029
 - Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan (2017)
 - Houghton and Wyton Neighbourhood Plan (2018)
 - Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan (2019)
 - Bury Village Neighbourhood Plan (2021)

- Buckden Neighbourhood Plan (2021)
- Grafham and Ellington Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2036 (2022)

7.4 The main issues to consider in the determination of this application are:

- The Principle of Development
- Design and Visual Amenity
- Residential Amenity
- Highway Safety and Parking Provision
- Flood Risk and Surface Water
- Biodiversity
- Accessible and Adaptable Homes
- Water Efficiency
- Developer Contributions

The Principle of Development

7.5 Policy LP7 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 defines St Neots as a spatial planning area. Whilst the area in question is not an allocated site, Policy LP7 states that a proposal for development on a site which is additional to those allocated in the plan will be supported where it fulfils the following requirements and is in accordance with other policies. For residential development the policy is set out as below:

7.6 A proposal for housing development (Class C3) or for a residential institution use (Class C2) will be supported where it is appropriately located within a built-up area of an identified Spatial Planning Area settlement.

7.7 In this case the application site is considered to lie within the built-up area of the settlement and is therefore acceptable in principle subject to compliance with the other relevant policies and considerations.

Design and Visual Amenity

7.8 Springbrook appears typical of a 1960's purpose-built housing development. The section of the road in the immediate vicinity of the application site hosts terraced dwellings and some two-storey flats which are of brick and tile construction. Many of the houses have cladding to the front elevations. Also evident in the streetscene is the four-storey flats to the south-east which appear as a dominant feature. Given this variance in design and style the streetscene cannot be considered to have a uniform appearance.

7.9 Adjacent to number 28 Springbrook there is a garage court which has seven garages, it is proposed to demolish these garages and to erect two 2-bedroom semi-detached dwellings to the Springbrook frontage.

- 7.10 HDC's Urban Design Team have been consulted on the proposals and raise no objection in terms of the siting noting that the proposed dwellings are arranged to the front of the road and therefore align with numbers 46-50 to the east. Whilst no specific advice on the design has been provided from Urban Design officers consider that the design and scale is sympathetic to the location and would not appear as a dominant feature in the streetscene, particularly given the variance of style and design evident in the vicinity. Following earlier engagement with the agent side hall and dining room windows have been introduced. This is considered a positive feature both in terms of design (adding interest) and the increased level of surveillance this affords to the drives and public footpaths. Surface materials of the dwellings shall be secured by condition.
- 7.11 In terms of outdoor space officers note that there is some degree of hard and soft landscaping included in the plans but further detail on these matters shall be secured by condition to include further clarity on proposed boundary treatments. Urban Design are however broadly supportive of the measures proposed in relation to boundary treatments. That said, it would be preferred for some additional soft landscaping to be provided adjacent to the driveway areas, but Chorus have confirmed that this is not an option as they do not own the land in question. The driveways for each dwelling will therefore be separated from the adjacent plots by virtue of 1-metre-high metal railings. Though the additional soft landscaping would have been a positive feature the measures proposed are considered to be acceptable on balance.
- 7.12 Officers note that a shed has been provided in the rear gardens of both plots which, though of limited scale should provide for secure covered cycle space. There is also ample space for the storage of wheeled bins in the rear garden of plot 1 and to the side of plot 2, these are marked on the plans and considered to be acceptable. Further detail in relation to the design of the cycle storage shall be secured by condition. It should be noted that Cambridgeshire Constabulary did make some observations in their comments with regard to some design aspects (boundary treatments for example) but which were contrary to the advice of Urban Design. These are recommendations as opposed to requirements. Some amendments (outside of planning) may be achieved. An informative note shall be added to any permission with regard to these.
- 7.13 Officers observe that there is currently a utility box which in its current location would be across the driveway access of plot 1. Confirmation have been received from the agents that this shall be relocated.
- 7.14 Overall, whilst the concerns raised in the objections in terms of visual amenity and density of development in the area are noted, given the positive comments from Urban Design and the other

factors detailed above, it is considered that the proposed dwellings would make a positive contribution to the area. At present the appearance of the garage court does little to enhance the area, the design of the dwellings do not look out of place such that they would appear overly prominent in the streetscene and they have been carefully designed to integrate well. Therefore, the proposal is considered not to have a detrimental impact upon the character or appearance of the area and, (subject to condition) complies with Policies LP1, LP2, LP11 and LP12 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036, Policy A3 of the St Neots Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029, the NPPF (2021) and the National Design Guide (2021) in this regard.

Residential Amenity

- 7.15 As established in the preceding sections of this report, the dwellings are located between numbers 40 and 42 Springbrook (which are flats) to the north-west and number 46 Springbrook to the south-east. They are located forward in their plots in relation to numbers 40 and 42 but largely level with the frontage of number 46 (and its immediate neighbours) both of these buildings have blank side gables and so no side windows are compromised by this proposal. Given that there is no projection beyond either the front or rear elevation of number 46 there are considered to be no impacts in terms of loss of light to this dwelling. In terms of numbers 40/42 officers note that there is a separation distance (dwelling to dwelling) of approx. 6.2 metres. The proposed dwelling on plot 1 extends approx. 5 metres forward of these properties. However, officers have conducted the 45-degree test as detailed in the Huntingdonshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) and are satisfied that there should be no significant loss of light to these dwellings as a result of these introductions. This is particularly so when it is considered that the front of the dwellings face a southerly direction. Further, there appears to be no 'usable space' to either side of numbers 40/42 and 46 which would be unduly affected by this addition. The same consideration applies to the rear gardens when the siting, scale, orientation and separation distance of the proposed dwellings in relation to the adjacent plots is considered. In terms of number 28 Springbrook which lies to the north of the site there is a separation distance (dwelling to dwelling) of approx. 14 metres which is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.16 Overall, taking the above factors into consideration the development is considered to be acceptable in terms of overbearing impact, overshadowing and loss of light.
- 7.17 In terms of overlooking and loss of privacy the side elevations of both plots 1 and 2 host one window at first-floor level which serves the landing/stairwell area. As previously established, given the lack of any side windows in the adjacent dwellings and limited amenity space to the sides these are considered not to be

harmful. The ground floor windows are also considered to be acceptable. The windows to the front of both plots look out towards Springbrook and do not offer any additional views than those afforded by the existing dwellings. The rear first floor windows serving the bathroom and bedroom 2 (in both plots) look towards the side elevation/rear garden area of number 28 Springbrook. Officers note that there are two windows at first floor level in the side elevation of number 28, these are of limited scale and do not appear to serve habitable rooms. There is a further door and window to the ground floor but again, given the scale of the window it is unlikely that this serves a habitable room and certainly if it does it would be unlikely to be the sole window. Therefore, the degree of separation of approx. 14 metres (dwelling to dwelling) for windows facing non-habitable rooms (at least in one of the dwellings) is considered to be acceptable.

- 7.18 Officers note that number 28 has a wooden structure attached to the rear which provides some level of restricted views to the rear garden. Officers have considered the impact of the introduction of first-floor windows within 11 metres of the boundary line which will offer some increased views to the rear garden. The windows serving the bathrooms of the new dwellings can be obscure glazed by condition this is not a solution for a bedroom and so the same cannot be applied to the bedrooms. It is considered that on balance however the introduction of these rear windows will not be overly harmful in terms of residential amenity. There are rear windows at first floor level to both the flats and number 46 Springbrook which (though not directly opposite) have a similar relationship and so the refusal of this application on the basis of loss of privacy and overlooking is not considered to be justified.
- 7.19 In terms of other factors in relation to residential amenity officers note the concerns raised regarding potential increased noise, and odours from bin storage and collection points. Whilst there is likely to be an increased level of noise during the development stages it is not considered that this will be a long-term issue and the introduction of two dwellings is unlikely to significantly impact upon residential amenity through noise issues. As stated in the previous section of this report, provision for bin storage has been identified on the plans and is considered acceptable. HDC's Operations (Waste and Recycling Team) have been consulted and raise no objections stating that the proposed development would not have a great effect on waste collections in the area as it's only an additional 29 bins per service. They observe that there are no communal collection points and collection from the highway will be easy. They also note that all of the dwellings can store their bins within their gardens. It is recognised that the storage of wheeled bins and waste collection methods may present some form of nuisance, but this cannot be completely eradicated through the planning process and again the introduction of development of this scale is unlikely to

significantly contribute to this. There are appropriate channels (separate to Planning), that can be taken to address any future issues that may arise. Officers also consider the size of the dwellings and associated amenity land to be suitable for the scale of the development.

- 7.20 Lastly, matters relating to parking and potential amenity concerns which may arise from displacement of existing provision will be dealt with later in this report.
- 7.21 Therefore, taking the above points into consideration, the development is considered not to have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, and would provide a suitable level of amenity for future occupiers of the proposed dwellings and therefore accords with LP14 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 and the NPPF (2021) in this regard.

Highway Safety and Parking Provision

- 7.22 As the proposal will result in the demolition of seven garages and the loss of the associated garage court, which officers understand is unofficially used for parking, there is naturally some concern about this loss, and this is certainly what most of the objections relate to. In this case the revised existing parking and garage usage detail which has been submitted reflects that from the 7 garages 3 are used locally, 2 from outside of the area and 2 are void. The proposals include two spaces per dwelling which is considered to be sufficient.
- 7.23 Since these applications were presented at DMC in February 2022 the applicants have submitted revised details with regard to parking provision following the loss of the garages and garage courts. Parking surveys have also been completed which were carried out in March and April 2022 (both on a weekday and at the weekend) and a later assessment (explained below) in June 2022 (a weekday) to meet a request made by Cambridgeshire County Council's Highways Team. Upon initial review of the revised surveys and details within these, concerns were raised by Highways that the surveys had not been carried out to fully accord with the Lambeth Methodology (as was suggested). Therefore, an amended survey was requested (including the June data). There were also a number of other matters which Highways considered needed to be addressed such as:
- The inclusion of vehicles parking in the garages included in the figures.
 - Criteria used to identify the spaces to ensure that they would be in a suitable (and safe) location.
 - Query on provision of the unallocated spaces which will be provided (mainly their location – several in one area).

Following these comments revised survey detail was provided to the Local Planning Authority (as detailed above) and CCC

Highways were consulted again. This time, as well as the Development Management Team of Highways the Transport Assessment Team have also been consulted. The Development Management section has provided comments advising that in terms of the layout access and scale, their original comments (prior to February DMC) remain consistent. They state that the accesses do not change in terms of their suitability or safety whether they are considered as individual applications or as a whole. The original comments received stated that there were no objections in principle but that the LPA should consider the impact of the displaced vehicles (from the garages and associated courts) when determining the applications, particularly with regard to any residential amenity impacts which was also a matter (raised originally) by HDC's Urban Design Team. Overall, Highways raised no objection on grounds of highway safety. It should be noted that Urban Design have not been consulted further on the proposals given the level of detail provided in the surveys as their original concerns mainly focused on the fact that the earlier parking surveys did not consider parking which takes place within the garage courts which the later surveys now cover.

The CCC Transport Assessment Team have responded separately advising that they would not comment on a development of this scale as it is below the threshold which calls for a Transport Statement or a Transport Assessment to be provided. They advise that they expect a 'light touch' transport statement for 50 dwellings plus and a transport assessment undertaking full capacity assessments for 80 dwellings plus. To conclude, they advise that 29 dwellings would not have a severe impact on highway safety or capacity.

- 7.24 Further to the above, it should be noted that Cambridgeshire Constabulary, Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue, the East of England Ambulance Service and HDC Operations (Waste and Recycling) have also been consulted on the proposals. They raise no objections in terms of accessibility. Both Cambridgeshire Constabulary and Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue caveat that this is provided people are parking legally and responsibly. However, it should be recognised that this is likely to be an issue in any area and the matters regarding legal parking are not a matter which are within planning control. Again, balanced consideration should be given to the loss of the garages (which the applicants have demonstrated are largely unused) and the re-provision as part of this (and the related) schemes.
- 7.25 Officers have carefully considered the potential impacts upon residential amenity as a result of the displacement of the vehicles from the garages and garage courts and the cumulative impacts (as a result of 14 similar applications in the same area). Broadly, the development in its entirety will result in the loss of 174 garages, 109 of these are void (as per the latest details

submitted). Of the 65 garages in occupation 45 are used by residents within the site area and 20 are in occupation by people who live outside of the area. It is noted (as is raised in the objections) that the parking courts are also used (unofficially for parking). However, it should be regarded that this area is private property under the ownership of Places for People, therefore it is within their gift to prevent this use at any time (regardless of the outcome of this application). Further, as the area is not within a Conservation Area, in planning terms demolition could take place outside of planning control.

- 7.26 As part of the development (the 14 applications as a whole) 45 allocated spaces will be provided, thus providing parking spaces for each vehicle displaced by the loss of a garage. (for those who currently rent garages and live within the area – no provision will be made for the 20 tenancies held by those that live outside of the area). 38 visitors' spaces shall be provided and so there is a total provision of 83 spaces as a result of the development. Further, each new dwelling (with the exception of one which requires a larger disabled access space) shall have two spaces allocated to it, thus 57 spaces will be provided for the 29 dwellings proposed as part of the entire scheme. Officers note the concerns raised regarding displacement from the (unofficial) parking taking place within the garage court areas. The data collected during March/April 2022 indicated that as a worst-case scenario 107 vehicles were parking in the garage courts (subject to this and the associated applications) and this assessment was undertaken during the early hours of a Saturday morning when most people were likely to be at home and thus parking their vehicles within the courts. The March/April data demonstrated that between 130-193 on street parking spaces remained free within the study area overnight on a weekend and during the day on a weekday. The later studies did not contradict the earlier figures and therefore 107 vehicles displaced remains a worst-case scenario. The statement therefore concludes that even if the additional parking provided as part of these scheme was unavailable, even in a worst-case scenario (of 107 vehicles displaced from the garage courts) on street provision is available within a short walk of resident's homes within the overall estate. Officers have noted the concerns raised regarding the locations and suitability of the kerbside parking in relation to legal parking and the Highway Code. However, officers refer back to the fact that the legalities of parking are not a planning matter and that given the scale of the development Cambridgeshire County Council as the Local Highways Authority have not raised any objections in terms of highway safety and once again, the Transport Assessment Team have confirmed that the provision of 29 dwellings is below the threshold for formal transport statement to be submitted as it would not have a severe impact on highway safety or capacity.

- 7.27 It should also be highlighted that (as confirmed in the revised Parking Displacement Statement) that Chorus Homes do have other garage courts in close proximity where there are void garages and so if the residents would still prefer to rent a garage, then this is a possibility, though, in practice there are practical implications to consider as part of this solution.
- 7.28 It is considered that the provision of affordable housing is a key factor in the determination of this application. The most recent data from the Annual Monitoring Report 2022 Part 1(Housing Supply) reflects that the availability of affordable housing in Huntingdonshire is a major issue with a growing gap between average earnings and housing costs. In 2021/2022 255 new affordable homes were completed, amounting to 23.61% of all new dwellings completed and 27.29 of completions on qualifying sites (those that meet the affordable housing policy criteria). In St Neots, 13 affordable dwellings were provided.
- 7.29 7.26 Though the loss of parking provision is naturally going to result in increased pressure on the adjacent roads forming the estate it does not present any significant highway safety concerns (as detailed in the consultee comments from CCC Highways). Therefore, when the impacts of the loss of these underutilised garages and the garage courts (which as stated above are considered as private property and presumably could be protected by barriers if the landowner so wished) are balanced against the need for affordable housing it is considered that the public benefits of the provision of additional affordable housing would outweigh any potential amenity issues arising from the loss of parking provision, particularly when the level of replacement parking which will be introduced as part of the scheme alongside the parking for each individual dwelling is considered.
- 7.30 In terms of parking associated with the dwelling the plans reflect two off road tandem spaces per dwelling to the side of each plot. As noted above, the dimensions of these are considered to be sufficient for their purpose. Further, Policies LP16 and LP17 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 aim to support more sustainable modes of transport with LP17 specifically stating that a proposal that includes residential development will be expected to provide at least one clearly identified secure cycle space per bedroom for all dwellings (C3 Use Class) unless it can be demonstrated that this is unachievable. The submitted plans reflect that this has been considered and a shed has been provided in the rear gardens which appears to broadly meet with this requirement (but will be secured by condition). It is noted that the provision of electric vehicle charging points is a matter which has been raised, however, Huntingdonshire District Council do not have a current Policy in place which would allow for this to be enforced.

- 7.31 Special regard has also been given to the comments raised (primarily by the Town Council) that Policies PT1 and PT2 of the St Neots Neighbourhood Plan have not been given consideration. Policy PT1 deals with the demonstration of how sustainable transport modes can be maximised (including cycling), whilst PT2 deals with parking provision and specifically states (amongst other matters) that 'all development proposals which include an element of residential development must provide adequate space for vehicle parking to meet the expected needs of residents and visitors.' As detailed in the preceding sections of this report, the level of parking associated with the new dwelling is considered to be acceptable, and, given the results of the evidence provided by the surveys it is considered that this application alone (or those forming the wider scheme) would not be contrary to this Policy. Officers consider that the location of the development (in a sustainable and the provision of secure covered cycle storage (to accord with Policy LP17 of the Local Plan) is sufficient in its aim such to encourage sustainable modes of transport.
- 7.32 Broadly speaking, whilst the concerns raised in the objections are noted and officers do not discount the potential amenity/access issues caused by the parking displacement, given the comments from CCC Highways there is no reason to consider that development of this scale would result in a detrimental impact on highway safety in the locality and therefore no justifiable reason for a refusal on this basis alone. Further, the comments from Cambridgeshire Constabulary, Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue and the East of England Ambulance Service all demonstrate that they have no concerns with regard to public safety as a result of being able to access emergencies when required. Overall, the parking provision and cycle storage associated with the dwellings are acceptable, therefore, the proposed development is considered to broadly meet the objectives of Policies LP16 and LP17 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036, Policies PT1 and PT2 of the St Neots Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029 and the NPPF (2021) and would not give rise to highway safety issues.

Flood Risk and Surface Water

- 7.33 The application site is in Flood Zone 1 as identified by the Huntingdonshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017), which means it has a low probability of fluvial flooding and is not subject to the sequential and exception tests as set out within the NPPF. The site is less than 1 hectare in size but is identified as having a greater than 75% risk of flooding as a result of surface water. As per the guidance contained within the NPPF (2021) sites which may be subject to 'other sources' of flooding and which would also introduce a more vulnerable use (a dwelling is classed a more vulnerable) should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment.

- 7.34 Subsequently a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted and has been passed to the LLFA for consultation. During the lifetime of the application various iterations of the FRA has been provided along with technical details (at the request of the LLFA). As such, the LLFA have commented that they raise no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions relating to drainage, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and surface water run-off measures.
- 7.35 The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable (subject to conditions) with regard to its approach to flood risk and complies with Policies LP5 and LP15 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036, Policy P4 of the St Neots Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029, and the NPPF 2021 in this regard.

Biodiversity

- 7.36 Policy LP30 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 requires proposals to demonstrate that all potential adverse impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity have been investigated. Policy LP30 also requires development proposals to ensure no net loss in biodiversity and provide a net gain in biodiversity where possible. In this case, though no measures such to provide a net gain have been provided, given the nature of the site and its surroundings it is considered that it provides little value in terms of biodiversity and so there will be no net loss as a result of the development. A condition shall be attached to the permission such to secure details of biodiversity enhancement measures prior to development beyond slab level. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable with regard to its impact on biodiversity and therefore accords with Policy LP30 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 in this regard.

Water Efficiency

- 7.37 Policy LP12 of the Local Plan to 2036 requires proposals that include housing to comply with the optional building regulation for water efficiency, as set out in Approved Document G. The agent has confirmed that the proposed development is designed in accordance with and will be built in accordance with the LP12 (j) standards. A condition will be imposed upon any consent to ensure that the development is built in accordance with these standards and that they are maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Accessible and Adaptable Homes

- 7.38 Policy LP25 of the Local Plan to 2036 requires proposals that include housing to meet the optional Building Regulation requirement M4(2) "Accessible and adaptable dwellings" unless it can be demonstrated that site specific factors make this unachievable. The agent has confirmed that the proposed

development is designed in accordance with and will be built in accordance with the M4(2) standards. A condition will be imposed upon any consent to ensure that the development is built in accordance with these standards and that they are maintained for the life of the development. Officers note the concerns raised regarding disabled persons access but given this confirmation the proposal is considered to meet all necessary requirements in this regard.

Other Issues

Development Obligations:

- 7.39 Part H of the Developer Contributions SPD (2011) requires a payment towards refuse bins for new residential development. A Unilateral Undertaking form for wheeled bin signed by the applicant and dated December 2021 has been received.
- 7.40 The proposal is therefore considered to accord with the requirements of Policy LP4 of the Local Plan to 2036 and the Developer Contribution SPD in this regard.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):

- 7.41 The development will be CIL liable in accordance with the Council's adopted charging schedule; CIL payments will cover footpaths and access, health, community facilities, libraries and lifelong learning and education. A completed Community Infrastructure Levy Form has been provided.
- 7.42 The proposal is therefore considered to accord with the requirements of Policy LP4 of the Local Plan to 2036 and the Developer Contribution SPD in this regard.
- 7.43 There are no other material planning considerations which have a significant bearing on the determination of this application.

Conclusion

- 7.44 The proposed development is compliant with the relevant national and local policy as it:

*Is acceptable in principle

And it:

- * Is of an appropriate scale and design
- * Would not have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area;
- * Would not have a significantly detrimental impact upon the amenity of neighbours;
- * Would not result in an increased risk of flooding in the locality;

- * Is acceptable with regard to parking provision and highway safety;
- * Is acceptable with regards to biodiversity matters;

7.45 There are no other material planning considerations which have a significant bearing on the determination of this application.

7.46 Taking national and local planning policies into account, and having regard for all relevant material considerations, it is recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

8. RECOMMENDATION - APPROVAL subject to conditions to include the following

- Time limit
- Development in accordance with plans
- Materials
- Architectural details
- Obscure glazing
- Hard and soft landscaping
- Cycle storage design
- Highway matters
- Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) requirements
- Biodiversity enhancement
- Contaminated land/mitigation measures
- Water efficiency measures to accord with LP12
- Accessible and adaptable homes to accord with LP25

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388424 and we will try to accommodate your needs

CONTACT OFFICER:

Enquiries about this report to **Kevin Simpson Development Management Officer** – Kevin.simpson@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|---------------------|--|---------------|---|
| S1 | 21/02393/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Adjacent 13 Mallard Lane St Neots Demolition of 7 garages and construction one 3 Bed Dwelling with associated external works | Refuse | <p>The following comments should be considered for Chorus Homes Group applications on the schedule of plans - no's 1 to 9 and 11 to 14.</p> <p>The Council's two overriding concerns are over development and reduction of existing parking provisions, with other concerns resulting from these to issues. This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking.</p> <p>This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street.</p> <p>The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>A standard was required when the estate was first constructed, and car ownership has increased since that time. Removal of existing parking spaces is counterproductive and will negatively impact on the housing area as a whole.</p> <p>Committee members agree with the Consultee objections from LLFA dated 12/08/2022:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hydraulic calculations 2. Flooded volumes <p>Informatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infiltration • Pollution control <p>The Council's concerns can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overlooking/loss of privacy • Adequacy of parking/loading/turning • Highway safety |
| S2 | 21/02398/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Adjacent 2 Mallard Lane St Neots Demolition of 6 garages and construction of two 2 Bed Dwellings with associated external works | Refuse | |
| S3 | 21/02399/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Land between No 8 and No 10 Mallard Lane, St Neots Demolition of 10 garages and construction of 1 dwelling with associated external works | Refuse | |
| S4 | 21/02400/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Land between No 20 and No 22 Mallard Lane, St Neots Demolition of 6 garages and construction of two 2 Bed Dwellings with associated external works | Refuse | |
| S5 | 21/02396/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Land adjacent (southeast) to No 32 Mallard Lane, St Neots Demolition of 12 garages and construction of two 2 bed dwellings with associated external works | Refuse | |
| S6 | 21/02397/FUL | Chorus Homes Group North Of 197 Duck Lane St Neots Demolition of 13 garages and construction of two 3 bed dwellings with associated external works | Refuse | |
| S7 | 21/02431/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Opposite 27 To 30 Naseby Gardens St Neots Demolition of 16 garages and construction of four 2 bed dwellings with associated external works | Refuse | |
| S8 | 21/02436/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Between 130 And 132 Duck Lane St Neots | Refuse | |

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|---------------------|--|----------------|---|
| | | Demolition of 24 garages and construction of 3 dwellings (one 1 Bed, two 2 Beds) with associated external works | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inability for emergency vehicles to manoeuvre through the estate. • Traffic congestion • Layout and density of building • Road access • Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies • Disabled persons access • Proposals in the development plan. • Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) • Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents • Loss of important open spaces or physical features. • Allows for insufficient spaces for future on-street EV changepoints which will inevitably be required as the government pushes for greater EV ownership. <p>Please also record the Council's objections in in line with NPPF;</p> <p>The proposals conflict with Section 2, Para 7 NPPF which states: "... the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs "</p> <p>The proposed developments will leave no scope for future EV charge hubs or points.</p> <p>Section 2, Para 104 NPPF reinforces the requirement to consider transport issues and changing transport technology at the earliest stage of plan making.</p> <p>Para 16 NPPF states: plans should... "(c) be shaped by early, proportionate, and effective</p> |
| S9 | 21/02494/FUL | Chorus Homes Group North East of 157 Duck Lane, St Neots Demolition of 6 garages and construction of two 3 bed dwellings with associated external works | Refuse | |
| S10 | 21/02493/FUL | Chorus Homes Group North of 115 Duck Lane, St Neots Demolition of 7 garages and re-modelling of existing parking area | Approve | |
| S11 | 21/02438/FUL | Chorus Homes Group North Of 54 Henbrook St Neots Demolition of 33 garages and construction of 3 dwellings (one 3 bed, two 2 beds) with associated external works | Refuse | |
| S12 | 21/02437/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Rear Of 108 To 114 Duck Lane St Neots Demolition of 19 garages and construction of two 3 bed dwellings with associated external works | Refuse | |
| S13 | 21/02394/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Adjacent 28 Springbrook Eynesbury Demolition of 7 garages and construction of two 2 bed dwellings with associated external works | Refuse | |
| S14 | 21/02495/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Adjacent 45 Springbrook Eynesbury Demolition of 8 garages and construction of three 2 bed dwellings with associated external works | Refuse | |

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|-----------|-------------|---------------|---|
| | | | | <p>engagement between plan-makers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees;”</p> <p>This is reinforced in the St Neots Neighbourhood Plan;</p> <p>“1.4.8 Early discussions should be held with the Town Council to discuss design issues. Proposals that have evolved with the community will be favourably considered. The Town Council can provide valuable advice to applicants in terms of St Neots special character and local distinctiveness.”</p> <p>Chorus Homes have however failed to engage with the Town Council or the community on the applications presented.</p> <p>The application has failed to take into account or include strategic policies from the Local Planning authorities policies or the local Neighbourhood plan as set out in Para17 of NPPF; “The development plan must include strategic policies to address each local planning authority’s priorities for the development and use of land in its area 12. These strategic policies can be produced in different ways, depending on the issues and opportunities facing each area. They can be contained in:</p> <p>a) joint or individual local plans, ...”</p> <p>The applications have not considered or addressed Policy PT1 of St Neots Neighbourhood Plan, which states: “Policy PT1 Development proposals</p> |

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|-----------------------|--|----------------|---|
| | | | | <p>must demonstrate how opportunities for the use of sustainable modes of transport are maximised. This should be achieved through maximising the potential for cycling and walking throughout the site and through contributions towards the extension, linking, and/or improvement of existing routes throughout St Neots.”</p> <p>Finally, the proposals conflict with Policy PT2 of St Neots Neighbourhood Plan, which states; “Policy PT2 All development proposals which include an element of residential development, including change of use to residential, must provide adequate space for vehicle parking to meet the expected needs of residents and visitors. A design-led approach should be taken to ensure parking is properly integrated into the layout of the scheme, minimises adverse impacts on surrounding uses, and facilitates traffic flow and accessibility for service and emergency vehicles.”</p> |
| S10 | 21/02493/FUL | Chorus Homes Group North of 115 Duck Lane, St Neots Demolition of 7 garages and re-modelling of existing parking area | Approve | The committee welcome the proposed remodelling of the existing parking area. |
| S15 | 22/01546/FUL | 47 Springbrook Eynesbury St Neots Change of use from amenity land to garden and erect fence | Refuse | Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents. Loss of important open spaces or physical features. Highway safety. Contrary to SNTC Neighbourhood Plan. |
| S16 | 22/01405/FUL | Mr Neil Frost Land East Of 16 Stevenson Court Between the River and Crosshall Road Eaton Ford Retention of a replacement/altered mooring deck and the retention of altered fencing (Retrospective) | Approve | Minimum impact on neighbours. Within a sustainable location. |
| S17 | 22/01470/HHFUL | Mr D Woodward 261 Great North Road Eaton Socon St Neots Demolition of rear outbuilding and conservatory. Rear single storey | Approve | Satisfactory proposal in terms of scale and pattern of development. Makes efficient use of its site. |

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|-----------------------|--|----------------|---|
| | | extension with associated landscaping and drainage. Additional window to site gable end | | |
| S18 | 22/01717/TREE | Mrs Carolyn Martin 17 Duloe Road Eaton Socon St Neots Lime T7. Lift crown to 5m above the driveway and prune to clear garage building by 2m. To improve ambient light levels and prevent the potential for building damage. Also, exempt works: remove dead wood | Approve | Subject to the approval of HDC Tree Officer. |
| S19 | 22/01733/HHFUL | Mr & Mrs Weldon 18 Valerian Close Eaton Ford St Neots Erection of first floor front extension and two storey front extension | Approve | Improves the property. Makes efficient use of its site. |
| S20 | 22/01477/LBC | Ms Alison Manton 5 Audreys Court 153 Great North Road Eaton Socon Retrospective Removal of disintegrating Gable End Windows and replacement with Wooden Double Glazed Fire Compliant Windows 1 x bathroom 1 x Living Room | Approve | Subject to the approval of HDC Conservation Officer. Fits in with local street scene. Satisfactory proposal in terms of scale and pattern of development. |
| S21 | 22/01747/HHFUL | Mr Watson Sycamore House 119 Great North Road Eaton Socon Erection of orangery to replace existing conservatory, construction of a carport, changes to the front boundary treatments. | Approve | We consider that the proposal would assimilate itself to the existing part of the town. |
| S22 | 22/01602/FUL | Santander UK PLC (Mr Alastair Rodda) 56 Market Square St Neots PE19 2HL Alterations to main pedestrian entrance and internal installation of 1no new 46 (portrait) TV screen within a metal shroud floor standing unit. | Approve | Minimum impact on neighbours. We consider that the proposal would assimilate itself to the existing part of the town. |
| S23 | 22/01772/HHFUL | Mr James & Chris Tortise-Crawford 12 East Street St Neots PE19 1JU | Approve | Minimum impact on neighbours. Improves the property. |

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|--|---------------|--|
| | | Erection of single storey and two storey rear extension. Demolition of existing extensions. | | |
| S24 | 22/01266/FUL | Miss Yen Hai Thi Hoang 16 High Street St Neots PE19 1JA Change of use from a Nail Parlour (Sui Generis) to a Bubble Tea Shop (Class E) | | Application withdrawn – not considered |

Committee Chairperson

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS – 7 June 2022

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|---------------|---|---|--|
| 1 | 22/00827/S106 | <p>Jemma Brown Land North Of Cambridge Road St Neots Variation of Section 106 associated with 070401273, in respect of the affordable housing clause.</p> | NOTED | Members noted that there was a variation around right to buy for which the Committee was not sufficiently qualified to comment. |
| 2 | 22/01147/REM | <p>Loves Farm Eastern Expansion Development Area Cambridge Road St Neots Application for reserved matters in respect of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping pursuant to Sub-Phase B of outline planning permission 1300388OUT for the construction of Spine Road and Secondary Road Primary Infrastructure</p> | APPROVE Subject to the recommendations submitted by members. | <p>Highway Safety: Road Narrowing – road narrowing schemes should be avoided. They can cause issues for vehicles and emergency services. On Love's Farm, many road narrowing schemes are hot spots for collisions, especially where there are no parking restrictions to ensure room for two-way traffic either side of the schemes.</p> <p>Road Design: Committee members recommend the addition of limited sections of wider roads to allow for 2 car widths in addition to on-street parking, similar to Great High Ground beside the Pirate Ship playground. Some limited sections of clearly designated on-street parking will discourage and free-for-all approach by residents and visitors that would result in antisocial and dangerous parking.</p> <p>Use of Block Paving: Committee members recommend against the use of block paving. The surface does not lend itself to hard wearing road markings such as parking restrictions, which are liable to cracking, rendering them unenforceable. Block paving at two locations with high volume traffic on Stone Hill have exhibited some movement and have become uneven and unstable.</p> |
| 3 | 21/02393/FUL | <p>Chorus Homes Group Adjacent 13 Mallard Lane St Neots Demolition of 7 garages and construction one 3 Bed Dwelling with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received</p> | | <p>The following comments should be considered for all Chorus Homes Group applications on the schedule of plans - no's 3 to 16.</p> <p>The Council's two overriding cover are over development and reduction of existing parking provisions, with other concerns resulting from these to issues.</p> |

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS – 7 June 2022

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|---|---------------|---|
| 4 | 21/02398/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Adjacent 2 Mallard Lane St Neots Demolition of 6 garages and construction of two 2 Bed Dwellings with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received | | This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. |
| 5 | 21/02399/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Between 8 And 10 Mallard Lane St Neots Demolition of 10 garages and construction of 1 dwelling with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received | | This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access. |
| 6 | 21/02400/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Between 20 And 22 Mallard Lane St Neots Demolition of 6 garages and construction of two 2 Bed Dwellings with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received | | A standard was required when the estate was first constructed, and car ownership has increased since that time. Removal of existing parking spaces is counterproductive and will negatively impact on the housing area as a whole. |
| 7 | 21/02396/FUL | Chorus Homes Group South East Of 32 Mallard Lane St Neots 12 garages and construction of two 2 bed dwellings with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received | | The Council's concerns can be summarised as; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overlooking/loss of privacy • Adequacy of parking/loading/turning • Highway safety • Inability for emergency vehicles to manoeuvre through the estate. |
| 8 | 21/02397/FUL | Chorus Homes Group North Of 197 Duck Lane St Neots Demolition of 13 garages and construction of two 3 bed dwellings with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic congestion • Layout and density of building • Road access • Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies • Disabled persons access • Proposals in the development plan. • Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) • Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents |
| 9 | 21/02493/FUL | Chorus Homes Group North Of 115 Duck Lane St Neots Demolition of 7 garages and re-modelling of existing parking area New Parking Surveys Received | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of important open spaces or physical features. • Allows for insufficient spaces for future on-street EV changepoints which will inevitably be required as |

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS – 7 June 2022

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|---|---------------|---|
| 10 | 21/02438/FUL | Chorus Homes Group North Of 54 Henbrook St Neots Demolition of 33 garages and construction of 3 dwellings (one 3 bed, two 2 beds) with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received | | the government pushes for greater EV ownership. Please also record the Council's objections in in line with NPPF; The proposals conflict with Section 2, Para 7 NPPF which states: "... the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs " |
| 11 | 21/02436/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Between 130 And 132 Duck Lane St Neots Demolition of 24 garages and construction of 3 dwellings (one 1 Bed, two 2 Beds) with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received | | The proposed developments will leave no scope for future EV charge hubs or points. Section 2, Para 104 NPPF reinforces the requirement to consider transport issues and changing transport technology at the earliest stage of plan making. |
| 12 | 21/02437/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Rear Of 108 To 114 Duck Lane St Neots Demolition of 19 garages and construction of two 3 bed dwellings with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received | | Para 16 NPPF states: plans should... "(c) be shaped by early, proportionate, and effective engagement between plan-makers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees;" |
| 13 | 21/02394/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Adjacent 28 Springbrook Eynesbury Demolition of 7 garages and construction of two 2 bed dwellings with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received | | This is reinforced in the St Neots Neighbourhood Plan; "1.4.8 Early discussions should be held with the Town Council to discuss design issues. Proposals that have evolved with the community will be favourably considered. The Town Council can provide valuable advice to applicants in terms of St Neots special character and local distinctiveness." |
| 14 | 21/02495/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Adjacent 45 Springbrook Eynesbury Demolition of 8 garages and construction of three 2 bed dwellings with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received | | Chorus Homes have however failed to engage with the Town Council or |
| 15 | 21/02431/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Opposite 27 To 30 Naseby Gardens St Neots Demolition of 16 garages and construction of four 2 bed dwellings with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received | | |

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS – 7 June 2022

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|---|---------------|---|
| 16 | 21/02494/FUL | <p>Chorus Homes Group North East of 157 Duck Lane St Neots Demolition of 6 garages and construction of two 3 bed dwellings with associated external works New Parking Surveys Received</p> | | <p>the community on the applications presented.</p> <p>The application has failed to take into account or include strategic policies from the Local Planning authorities policies or the local Neighbourhood plan as set out in Para17 of NPPF; “The development plan must include strategic policies to address each local planning authority’s priorities for the development and use of land in its area 12 . These strategic policies can be produced in different ways, depending on the issues and opportunities facing each area. They can be contained in:</p> <p>a) joint or individual local plans, ...”</p> <p>The applications have not considered or addressed Policy PT1 of St Neots Neighbourhood Plan, which states: “Policy PT1 Development proposals must demonstrate how opportunities for the use of sustainable modes of transport are maximised. This should be achieved through maximising the potential for cycling and walking throughout the site and through contributions towards the extension, linking, and/or improvement of existing routes throughout St Neots.”</p> <p>Finally, the proposals conflict with Policy PT2 of St Neots Neighbourhood Plan, which states; “Policy PT2 All development proposals which include an element of residential development, including change of use to residential, must provide adequate space for vehicle parking to meet the expected needs of residents and visitors. A design-led approach should be taken to ensure parking is properly integrated into the layout of the scheme, minimises adverse impacts on surrounding uses, and facilitates traffic flow and accessibility for service and emergency vehicles.”</p> |

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS – 7 June 2022

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|-----------|-------------|------------------|---|
| | | | | The applicant has failed to take into account local priorities as directed by the NPPF. |

Committee Chairperson

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|--|---------------|---|
| 1 | 21/02393/FUL | <p>Chorus Homes Group Adjacent 13 Mallard Lane St Neots Demolition of 7 garages and construction one 3 Bed Dwelling with associated external works</p> | Reject | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|---|---------------|---|
| 2 | 21/02394/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Adjacent 28 Springbrook Eynesbury Demolition of 7 garages and construction of two 2 bed dwellings with associated external works | Reject | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|---|---------------|---|
| 3 | 21/02396/FUL | Chorus Homes Group South East Of 32 Mallard Lane St Neots Demolition of 12 garages and construction of two 2 bed dwellings with associated external works | Reject | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|---|---------------|---|
| 4 | 21/02397/FUL | <p>Chorus Homes Group North Of 197 Duck Lane St Neots Demolition of 13 garages and construction of two 3 bed dwellings with associated external works</p> | Reject | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|---|---------------|---|
| 5 | 21/02398/FUL | <p>Chorus Homes Group Adjacent 2 Mallard Lane St Neots Demolition of 6 garages and construction of two 2 Bed Dwellings with associated external works</p> | Reject | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|---|---------------|---|
| 6 | 21/02399/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Between 8 And 10 Mallard Lane St Neots Demolition of 9 garages and construction of 1 dwelling with associated external works | Reject | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|--|----------------------|---|
| 7 | 21/02400/FUL | <p>Chorus Homes Group Between 20 And 22 Mallard Lane St Neots Demolition of 6 garages and construction of two 2 Bed Dwellings with associated external works</p> | <p>Reject</p> | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|---|---------------|---|
| 8 | 21/02495/FUL | Chorus Homes Group Adjacent 45 Springbrook Eynesbury Demolition of 8 garages and construction of three 2 bed dwellings with associated external works | Reject | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|--|---------------|---|
| 9 | 21/02437/FUL | <p>Chorus Homes Group Rear Of 108 To 114 Duck Lane St Neots Demolition of 19 garages and construction of two 3 bed dwellings with associated external works Demolition of 19 garages and construction of two 3 bed dwellings with associated external works</p> | Reject | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|--|---------------|---|
| 10 | 21/02438/FUL | <p>Chorus Homes Group North Of 54 Hen brook St Neots Demolition of 33 garages and construction of 3 dwellings (one 3 bed, two 2 beds) with associated external works</p> | Reject | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|--|---------------|---|
| 11 | 21/02494/FUL | Chorus Homes Group North East Of 157 Duck Lane St Neots Demolition of 6 garages and construction of two 2 bed dwellings with associated external works | Reject | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |


| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|--|----------------------|---|
| 12 | 21/02436/FUL | <p>Chorus Homes Group Between 130 And 132 Duck Lane St Neots Demolition of 24 garages and construction of 3 dwellings (one 1 Bed, two 2 Beds) with associated external works</p> | <p>Reject</p> | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|--------------|--|---------------|---|
| 13 | 21/02431/FUL | <p>Chorus Homes Group Opposite 27 To 30 Naseby Gardens St Neots Demolition of 16 garages and construction of four 2 bed dwellings with associated external works</p> | Reject | <p>This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features.</p> |


| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| 14 | 21/02493/FUL | Chorus Homes Group North od 115 Duck Lane, St Neots Construction of one 1 bed dwelling with associated external works | Reject | This development is on land that is used by local residents for parking. This includes not just the garages that are earmarked for demolition, but also the hard standing that has become the de facto parking provision as garages have become too small and/or too expensive for residents to use for parking. This will result in a significant loss of parking, pushing traffic into the street. The resulting congestion will cause significant problems for local residents, including road safety and emergency vehicle access. Overlooking/loss of privacy Adequacy of parking/loading/turning Highway safety Traffic congestion Layout and density of building Road access Local, strategic, regional, and national planning policies Disabled persons access Proposals in the development plan. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions) Demonstrable harm to the amenity of the residents Loss of important open spaces or physical features. |
| 15 | 21/02413/HHFUL | Mr Thomas Evans 30 Luke Street Eynesbury St Neots Demolition of existing chimney and external alterations to the rear part of the building, including the addition of conservation rooflights | Reject | Effect on listed building and conservation area. Design, appearance, and materials. |
| 16 | 21/02381/HHFUL | Mr & Mrs Tom Walker 155 Great North Road Eaton Socon St Neots Proposed first floor extension to the front of the property | Approve | Improves the property. Will have no negative impact on the wider landscape character of the area. |
| 17 | 21/02000/HHFUL | Mr Mark McGuigan 5 St Neots Road Eaton Ford St Neots Dropping of roadside kerb | Approve | Noted |
| 18 | 21/02427/HHFUL | Mr and Mrs Howe Home Field Kings Lane St Neots Proposed single storey free standing out-building including sleeping accommodation and a shower room (to be used solely by a family member) | Approve | Minimum impact on neighbours |

| No. | Reference | Development | SNTC Decision | Notes |
|-----|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| 19 | 21/02603/FUL | Mr Peter Mckeown 22 High Street St Neots PE19 1JA Full retrospective planning application to regularise matters on site for a residential development containing 18 dwellings (including conversion of existing chapel) along with access, parking, landscaping, and associated infrastructure | Noted | |
| 20 | 21/02552/HHFUL | Mr & Mrs McGarry 37 Burwell Road Eaton Ford St Neots PE19 7QQ Proposed single storey infill extension between house and garage and widen existing front entrance canopy | Approve | Makes efficient use of the site |
| 21 | 21/02571/TREE | Mr Micheal Cullis The Spinney 98A Great North Road Eaton Socon St Neots PE19 8EJ Oak Tree - general tidy and removal of dead timber, clean the undergrowth and dead wood and to ensure there is no danger from the boughs that hang across the public footpath and the garden immediately left of the public footpath. This will also bring further light into property | Approve | Noted |
| 22 | 21/02511/LBC | Mr and Mrs D Barnes The Mill House School Lane Eaton Socon St Neots PE19 8GW Remove garage door and insert window; insert 2 windows in north elevation and extend balcony | Approve | Subject to approval of conservation officer |
| 23 | 21/02504/HHFUL | Cheryl Stead 30 Wilkinson Close Eaton Socon St Neots PE19 8HJ Proposed two storey side/front extension. | Approve | Satisfactory proposal in terms of scale and pattern of development |

Committee Chairperson



First Floor





2B Standard (GIFA = 79.3m²)
Ground Floor



2B Standard (GIFA = 79.3m²)



Location Plan



Site Plan



DO NOT SCALE FROM THIS DRAWING
THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR IS TO CHECK ALL DIMENSIONS ON SITE AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE SUPERVISING OFFICER.
ALL DIMENSIONS ARE SHOWN IN 'mm' UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED.

NOTES:

KEY

- HARD LANDSCAPING:**
- Allocated Parking**
Allocated parking to be surfaced with tarmac to approval of Local Authority.
 - Private Paths**
Private footpaths formed with paving slabs to approval of Local Authority.
 - Bin Collection Points**
Bin collection points to be permeable tarmac paving to approval of Local Authority.
- SOFT LANDSCAPING:**
- Rear Gardens**
 - Front Gardens**
Front gardens to be turf/shrub borders, refer to landscape drawings.
 - Proposed New Trees**
Locations of new planting (indicative). Refer to detailed landscaping proposals prepared by Landscape Architect.
 - Soft Landscaping / Planting**
Location of proposed planting, indicative.

BOUNDARY TREATMENTS:

- 1.8m Close Boarded Fence**
1.8m high close boarded timber fence with concrete gravel boards at changes of level where required.
- 1m Metal Rail Fence**
1000mm high vertical metal rail fence.
- 1.8m High Wall**
1800mm high 225mm thick brick wall with brick on edge coping.

OTHER:

- Refuse Bins**
Location of refuse bin storage within curtilage of dwellings / bin collection points.
- Timber Sheds**
Location of timber sheds within gardens providing cycle storage.
- Car Parking**
Allocated parking space for existing resident
Parking provision for new dwelling
Visitor spaces.

| Site 13 - Development Summary | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Plot no. | Type | Size (m²) | Total (nr.) |
| 1 & 2 | 2B4P | 79 | 2 |
| | | | Total 2 |
| Site Area | 0.04 Ha | | |
| Parking | 4 spaces (See Parking Strategy) | | |

| Revisions | | |
|-----------|--------|--|
| Suffix | Date | Amendments |
| A | Jan 22 | Additional windows added to side elevations. |
| B | Feb 22 | Red line corrected on Location Plan |

Status **PLANNING SUBMISSION**

The Design Partnership
The Design Partnership (Ely) Ltd
Claremont House,
10 Station Road,
Chatteris
Cambridgeshire PE16 6AG
Tel: 01354 693111

Job Title
Proposed Redevelopment of Garage Court
Adjacent to No.46 Springbrook
St Neots for Chorus Homes Developments Ltd

Drawing Title
Planning Drawing
Site Plan, Location Plan,
Floor Plans & Elevations

| Date | Scale | Dwn | Dwg No | Rev |
|---------|----------|-----|---------------|-----|
| Sept 21 | Var @ A1 | BP | CH-903-P13-01 | B |