

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 18 NOVEMBER 2019

Case No: 19/00503/FUL (Full Planning Application)
Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two dwellings
Location: 6 Mill Common Huntingdon PE29 3AU
Applicant: 6 Mill Common Ltd (Mr P Marsden Findlay)
Grid Ref: 523695 271350
Date of Registration: 09.05.2019
Parish: Huntingdon

RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE

This application is referred to the Development Management Committee as Huntingdon Town Council's recommendation of Approval is contrary to the officer recommendation of Refusal.

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

- 1.1 The site comprises a two storey detached dwelling situated within the built-up area and conservation area of Huntingdon and is currently unoccupied and in a derelict state with overgrown vegetation. This area of Mill common has been identified as an area of high archaeological potential.
- 1.2 The site backs onto Alconbury Brook and beyond that lies Portholme Meadow which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) .There are several protected trees within the application site and within the neighbouring gardens, close to the shared boundaries. The site is in close proximity to the A14 trunk road and falls within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The levels within the site fall significantly from Mill Common down to Alconbury Brook.
- 1.3 The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of two, three storey, 4 bedroom dwellings with double garages each with its own driveway.

- 1.4 The application has been amended since first submission, reducing the size of the site to exclude the area of land to south which is designated as being in flood zone 3, the amended site area has therefore been assessed as being in flood zone 1. The proposals have also been amended reducing the depth and massing of the dwellings and their siting within the site. Both plots now step down in height and the side ground floor windows have been removed to resolve previous amenity impacts concerns with overlooking, overshadowing and loss of light to the neighbouring properties 'Glendower' and 'Whitehills'.
- 1.5 The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment dated September 2019.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE

- 2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2019) sets out the three economic, social and environmental objectives of the planning system to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF confirms that 'So sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for:

- delivering a sufficient supply of homes;
- achieving well-designed places;
- conserving and enhancing the natural environment;
- conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
-

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

3. PLANNING POLICIES

- 3.1 Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 (Adopted 15th May 2019)

- LP1: Amount of Development
- LP2: Strategy for Development
- 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
- LP31: Trees, Woodland, Hedges and Hedgerow.
- LP34: Heritage Assets and their settings
- LP36: Air Quality

3.2 Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) 2018-2026

- NE3 - Setting of Huntingdon
- BE1 - Design and Landscaping
- BE2 - Local Distinctiveness and Aesthetics
- BE3 - Heritage Assets

3.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and Guidance:

- Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD 2017
- Huntingdonshire Townscape and Landscape Assessment SPD 2007
- Huntingdon Conservation Area Character Assessment 2007
- Developer Contributions SPD 2011 - Part H
- Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD 2017
- Annual Monitoring Report October 2019 regarding housing land supply

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

4. PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 None relevant.

5. CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Huntingdon Town Council - Recommends approval (COPY ATTACHED) and commented - Recommend approve subject to archaeological investigations due to recent find in the Mill common Area.

5.2 Huntingdon Town Council - Updated comments following amendments: Recommends approve. Members noted the revised tree information and updated Flood risk assessment, but pointed out that they'd still like to see archaeological investigations in the area.

5.3 CCC Local Highway Authority (LHA): No objections or recommendations.

- 5.4 The Wildlife Trust - No comments received.
- 5.5 HDC Conservation - Objects to the proposals and commented: The existing dwelling does not appear of special merit to the Conservation Area, so demolition may be supported in principle. This proposal for two dwellings introduces more bulk, massing and is a larger scale. The general morphology of this part of the Conservation Area is single dwellings in spacious plots. The proposed development is cramped within the existing plot and removes the existing space around the dwelling which also provides space between it and neighbouring dwellings and plots.
- The proposed two three-storey dwellings include two driveways, parking, turning areas, two double garages, three rear terraces and steps for each, changing of ground levels and existing landscape in this sensitive natural area. (note 1900 OS maps show landscape features and buildings on this site).
- The proposal has more height and bulk than existing with more glazing towards the flat, open meadow of Port Holme and therefore the intensification of development here is considered harmful and without public benefit to outweigh. The relationship of the existing dwelling with others on Mill Common and their relationship with important elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area, such as the River and Portholme is not preserved by this proposal.
- 5.6 HDC Trees & Landscaping - Recommends refusal due to significant Arboricultural impacts and lack of sufficient information and commented: The site contains a range of important, predominately broadleaf trees which are subject to the protection a Tree Preservation Order and the surrounding Conservation Area. Most notably are a mature Chestnut at the front of the site to the immediate east of the drive and a Willow and Yew group to the south of the existing house. The trees are commensurate in terms of their species and age and significantly contribute to the treed character of the surrounding area. As such, I consider that they hold significant public visual amenity value and their retention and protection is essential as part of the redevelopment of this site.
- While the application is supported by an Arboricultural Report and Tree Protection Plan, it does not reflect the latest layout plan for the site.

Furthermore, the details do not include any reference to trees adjacent to the site, nor does it provide a full impact assessment in respect of the trees. As such, it is not possible to fully explore the implications of the proposals. However on the basis of the information submitted, I have the following concerns:

The proposed division of the access to create a separate driveway has the potential to have a significant detrimental impact on T1 (mature Horse Chestnut). This proposal brings the driveway of Plot 1 to the east, directly into the theoretical Root Protection Area (RPA) of T1. Given that the root area of this tree is unlikely to be a concentric circle due to the presence of the road and hard surface to the north, the siting of the new driveway and parking will significantly decrease the rooting area of the tree which is not under a hard surface. This is likely to impact on the availability of essential substances to the feeding roots, having a negative impact on its physiological condition and potentially inducing premature decline and loss.

The garage unit of Plot 1 is also proposed to sit directly within the RPA of T1. The construction of this will also impact on the feeding roots of the tree and potentially the larger anchoring roots. Again this is likely to have a negative impact on the tree's physiological condition. Paragraph 5.3.1 of the British Standard 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations) outlines that the default position should be that structures (inc. hard surfaces) should be located outside of RPA's unless there is an "overriding justification" which I do not consider there to be in this situation. Especially as site design could address these.

While the Arb' Report suggests some mitigation activities (pg 3) these are not considered to fully address the principal issues of development within the RPA of a mature trees and do not give robust proposals of how these issues could be overcome.

The Arb Report does not address the impact of the changes in levels and working environment around trees T2-T4. They appear to be shown as retained, yet no details of how the excavation to the immediate north and how the trees will be affected is given.

- 5.7 HDC - Urban Design - recommends refusal and commented: The submitted scheme for two dwellings forms a cramped and overly intensive form of development and fails to relate to the more spacious

arrangement and character of existing dwellings in Mill Common. Recommend development is limited to a single dwelling with planting either side and side driveway/garage.

- 5.8 HDC Environmental Health - Additional information required prior to determination of the application and commented: Policy LP 36 (c) states that an Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA) is required if: 'any part of the site is located within 50m of an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or a Clean Air Zone (CAZ);' Therefore an AQIA is required. This will need to focus more on the impact of the current AQ on any future residents, rather than the impact of the proposed development on the current state of affairs.

In a similar stance, again due to the proximity of the A14 I would also recommend a noise condition along the lines of the following:

Prior to the commencement of the development to which this permission relates, a scheme detailing the impact of road traffic noise from the A14 on the development site and mitigation measures to be employed, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The proposed development shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the scheme approved. No deviation shall take place without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. The officer also requests that conditions should be attached to the decision notice restricting the hours of deliveries and timing of the construction phases and that there shall be no burning of waste.

- 5.9 HDC Operations (Bins) - No comments received.
- 5.10 Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology - No objections to the development subject to the submission of a programme of archaeological investigation secured through the inclusion of a negative condition, and commented: Our records indicate that this site lies in an area of high archaeological potential, situated directly adjacent to the site of a former 12th century siege castle, the earthwork remnants of which are incorporated into garden landscaping (Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record reference 02545, 02545c). The siege castle itself partially occupied the re-used location of a Roman 'corridor' villa site, and the remnants of both were identified during archaeological investigations in 1967-68, when rescue

excavation undertaken following the discovery of human bones during the construction of no.7 Mill Common identified a Roman building, the site of which was later overlain by a large Saxon cemetery and a building of contemporary date which may represent a chapel (CHER refs ECB2618, 02545a, 02545b). The cemetery was no longer in use by the 14th century and a postmill was built on the site in the later medieval period and subsequently the clay foundations of this building were cut by a large grave containing eight bodies, which may relate to the gallows which occupied the site by the 17th century (02545d, 02545e). Subsequent development-led archaeological investigations in the immediate vicinity have identified further evidence of Roman occupation to the east of the proposed development at 3 Mill Common (MCB16329), to the immediate north in the grounds of 4 Mill Common (MCB26705) and directly adjacent to the south-east at 5a Mill Common (MCB17364).

Condition: Archaeology - No demolition/development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI) which has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI which shall include:

- a) the statement of significance and research objectives;
- b) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
- c) The programme for the analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material. Part (c) of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Developers will wish to ensure that in drawing up their development programme, the timetable for the investigation is included within the details of the agreed scheme.

Reason - To ensure that the significance of historic environment assets is conserved in line with NPPF section 16.

- 5.11 Environment Agency (EA) - No objections, subject to the mitigation measures proposed in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) being adhered to.
- 5.12 Anglian Water - No comment.
- 5.13 Cadent Gas /National Grid - No objections, commented: Searches based on your enquiry have identified that there is apparatus in the vicinity of your enquiry which may be affected by the activities specified.

6. REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.1 Representations were received from 5A, 7 and 11A Mill Common, 78 Monkton Farleigh Bradford-on Avon and 42 Jackson St Peniculk Midlothian raising the following objections to the proposals:
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
 - Out of keeping with the character of the area
 - Impact on archaeology
 - Loss of trees
 - Overdevelopment of the site

7. ASSESSMENT

- 7.1 This report assesses the following principal, important and controversial issues:
- The Principle of the development and design
 - Impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation area
 - Residential Amenity
 - Access and Highway Safety
 - Ecology, Biodiversity and protected Trees
 - Infrastructure requirements and Planning Obligations
 - Housing Mix

The Principle of the Development

- 7.2 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Section 38(6)) identifies that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is reiterated within the NPPF 2019. Under section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 when dealing with planning applications, the Local Planning Authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as

material to the application, and to any other material considerations. 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 The site is located within the built up area of Huntingdon. Policy LP7 supports a proposal for housing development (class C3) where it is appropriately located within a built-up area of an identified Spatial Planning Area settlement. As such, the broader principle of residential development is considered to be acceptable in principle on the site, subject to all other material considerations being addressed.

Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

- 7.4 This part of Mill Common is characterised by dwellings of different styles within generous plots comprising generous areas of landscaping with tree planting between dwellings.
- 7.5 The amendments reduce the depth, massing and change the siting of the units. Both plots now step down in height to 1 storey adjacent to the east and west boundaries and have been reduced in depth from approximately 17.4m to 13.7m with the shallower 10m deep single storey elements (incorporating the ground floor bedrooms and bathroom) arranged so as to abut the side garden boundaries with 'Glendower' and 'Whitehills' either side.
- 7.6 Plot 1 has been relocated approximately 1.3m further way from the eastern site boundary with 'Glendower'. The ground floor kitchen and utility windows have been omitted from the side (east and west) elevations of both plots.
- 7.7 The revised massing, reduced depth of the units and removal of the side ground floor windows is supported and resolves previous amenity impacts (overlooking, overshadowing and loss of daylight) to 'Glendower' and Whitehills' either side.
- 7.8 The garage for Plot 1 has been relocated further north closer to Mill Common, with the two parking spaces located to be south, between the garage and the dwelling. Whilst this arrangement improves the

concealment of the parking, the proposed garages continue to project significantly further forward of the proposed units and Glendower and Whitehills either side. The siting of the garages limits the extent of soft landscaping at the front of the units and is dominant and detracts from the appearance of the units. The garage for Plot 1 also results in a significant loss of tree planting at the front and side of the dwelling. The HDC Design Guide (page 94) requires garages to be aligned with or setback from the building frontage, however given the narrow width of the site and the proposal for two units this would not be possible. These garages remain unacceptable.

- 7.9 The proposals do not demonstrate where the cycle and refuse storage is to be located, however this could be controlled by a condition if the recommendation were to approve.
- 7.10 The revised site plan introduces a boundary to the rear of the dwellings in line with the front elevation of No. 5a Mill Common to the southeast. This appears to foreshorten the depth of the proposed gardens - it is unclear why this additional boundary is required. A 1.8m boundary in this location is likely to appear visually prominent from Port Holme Meadow.
- 7.11 Despite the amendments the proposal remains for two dwellings, arranged with a narrow 1.45m break between the units. The proposed massing and depth of the dwellings with the two identical units would continue to form an overly cramped and intensive form of development that would fail to relate to the more spacious form of development in the vicinity and would result in significant harm to the established character and appearance of the conservation area which would be at odds with the prevailing linear pattern of development fronting Mill Common.
- 7.12 For the above reasons, the submitted scheme is contrary to Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 (adopted May 2019) Policies LP11, 12, 13, 34, Policies NE3, BE1, BE2 and BE3 of Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2026 and the place making principles set out within chapter 3 of the HDC Design Guide SPD 2017.

Residential Amenity

- 7.13 The relevant part of the NPPF (2019) and the Council's planning policy LP14 of the Local Plan to 2036 seeks to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties. The policy also seeks to ensure residential amenity is not harmed as a result of development; the NPPF (2019), within its core principles states that planning should "always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings".
- 7.14 It is considered that the submitted drawings demonstrate that the site could accommodate the amount of development proposed without having an adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity however; the site is located within and Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) given its proximity to the A14 trunk road. Policy LP14 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan Policy to 2036 states that a proposal will be supported where a high standard of amenity is provided for all users and occupiers of the proposed development and maintained for users and occupiers of neighbouring land and buildings. Criteria C of this policy goes on to state that a proposal will be required to ensure that; the predicted adverse noise impacts, including internal and external levels, timing, duration and character, will be acceptable and d. That predicted adverse impacts from the following sources will be made acceptable, these include obtrusive light; contamination; air pollution; water pollution; odour; dust; and overheating.
- 7.15 Policy LP36 states that a proposal will need to be accompanied by an Air Quality Assessment where any part of the site is located within an AQMA. The application is not supported by any such assessment. The proposals therefore do not demonstrate that the prospective occupiers of the dwellings will enjoy a high standard of amenity in regards to air pollution, the proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to policy LP14 and LP36 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 and Policy BE1 of Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2026 in regards to amenity impacts.
- 7.16 Details of proposed noise mitigation measures could be required by condition if Members are minded to approve the application contrary to the recommendation of the officer.

Access and Highway Safety

- 7.17 Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets the test that "development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of the development would be severe".
- 7.18 The main issue is whether there would be any severe adverse effects on highway safety and traffic flow arising from the proposed development of two homes in this location. In determining whether the development would have severe residual cumulative impacts, Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) has been consulted. The Local Highway Authority has no objections to the application and made no recommendations.
- 7.19 Whilst the proposals make adequate provision for the parking and turning of vehicles within the site, there are no details of cycle storage provision however these details could be controlled by a relevant condition if the application were to be supported.
- 7.20 The proposals are therefore considered to meet the aims and objectives of paragraph 109 the NPPF, NPPF, policies LP16 and LP17 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 (HLP) and Policy BE1 of Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2026 which seek as a basic requirement of any successful developments provides a safe physical access from the public highway to ensure that pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles have access as required.

Ecology, Biodiversity

- 7.21 The site comprises several trees and is currently overgrown with shrubs and weeds; the site is also located close to Portholme Meadow a SSSI and Alconbury Brook and would provide an ideal habitat for protected species.
- 7.22 Policy LP30 states that a proposal is required to demonstrate that all potential adverse impacts on biodiversity have been investigated via an 'appropriate assessment' in accordance with the Habitats Directive, the policy goes on to say a proposal is required to demonstrate that there will be no net loss in biodiversity and provide a net gain where possible

through the planned retention, enhancements and creation of habitats and wildlife features, appropriate to the scale, type and location of development. This policy also follows the criteria set out in the NPPF.

- 7.23 As no such assessment has been submitted to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts or a net gain in biodiversity the proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF (2019), Policy LP30 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 and Policies BE1 and BE2 of Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2026.

Impact on Protected Trees

- 7.24 The site contains a range of important, predominately broadleaf trees some of which are subject to the protection of a Tree Preservation Order and the surrounding conservation area.
- 7.25 Policy LP31 states that a proposal is required to demonstrate that the potential for adverse impacts on trees has been investigated, whilst the application is accompanied by a supporting by an Arboricultural Report and Tree Protection Plan, it does not reflect the latest layout plan for the site. Furthermore, the details do not include any reference to trees adjacent to the site, nor does it provide a full impact assessment in respect of the trees. As such, it is not possible to fully explore the implications of the proposals. The proposals are therefore likely to result in damage and premature loss of onsite trees, eroding the character of the surrounding area which is contrary to Policy LP31 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 and Policies BE1 and BE2 of Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2026.

Infrastructure Requirements and Planning Obligations

- 7.26 The Infrastructure Business Plan 2013/2014 (2013) was developed by the Growth and Infrastructure Group of the Huntingdonshire Local Strategic Partnership. It helps to identify the infrastructure needs arising from the development proposed to 2036.
- 7.27 Statutory tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (Regulation 122) require that S106 planning obligations must be:

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the development; and
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

7.28 The application is not accompanied by a satisfactory completed unilateral undertaking for the provision of wheeled bins, the proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to Policy LP4 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 and the Developer Contributions SPD (2011) Part H.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):

7.29 As this planning application is for a minor development, 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.

Housing Mix

7.30 Policy LP25 of HLP states that a proposal that includes housing will be supported where it meets Building Regulation accessibility standards (or replacement standards) as set out below, unless it can be demonstrated that site specific factors make achieving this impractical or unviable:

f. ensuring 100% of new dwellings, across all tenures provided, meet Building Regulation requirement M4 (2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' (or replacement standards); and

7.31 The proposals are supported by a statement dated 23.10.19 by Keith Hutchinson (agent) that confirms that the two dwellings have been designed to fully comply with the requirements. The supporting statement demonstrates how the proposals will meet the aims and objectives of Policy LP25, in particular meeting criteria f) and is therefore considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Other matters - Archaeology

7.32 The proposals have been assessed in accordance with Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology who have identified that the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential, whilst CCC

Archaeology do not object to the proposals proceeding in this location they have requested that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigations secured through the inclusion of a negative condition. Should members decide to approve the proposals contrary to the officer recommendation, a condition would be required to be added to the decision to this effect.

Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 7.33 The NPPF has at its heart the presumption in favour of sustainable development. To be sustainable, development must, as noted in paragraph 6 of the NPPF, strike a satisfactory balance between the economic, environmental and social considerations.
- 7.34 In terms of the economic dimension of sustainable development, the proposal would modestly contribute towards economic growth, including job creation - during the construction phase and in the longer term through the additional population assisting the local economy through spending on local services/facilities. There will also be Council Tax receipts arising from the development. The loss of this relatively small parcel of land is outweighed by the modest positive economic benefits of this development, in this location.
- 7.35 Regarding the social dimension, the site itself appears to have no significant physical constraints and is deliverable. It would also marginally increase the supply of housing, although the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land, therefore the provision of two market dwellings on the application site is afforded very limited weight. The proposal would be within walking and cycling distance of the limited facilities of Huntingdon.
- 7.36 In terms of the environmental dimension of sustainable development, there is environmental harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area with the loss of trees, the applicant has also failed to demonstrate that there would be no adverse impacts on biodiversity and protected trees.
- 7.37 Having assessed all three dimensions of sustainable development; economic, environmental and social within this report it is concluded

that the proposal is considered to result in environmental harm. There is only a minor benefit of two dwellings of market accommodation. However, section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

- 7.38 The scheme would therefore conflict with the NPPF (2019) which states that it does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Officers consider that the creation of two market dwellings in this location would not accord with the above mentioned policies of the up-to-date Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036, and, as outlined in the preceding sections of this report, there are no other material considerations which would provide an overriding reason to disregard the development plan. Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission should be refused for the following reasons:

8. RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE for the following reasons

Reason 1 - Character and appearance of the conservation area

The proposed massing and depth of the dwellings with the two identical units would create an overly cramped and intensive form of development that would fail to relate to the more spacious form of development in the vicinity and would result in significant harm to the established character and appearance of the conservation area and would be at odds with the prevailing linear pattern of development fronting Mill Common. There are no public benefits that would outweigh this identified harm and the proposals are therefore contrary to the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 (adopted May 2019) Policy LP11, LP12, LP13, LP34, Policies NE3, BE1, BE2 and BE3 of Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2026 and the place making principles set out within chapter 3 of the HDC Design Guide SPD 2017, and the place making principles set out within chapter 3 of the HDC Design Guide SPD 2017.

Reason 2 Amenity - Air Quality

The site is located within close proximity to the A14 Trunk road within a designated Air Quality Management Area where an appropriate Air Quality Impact Assessment is required to support any proposal for development. The application is not supported by any such assessment. The proposals therefore do not demonstrate that the prospective occupiers of the dwellings will enjoy a high standard of amenity in regards to air quality, the proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to policy LP14 and LP36 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 and Policy BE1 of Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2026 in regards to amenity impacts.

Reason 3 Biodiversity

The site comprises several trees and is currently overgrown with shrubs and weeds, the site is also located close to Portholme Meadow a SSSI and Alconbury Brook and would provide an ideal habitat for protected species. The application fails to demonstrate that there will be no significant detrimental impacts on protected habitats and species and fails to demonstrate that the proposals will achieve a net gain in Biodiversity. The proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to Paragraph 170 of the NPPF (2019), policies LP30 and LP31 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 and Policies BE1 and BE2 of Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2026.

Reason 4 Trees

The site contains a range of important, predominately broadleaf trees some of which are subject to the protection of a Tree Preservation Order. Whilst the application is accompanied by a supporting Arboricultural Report and Tree Protection Plan, it does not reflect the latest layout plan for the site. Furthermore, the details do not include any reference to trees adjacent to the site, nor does it provide a full impact assessment in respect of the trees. As such, it is not possible to fully explore the implications of the proposals. The proposals are therefore likely to result in damage and premature loss of onsite trees, eroding the character of the surrounding area which is contrary to Policy LP31 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 and Policies BE1 and BE2 of Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2026 which seeks

to protect existing trees and hedgerows from the impacts of development and to halt the loss of trees in Huntingdonshire.

Reason 5 - Bin UU

The proposals seek to increase the number of dwellings within the site and there would be an additional requirement for provision of bins for the addition of another dwelling at the site. The application is not accompanied by a satisfactory completed (omission of accompanying plan) unilateral undertaking for the provision of wheeled bins, the proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to Policy LP4 and the Developer Contributions SPD (2011) - Part Hlf 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

CONTACT OFFICER:

Enquiries about this report to **Debra Bell Senior Development Management Officer 01480 388139**

HUNTINGDON TOWN COUNCIL**PLANNING COMMENTS : 30th May 2019**

19/00503/FUL

Mr P Marsden Findlay, 6 Mill Common, c/o Agent

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two dwellings

Recommend APPROVE subject to archaeological investigations due to recent finds in the Mill Common area.

19/00526/FUL

Mr Ogle, c/o Agent

Change of use from public house to 5 flats. Victoria Inn, 52 Ouse Walk, Huntingdon, PE29 3QW

Recommend APPROVE.

19/00679/FUL

Mr Ian Emery, c/o agent Campbell McCrae Ltd, Chapel House, 5 The Stiles, Godmanchester, PE29 2JF

Part-demolition of existing double garage and construction of new dwelling-house, including amenity and revised vehicular access. Land at 93 Desborough Road, Hartford

Recommend APPROVAL.

Amended site plan , elevations, floor plans and roof plans received.

Recommend APPROVE.

HUNTINGDON TOWN COUNCIL**PLANNING COMMENTS : 11th July 2019**

19/00503/FUL

Mr P Marsden Findlay, 6 Mill Common, c/o Agent

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two dwellings

Recommend APPROVE subject to archaeological investigations due to recent find in the Mill Common area.

1. Revised Tree information received. 2. Updated Flood Risk Assessment

Recommend APPROVE. Members noted the Revised Tree Information and Updated Flood Risk Assessment, but pointed out that they'd still like to see archaeological investigations in the area.

19/01203/FUL

Mr C Death, Meadow Barns Developments Ltd, c/o Agents

Erection of building to accommodate four 1-bed residential units. 97 High Street, Huntingdon, PE29 3DP

Recommend APPROVE. Members had no objections.

19/01188/FUL

Mr A Cooper, 29 Claytons Way, Huntingdon, PE29 1WW

Construct new 3 bedroom dwelling with the curtilage of No. 29 boundaries. Land at 29 Claytons Way, Huntingdon

Recommend APPROVE. Members agreed with the conditions suggested by CCC Highways but otherwise had no objections.

19/01247/S73

Mr Peter Harris, Hotel Chocolat, c/o Agent

Amendment of condition 2 from application 19/00245/FUL - new plans to increase canopy height by 1.3m and adding a mezzanine. 3 Redwongs Way, Huntingdon, PE29 7HF

Recommend APPROVE. Members had no objections.

HUNTINGDON TOWN COUNCIL**PLANNING COMMENTS : 5th SEPTEMBER 2019**

19/00503/FUL

Mr P Marsden Findlay, 6 Mill Common, c/o Agent

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two dwellings

Recommend APPROVE subject to archaeological investigations due to recent find in the Mill Common area.

1. Revised Tree information received. 2. Updated Flood Risk Assessment 27/08/2019 Amended FRA 08/07/2019; Amended plans received, reduced site plan and amended elevations plans.

Recommend APPROVE. Members noted the Revised Tree Information and Updated Flood Risk Assessment, but pointed out that they'd still like to see archaeological investigations in the area.**05/09/2019 Recommend APPROVE.**

19/00919/FUL

Kate Bleloch, Lidl Great Britain, Wellington Parkway, Magna Park, LE1 4XW

To create a two lane egress onto Stukeley Road from Lidl's existing access. 11 Stukeley Road, Huntingdon

Recommend REFUSE. Members felt the proposed changes would not reduce congestion in the area, and suggested right turns out of the store negatively affected the safety of the road. Members also felt that adding another lane would make the crossing unsafe for pedestrians. Members also noted that there was insufficient space for the proposed box junction. Lastly, Members felt that the traffic and incident information was incomplete. Members recommended that the junction should allow left turns only.

Response note received by Agents 16/08/2019 addressing comments received from CCC Highways and Huntingdon Town Council

Recommend REFUSE. Members did not feel that the response and design from Lidl alleviated their previous concerns.

19/01573/HHFUL

Miss Yvette Strevens, 7 Tennyson Close, Huntingdon, PE29 1NG

Erection of single storey conservatory at the rear of the property. 7 Tennyson Close, Huntingdon, PE29 1NG

Recommend APPROVE. Members had no objections