Case No: 1202038FUL (FULL PLANNING APPLICATION)
Case No: 1202039CAC (CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT)

Proposal: ERECTION OF 2 FLATS AND ALTERATIONS OF EXISTING FLATS FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF GARAGES

Location: HARTFORD COURT 21 MAIN STREET HARTFORD PE29 1YS

Applicant: HARTFORD COURT

Grid Ref: 525443 272650

Date of Registration: 21.12.2012

Parish: HUNTINGDON

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION

1.1 The site relates to the garage and parking area for Hartford Court, a two storey building which provides four two-bed flats. The site is within the Hartford Conservation Area and adjacent the King of the Belgians which is a Grade II listed Public House (PH). In the vicinity of the site are residential properties, businesses and the Village Hall.

1.2 There are two applications at the site. The planning application seeks approval for the demolition of the garages and the erection of a two storey building which would provide two two-bed flats. The application also details provision of four on-site parking spaces which are understood to serve the existing flats and a bin and cycle storage area which accommodates bins and cycles from both the existing flats and the proposed development. Owing to the proposed works within the site, additional windows are to be inserted on the gable elevation of the existing Hartford Court flats to compensate for the loss of light to existing windows. The application for Conservation Area Consent seeks approval for the demolition of the garages only.

1.3 The application has been amended to alter the access width, amend the detailing of the gable elevations and change the cycle and bin storage arrangements. At Officer request the applicant has also undertaken an overshadowing report to assess the impacts of the proposed building on the adjacent Beer Garden; initially this assessed the impacts at 13.00 hours on 21st March. A revised report showing the impacts for the 21st of each month of April to September, for the time periods 13.00, 16.00 and 19.00 (18.00 for the 21st September as the computer software determines sunlight hours end before 19.00) has also been submitted and a period of reconsultation has been undertaken following receipt of these additional/amended details.

2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE

2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) sets out the three dimensions to sustainable development - an economic role, a social
role and an environmental role - and outlines the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Under the heading of Delivering Sustainable Development, the Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for: building a strong, competitive economy; ensuring the vitality of town centres; supporting a prosperous rural economy; promoting sustainable transport; supporting high quality communications infrastructure; delivering a wide choice of high quality homes; requiring good design; promoting healthy communities; protecting Green Belt land; meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change; conserving and enhancing the natural environment; conserving and enhancing the historic environment; and facilitating the sustainable use of minerals.

For full details visit the government website https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-communities-and-local-government

3. PLANNING POLICIES

3.1 Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995):

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

- **H37**: “Environmental Pollution” – housing development will not be permitted in locations where there is a hazardous installation posing a substantial risk to the public.

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

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

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

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

- **En8**: “Demolition in Conservation Areas” – consent may be withheld until acceptable plans for the new development have been approved, if approved the timing of demolition will be strictly controlled.

- **En9**: “Conservation Areas” - development should not impair open spaces, trees, street scenes and views into and out of Conservation Areas.
- **En11**: "Archaeology” – Permission will normally be refused for development that would have an adverse impact on a scheduled ancient monument or an archaeological site of acknowledged importance.

- **En12**: “Archaeological Implications” – permission on sites of archaeological interest may be conditional on the implementation of a scheme of archaeological recording prior to development commencing.

- **En13**: "Archaeological Implications" – in areas of archaeological potential, planning applications may be required to be accompanied by the results of an archaeological field evaluation or desk-based assessment.

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

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

### 3.2 Saved policies from the Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alterations (2002)

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

- **HL6** – Housing Density - indicates that housing development shall be at a density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare

- **HL10** – Housing Provision – in the district should reflect the full range of the local community’s needs by ensuring a choice in new housing.

### 3.3 Adopted Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009)

- **CS1**: “Sustainable development in Huntingdonshire” – all developments will contribute to the pursuit of sustainable development, having regard to social, environmental and economic issues. All aspects will be considered including design, implementation and function of development. Including reducing water consumption and wastage, minimising impact on water resources and water quality and managing flood risk.

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

### 3.4 Draft Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036: Stage 3 (2013)
• **Policy LP 1** ‘Strategy and principles for development’ - The Council will support proposals which contribute to the delivery of new housing, economic growth and diversification and infrastructure provision.

• **Policy LP 2** ‘Contributing to Infrastructure Delivery’ - A proposal will be supported where it makes appropriate contributions towards the provision of infrastructure, and of meeting economic, social and environmental requirements.

• **Policy LP 8** ‘Development in the Spatial Planning Areas’ - Four Spatial Planning Areas (SPAs) have been defined in Huntingdonshire. Huntingdon Spatial Planning Area is comprised of Huntingdon, Brampton and Godmanchester as well as the Strategic Expansion Location of Alconbury Weald. Huntingdon is the primary settlement within this SPA. A series of sites are allocated for development in this plan in order to achieve the spatial strategy. In addition to these other proposals will be supported where they are in accordance with policies of this plan and set criterion, including:
  - Residential Development - A proposal which includes housing, including residential institution uses or supported housing, will be supported where it is appropriately located within the built-up area of an identified SPA settlement.

• **Policy LP 13** ‘Quality of Design’ - A proposal will need to be designed to a high standard based on a thorough understanding of the site and its context.

• **Policy LP 15** ‘Ensuring a High Standard of Amenity’ - A proposal will be supported where a high standard of amenity is provided for existing and future users and residents of both the surroundings and the proposed development.

• **Policy LP 17** ‘Sustainable Travel’ - A proposal will be supported where it is demonstrated that:
  a. opportunities are maximised for the use of sustainable travel modes;
  b. traffic volumes can be accommodated and will not cause significant harm to the character of the surrounding area;
  c. any adverse effects of traffic movement to, from and within the site including the effect of car parking is minimised;
  d. a clear network of routes is provided that provides connectivity and enables ease of access, to, around and within the proposal and with the wider settlement for all potential users, including those with impaired mobility; and
  e. safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle routes, including links to new and existing services, facilities, footpaths, bridleways and the countryside are provided where appropriate and if possible formalised as rights-of-way.

• **Policy LP 18** ‘Parking Provision’ - A proposal will be supported where it incorporates appropriately designed vehicle and cycle parking with a clear justification for the level of provision proposed, having regard to:
  a. the potential to increase the use of alternative transport modes including public transport, walking and cycling;
b. highway safety;
c. servicing requirements;
d. the needs of potential users; and
e. the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties.

Parking provision should be considered as an integral part of the design process and its impact on the surrounding townscape and landscape minimised.

- **Policy LP 24 ‘Housing Mix’** - A proposal that includes housing development will be supported where the sizes, types and tenures of housing responds to the advice and guidance provided by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessments (as applicable), local assessments of housing need and demand or other relevant housing and demographic studies and the Council's Housing Strategy and Tenancy Strategy.

- **Policy LP 31 ‘Heritage Assets and their Settings’** - Great weight is given to the conservation of any heritage asset; more weight is accorded to assets of greater significance. A proposal which affects the special interest or significance of any heritage asset or its setting must demonstrate how it will conserve, and where appropriate enhance, the asset. Any harm must be fully justified and this harm will be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal. Substantial harm or loss will require exceptional justification. Harm to assets of the highest significance will require wholly exceptional justification.

Local policies are viewable at [https://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk](https://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk)

3.5 Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance:

3.6 Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD (2007) – Sections 2 and 4

3.7 Huntingdon Conservation Area Character Statement (2007)

3.8 Developer Contributions SPD (2011)

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 No relevant history to the proposed development; the existing four flats were approved under application B16.71.

5. **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Huntingdon Town Council** – recommends REFUSAL of the planning application and APPROVAL of the conservation area consent application (copies attached)

5.2 Cambridgeshire County Council Highways – Following receipt of amended plans – “the access has been increased to 4.5m and the parking is now obvious. The parking and turning however looks to be very tight therefore tracking should be provided to show how the turning area will work. Is the amount of parking provision in line with your policies?”

5.3 Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology – “Our records indicate that the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential. It is
considered likely that important archaeological remains survive on the site and that these would be severely damaged or destroyed by the proposed development. The site rests on the edge of the Medieval village core and close to All Saints Church, which reputedly dates from the 12th century (Historic Environment Record Number 14719). A number of important finds have been made in the immediate vicinity of the development plot, including Roman coins and a millstone to the south of the plot (HER 02700) and a medieval coin hoard to the north west (HER 02682). A number of prehistoric flint tools have also been found in the locality, along the north bank of the River Ouse (HER 01946, 01844, 00268a, 05559). We therefore consider that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation."

6. REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 ELEVEN letters of OBJECTION received from two addresses in Longstaff Way, seven addresses in Main Street, one from School Lane, and one from Othello Close. These raise concerns which are summarised as:-

Parking:
- There is no parking provision for the new flats; if the proposed planning application goes ahead there are potentially eight or even more vehicles that will need on-street parking (four from the existing flats that will lose their garage space and four more from the new build). This will exacerbate an already difficult but not insurmountable problem to a point where it becomes impossible.
- Main Street already has parking problems and the proposed mobile building in Trinity School car park will mean the loss of resident’s informal parking agreements there with additional vehicles parking on Main Street.
- The proposal displaces vehicles that use the off-street facilities at Hartford Court and lead to further pressures for on-street parking for residents, three businesses and Hartford Village Hall which is used during the day and evenings.
- The King of the Belgians has recently been awarded the “Community Pub of the Year” by CAMRA which is an accolade for both it and the community it serves. Parking at the pub consists of three spaces beside the pub and then on-street parking wherever patrons can find it.
- Fortunately the majority of the residential properties on Main Street have off-street parking but the remainder have to find parking on Main Street itself. When the village hall is in use for large gatherings (e.g. Tuesdays and Thursdays for the Bridge Club) it is difficult to find a space anywhere along Main Street and this has an adverse impact on the three businesses on the street whom are heavily reliant on passing motor borne trade: The King of the Belgians, Hartford Stores and Isis Hair Salon. The potential result would be a loss of patronage by the three businesses in Main Street to the point where they become no longer viable with consequent loss to the community of three valuable assets.
- There are already difficulties everyday with delivery vehicles to the PH and lack of parking has caused patrons to trade elsewhere in the past
- The ratio of dwellings to parking (six sharing four spaces) will add to the existing parking problem.
- Residents and visitors to Hall Close have been inconvenienced in the past by the overflow parking from Main Street.
- School buses (and collecting parents), deliveries and inappropriately parked cars have caused the road to be blocked on occasion.
- Some residents do not have off-street parking and no means of providing any.
- Main Street has overspill parking from Hall Close as the double yellow lines restrict visitor parking; it is also used for overspill parking from patrons of The Barley Mow.
- There will not be four sensible parking spaces left on site.
- Six flats, each with two bedrooms surely cannot be assumed to have car ownership well below the national average, nor that all residents will use public transport, bikes or walk, however good the local facilities and ideal it would be.

**Visual impacts:**
- The proposed new building is out of character with the existing surrounding buildings and will also detract from the King of the Belgians which is Listed Grade II.
- An attractive feature of this area is the single storey nature of a lot of buildings, an additional two storey development will certainly spoil the look and feel of this area; a better plan would be to replace Hartford Court with single storey dwellings.
- Main Street is a Conservation Area and the existing flats are completely out of character with the surrounding area, to allow a further block to be built would compound the error.
- The site is within a Conservation Area and everyone should be working together to preserve the overall nature and beauty of the street.
- The existing building is now a fait accompli, to add another similar building next to a listed building, opposite period cottages, and within a Conservation Area cannot be in the best interest of local development.

**Overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light and loss of view:**
- The two 1st floor living room windows and one of the 1st floor bedroom windows will look directly into the bedrooms and kitchen which are to the front of No. 5 Longstaff Way. In addition, the changes to the 1st floor of the existing building will also have a living room and a bedroom window which will look directly into these rooms. Currently there are no windows in the existing flats at Hartford Court to overlook properties on Longstaff Way, which makes the living accommodation very private and the location enjoyable. A possible solution to the existing building could be to retain the layout of it and not create new windows looking out onto Longstaff Way, and a solution to the new build such could be to adjust the layout such that the windows do not look out onto Longstaff Way.
- Proposed height and proximity of the proposal to the boundary of the PH will steal sunlight from the popular beer garden and leave tables in the shade.
- The two storey scale will mean that during winter months the sunlight to No. 18 Main Street will be totally blocked by this development.
- Line of sight from No. 18 Main Street to Hartford Church will be obstructed.

**Notification:**
Village Hall was not notified and as one of the nearest neighbours would expect to have been.

6.2 Following reconsultation, a further SIX letters were received from five individuals who previously commented; these raise the following:

* I am broadly in agreement with the findings of the report as to the direction of the shadows cast by the proposed new building. However, I am not content with the shadow prediction for the King of the Belgians (KoB) outbuildings... My own calculations predict the shadow from the outbuilding as being somewhat smaller than those shown by TC Consulting and Contracting. Notwithstanding the differences, the KoB’s beer garden will be subject to extra overshadowing between 1400 to 1600 hours between July and September to the extent that one or two tables will be in shadow during this period. This overshadowing could possibly impact on the business.

* Photographs (submitted) show occupancy of the Hartford Court parking area by three and four vehicles. There is also the van owned by Window geeks that regularly parks on Main Street. This van is used by one of the existing tenants of Hartford Court.

* The amendments shown in no way address the increasing problems of local parking. The statement made by the applicant that residents have only ever had two vehicles in total is not borne out by the true position. One resident has both a private car and a works van.

* The proposed style of building is out of character of the Main Street Conservation area. It would also overdevelop an already compact area.

* The requirement for the access path to be 4.5 metres wide is unlikely to be met because of the encroachment on the boundaries of the King of the Belgians.

* The extra on-street parking required by vehicles from the proposed flats would exacerbate an already difficult parking situation with a potential adverse impact on the residents, the three village SMEs and the Village Hall.

* The proposed flats are close to and overlook the King of the Belgians beer garden. There is a possibility that sometime in the future an individual noise complaint could be made that leads to the demise of this well used community pub.

* On balance I believe that this application brings little or no benefit to Main Street Hartford.

* Proposal could generate the need for an additional six and twelve on-street parking places

* Parking problems in Main Street are particularly bad at the western end of Main Street which leads to potential customers of the PH turning away

* The new build will overshadow the Beer Garden and lead to the loss of trade during summer months when this facility is well used; the impacts of which has not been adequately assessed as the report is limited to one time on one day of the year when shadows are at their shortest.

* The Beer Garden generates noise (from conversations and sometimes events which feature music), the proposed flats will be in close proximity to the garden area and therefore new residents could complain about noise from the PH.
7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

7.1 The main issues to consider in the determination of these applications are considered to be the principle of development and the impacts upon the character and appearance of the conservation area, setting of the adjacent listed building, on residential amenity, and on highway safety.

Principle of Development

7.2 The site is located within the built up area of Huntingdon where policy supports residential development of all scales.

7.3 The principle of development is therefore considered acceptable in this instance.

Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area and Setting of the Adjacent Listed Building

Demolition of the Existing Garages

7.4 The existing garages are not considered to be particularly noticeable within the streetscene. Given their scale and simple design it is not felt that they negatively impact upon the locality or setting of the adjacent listed building, but similarly they are not considered to positively contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The demolition of the garages is therefore not considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and there is Officer and Town Council support for the Conservation Area Consent application should the scheme for replacement development be considered acceptable.

Impact upon Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

7.5 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1992 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

7.6 This part of the Conservation Area is dominated by Hartford Court, the modern Parish Hall, and the open spaces along each side of the relatively modern Longstaff Way which has divided the historic core of Hartford. The historic character of the western end of Main Street is considered to have been diluted by modern development, although this is re-established to the east of the King of The Belgians by numerous Georgian and Victorian period buildings.

7.7 The immediate vicinity of the garages is not considered to be an overly attractive area and enhancement here is welcomed. The large blank gable wall of the existing flats is also felt to be a poor visual addition to the Conservation Area and the proposed addition of windows should help give the building some visual interest and relieve the impact of the solid slab of masonry.
7.8 The proposed flats would have a neutral impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area due to the fact that their main visual impact will be from Longstaff Way which has a more limited relationship to the historic layout of Hartford and given the existing character of the area. There will be some loss of permeability through the site (due to the proposed building) but this similarly would not be unacceptable. It is not felt that the development site offers any particular value as ‘green space’ and in fact it has poor hard landscaping.

7.9 The amended scheme includes ‘blind’ windows within the gable elevations of the new build; this is considered to give visual interest to the side elevations and aids in breaking up the massing of the brickwork. The bin storage area is now large enough to accommodate the refuse bins for both development and will ensure that these are not stored in a prominent location; this is considered to be an enhancement on the existing arrangements as the bins are currently stored close to the access point and are highly visible within the streetscene from Main Street.

7.10 It is therefore considered that, given that the significance of the Conservation Area around Hartford Court has been eroded (including by the existing flats) and that the majority of buildings are modern or have been heavily modified; the proposed scheme would have a neutral impact upon the character and appearance of the area. Therefore in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 131 and 134, the proposed scheme would sustain the significance of the heritage assets while delivering the wider public benefits of additional residential accommodation and making the best use of previously developed land.

7.11 Conditions are necessary to ensure appropriate materials and hard and soft landscaping.

Impact upon the Setting of the Listed Pub

7.12 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1992 (as amended) requires that special regard is given to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

7.13 The setting of the listed pub has been severely reduced by Longstaff Way and is best appreciated from Main Street; from this angle the visual impact of the proposed flats will be limited due to the siting further back in the site (from Main Street) than the listed building which sites at the back edge of the pavement. The proposed flats will, as the current flats do, form a backdrop to the listed pub. Whilst the flats would be closer to the pub than the existing Hartford Court building, the separation distance (approximately 0.9m from the pub boundary) is greater than exists for the current garages which are alongside the boundary. The pub also includes outbuildings which further enforce the separation of the listed building from the proposed building.

7.14 It is therefore accepted that the proposal will have some impact upon the setting of the listed building; however, in accordance with the
NPPF this is considered to be less than substantial harm which, when having regard to the development which exists in the vicinity and the wider public benefits of additional residential accommodation and making the best use of previously developed land, is not considered to be unacceptable.

Residential Amenity

7.15 Occupants of Hartford Court and Proposed Flats: Hartford Court is split into four flats; the original permission for the building shows the floor plans to have the units handed with bedroom and living room windows to the front and kitchen and bathroom windows to the rear of the building, with the garages behind. The submitted floor plan of the existing flats indicates the units are still handed versions of one another, although the flats have been altered internally to provide a second bedroom with the (original) windows on the rear of the building now serving bedroom 2 and the kitchen.

7.16 The proposed scheme results in the new building approximately 6.2m from the rear elevation of the building with two parking spaces between the buildings. The gable width of the new building aligns to the mid point of the kitchen windows of the ground and first floor flats closest to Longstaff Way.

7.17 The impacts arising from loss of light and outlook to the windows serving bedroom two of these flats has been mitigated by the insertion of windows in the south east gable elevation. Given this relationship, it is not considered that the residential amenities of occupants in the flats will be significantly harmed. The insertion of these windows should be secured by condition and provided prior to the commencement of development of the new building.

7.18 The parking spaces will also be closer to the rear of the building than they are currently; it is understood that the intension is to allocate the four spaces onsite to the current flats to compensate for the loss of the garages. Whilst the proposed parking arrangements will lead to increased disturbance closer to the building, it is not considered that this relationship is significantly harmful in terms of disturbance and loss of privacy. However a condition can require the submission of a parking scheme to ensure the parking space annotated on the site plan as No. 1 is allocated to the residents of the ground floor flat closest to it to reduce the impacts upon amenity and give the occupants adequate protection in this regard.

Neighbouring Residential Properties:

7.19 Concern has been raised about loss of light owing to the two storey scale of the building. It is accepted that in winter months when the sun is lowest, there will be some impact upon properties in Main Street to the north of the site, however the separation distance between the buildings at approximately 21m is considered acceptable and it is noted that the current arrangement results in the current flats being much closer to No’s 14 and 16 than the proposed building is to be; furthermore, there is a gap of approx. 6.2m between the buildings where sunlight will not be blocked.
Concern has been raised about overlooking from the windows on the rear of the proposed flats and those inserted into the south-east gable of the existing. The separation distance between the application site and the property opposite on Longstaff Way is around 35m and whilst accepting the application site is higher than Longstaff Way, it is not considered that planning permission could be refused in this instance due to overlooking.

King of the Belgians:

It is appreciated that the enclosed area to the rear of the King of the Belgians provides a Beer Garden. Alongside the boundary with the application site is an outbuilding with pitched roof and smoking area in the south west corner which constitutes a timber structure with a Perspex flat roof. The rear of the PH has a flat roof extension.

Concern was raised with the applicant due to the possible overshadowing impacts upon the Public House and its Beer Garden which are to the north-east and east of the proposed building. To the rear of the pub building are toilets and therefore the loss of lights to these windows is not considered harmful.

The British Research Establishment (BRE) has produced good practice guide on Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, this considers assessment of gardens and open spaces and states that the equinox (21st March) is a good date for assessment and advises that no more than two fifths of amenity area should be prevented from receiving any sunlight at all on the 21st March. The applicants employed a consultant to assess the overshadowing to the Beer Garden and the report (copy attached) concluded that there will be “a very low impact on the light receivable by its neighbouring properties’ gardens” and therefore “that the development design satisfies the requirements set out in BRE guide”. This initial study assesses the shadow cast at 13.00 hours on 21st March. Whilst accepting that the pub garden will receive more than two hours direct sunshine on the 21st March (in accordance with the BRE Guidance) due to the shadowing at 1pm, it was expected that the report would show the extent of overshadowing throughout the day as given the orientation, shadowing for the afternoon and evening hours was considered most important in order to assess how the amenity value of the beer garden would be affected by the proposal as later in the day is when the garden is most likely to be used by patrons. A request for a more in-depth report was therefore requested which included an assessment of the months April to September at 13.00, 16.00 and 19.00 hours. This report was submitted and a further period of consultation undertaken.

The report shows that the garden area will be affected by overshadowing at times, however the outbuilding within the Beer Garden is noted to already overshadow a large amount of the rear amenity area. The height and orientation of the proposed building means that at around 16.00 the shadow from the proposed flats will extend beyond the shadow caused by the pubs own outbuilding; this however does not completely overshadow the amenity area and tables could still be placed to receive direct sun. The computer model used to create the assessment determines that on the 21st September sunlight hours end before 19.00 and therefore an
assessment has been made at 18.00; it is between 16.00 and 18.00 in September (when the shadows are at their longest) that the Beer Garden becomes entirely overshadowed, although the proposed building is only responsible for half of the site being in shade. At this time of year, depending upon weather conditions, the Beer Garden may be used less frequently than earlier in the year.

7.25 The comments made through representations on the amended report consider the impacts of the outbuilding to have been wrongly shown and potentially based on inaccurate dimensions. The applicants were asked to comment on this point and the following reply was received: “…the dimensions quoted ... relate to a building with a bonnet roof with a high pitch whereas the outbuildings actually have gabled ends with a low pitch roof. If we used (the objector’s) dimensions the shadow cast would be greater than that shown and therefore inaccurately reduce the impact of the proposed development.”

7.26 The objector was asked to consider this point further but no additional comments were received. It is Officer opinion that the outbuildings have been plotted on the submitted plans and accurately show a height around 3.2m rather than the 5.1m suggested by the objector. As such, it is felt that the report can be considered reliable.

7.27 It is therefore considered that whilst there will be some impacts upon the amount of direct sunshine to the Beer Garden, there will still be large amounts of the (albeit relatively small garden area) which are not in shade. As such it is Officer opinion that a recommendation of refusal amounting to the impacts upon the Beer Garden and potential threat to the Public House could not be substantiated.

Highway Safety
Access:

7.28 The amended plans show the increase in access width requested by the Cambridgeshire County Council Highways Officer which will aid manoeuvrability into and out of the site.

Parking Provision:

7.29 Draft Local Plan policy LP18 and the NPPF do not set specific parking standards with the approach taken to consider each site on individual merits. The NPPF (2012) advises that if setting local parking standards, LPAs should take into account the accessibility of the development; the type, mix and use of development; the availability of and opportunities for public transport; local car ownership levels; and an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles. Emerging Local Plan policy LP18 provides support for schemes where it incorporates appropriately designed vehicle and cycle parking and has regard to factors including i) the potential to increase the use of alternative transport modes including public transport, walking and cycling; ii) impacts on highway safety; and iii) minimises the impact on the surrounding townscape and landscape. The impacts upon the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties is also detailed as a consideration in LP18.

7.30 Appendix 2 of the Design, Access and Heritage Statement is a Transport Statement which advises:
- There are at least three bus stops within 300m of the application site, with links to adjoining villages and Guided Bus route;
- The Hartford Court Management have advised in the last eleven years that a maximum of two occupants of the existing flats have owned a car and used the parking spaces available;
- The site is close to a number of employment areas and connected by a network of cycleways, footways and bus services with a high degree of permeability for cyclists and pedestrians;
- Each unit will be provided with an individual secure cycle parking store which can accommodate two cycles each.

This considers that the site is a sustainable site and that parking provision is not a necessity.

Representations received dispute that there are only two residents with vehicles and photographs have been submitted showing three vehicles parked on site. In response the applicant has stated: "we have been unable to ascertain the ownership of all of the vehicles shown. We have experienced unauthorised parking on the site in the past by, we assume, people visiting surrounding buildings. We hope that this would not happen if permission for the new development is approved, with appropriate signage erected. While we cannot accurately predict car ownership, the new units planned are of a similar standard to the existing units and it is therefore reasonable to assume similar requirements in the future. I have visited the site myself on a number of occasions each week, at differing times of the day, and have always found ample space to park."

A number of site visits have been undertaken by Officers and at times more than two vehicles have been parked on site.

The comments received regarding the difficulties of on-street parking, knock on impacts upon local businesses and poorly parked vehicles are acknowledged. The application site is considered to be in a sustainable location with access to alternative transport modes (rather than occupants being reliant upon private cars) and some local services. It is accepted that the Local Planning Authority has no control over whether residents of the new flats ultimately own vehicles and therefore will also park on the highway, however in light of the policy drive towards provision of new homes and in the absence of parking standards requiring off-street parking provision, it is not considered that a recommendation of refusal owing to lack of parking provision and wider impacts upon parking availability in the locality could be upheld.

The original scheme showed cycle storage provision for the new units (two spaces each); whilst this was welcomed, the storage was considered to have been poorly orientated and did not provide for natural surveillance. In addition, there was no provision for the existing flats; whilst accepting there is currently no cycle parking facilities, the garages do offer space for secure storage. The amended scheme therefore shows a cycle store which can accommodate 8 cycles (one for each unit across the site); this is detailed as being a timber open-fronted structure. This is considered adequate provision and a condition can secure installation prior to occupation of the new flats.

Turning Area:
7.35 The comments of the Highways Officer are noted in relation to the turning area, however it is considered that there is sufficient room for vehicles to turn and therefore enable entry and exit from the site in forward gear. As such, additional plans with tracking have not been requested from the applicant.

Other Matters
Alternative proposals:

7.36 Whilst alternative options for redevelopment of this site have been suggested by objectors as being more suitable, the role of the Local Planning Authority is to determine the application submitted on its own merits.

Archaeology:

7.37 The comments of the County Council Archaeology Officer in terms of the site’s potential archaeological interest is noted; the Agent has questioned this point and feels that whilst the application site may be in a location where mapping suggests that there is potential for remains, as the site was developed in the late sixties early seventies it is suggested that the archaeological potential would have been destroyed at that time therefore it would be unreasonable and an unnecessary cost to apply a condition for an archaeological investigation on this site.

7.38 In response, the County Archaeologist appreciates that the site may be truncated in the 60s and 70s but advises that we do not know this for a fact until the site is evaluated prior to development, and if the site is truncated as to what level of truncation. In addition he advises that many archaeologically rich sites encountered in the centre of settlements (and rural areas) have archaeological deposits at varying depths and degrees of truncation - in many cases untouched by post-medieval development. It is therefore County Officer opinion that in the case of this site an archaeological condition should be placed on any permission granted in order to ascertain archaeological presence/deposit model.

7.39 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) considers archaeology within para. 128 and states: “Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, Local Planning Authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.”

7.40 In accordance with this guidance, it is considered that the applicants should undertake an evaluation of the sites archaeological potential and this can be secured by condition.

Neighbour notification:
It is unfortunate that the Village Hall was not directly notified of the proposal however a site notice was posted in the area and the committee were clearly made aware of the application.

Conclusion

The proposal is situated within a location where new residential development should be supported subject to the detailed considerations being satisfied. Whilst the proposal would not enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, a neutral (or preserving) impact is required under policy and the relevant legislation. In this regard, having regard to the existing built form, including the flats opposite, it is considered that the proposal would have a neutral impact upon the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed pub which is outweighed by the community benefits of providing additional residential accommodation.

With regard to amenity impacts it is acknowledged that, at certain times of the year, some overshadowing into the Beer Garden would occur. However given the evidence that has been provided by the applicant this impact is not considered to be unacceptable. The proposal would also not have an unacceptable impact upon the residential amenity of the occupiers of any adjoining premises.

With regard to car parking the application site is considered to be within a sustainable location where access to public transport and, albeit limited, services is available on foot. Cycle provision is also provided for future residents of these two bed flats. Officers therefore consider that, despite local concerns regarding parking provision on the highway, a refusal could not be sustained on these grounds.

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

8. RECOMMENDATION- APPROVE 1202038FUL subject to conditions to include the following:

Time limit
Material samples
Manufacturer details of windows and doors
Hard and soft landscape
Additional windows to Hartford Court to be provided prior to commencement of new build.
Parking and turning area provided prior to occupation
Cycle storage provided prior to occupation
Archaeological investigation

RECOMMENDATION - GRANT CONSENT 1202039CAC subject to conditions to include the following:

Time limit
Contract for new building

CONTACT OFFICER: Enquiries about this report to Ms Charlotte Fox
Assistant Development Management Officer 01480 388457
### 1202038 FUL

**Mr D Ward, Hartford Court, Management Ltd.**

Erection of 2 flats and alterations of existing flats following demolition of garages - Hartford Court, 21 Main Street, Hartford PE29 1YS

Recommend *REFUSAL*. The Panel considered this to be an overdevelopment of the site and out of keeping within the Conservation area. There is insufficient parking and a loss of light to neighbouring properties.

Amendment 23/05/2013: 1. Amended design to gable elevations; 2. Amended site layout - access width, cycle and refuse storage; 3. Additional overshadowing Study (dated 8th April and addendum dated 6th May)

**Amendment 23/05/2013** - Recommend *REFUSAL* since concerns previously have not been addressed by the proposed amendments.

### 1202039 CAC

**Mr D Ward, Hartford Court, Management Ltd.**

Demolition of garages - Hartford Court, 21 Main Street, Hartford PE29 1YS

Recommend *APPROVAL*. The demolition of these garages would improve the area.

Amendment 23/05/2013: 1. Amended design to gable elevations; 2. Amended site layout - access width, cycle and refuse storage; 3. Additional overshadowing study (dated 8th April and addendum dated 6th May)

**Amendment 23/5/2013** - The Panel noted the amendment.

### 1300306 LBC

**Mr P Incledon-Webber, Ferrar House, 70A High Street, Huntingdon PE29 3DJ**

Re-roof property using existing Pegtiles, reclaimed Pegtiles, ridge and verge tiles to match. Install dormer and internal staircase to loft. Replace existing fibreglass insulation with sheep wool - 70A High Street, Huntingdon PE29 3DJ

Recommend *APPROVAL.*

### 1300413 FUL

**Mr John Cooper, 80 Park Avenue Papworth Everard Cambridge**

Erection of a dwelling and associated parking and new parking for 5 Wood Street and the erection of enclosures between the proposed dwelling and 5 Wood Street or similar Land at 5 Wood Street, Huntingdon

Recommend *REFUSAL* as the proposals will overdevelop the site. The Panel further considered that access for construction was inadequate and that the development would lead to increased risk to the safely of local residents who were members of the disabled living community.
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1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Overview

1.1.1 TC Consulting & Contracting Ltd has been commissioned to undertake a daylight and sunlight study of the proposed development at Hartford Court, Main Street, Hartford, Huntingdon PE29 1YS.

1.1.2 The aim of the study is to assess the impact of the development on the light receivable by the rear gardens at the neighbouring properties along Main Street.

1.1.3 The original study, based on the various numerical tests laid down in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guide ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice’ by P J Littlefair 2011, was completed on 28th March 2013.

1.1.4 In response to a request by Huntingdonshire District Council, TC Consulting & Contracting Ltd has been instructed to provide additional diagrams to show the result of the overshadowing to the neighbouring gardens between April and September.

1.1.5 Appendices 2 to 19 give the contour diagrams for each time period, specified as 13:00, 16:00 and 19:00 at monthly intervals from April to September. Each diagram indicates the shadow cast by the existing outbuildings and the additional shadow cast by the proposed development.

1.1.6 The software used to develop the diagrams determines that sunlight hours end before 19:00 on 21st September, therefore the final diagram has been developed for 18:00 and not 19:00 as specified.
APPENDIX 2

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 13:00 ON 21ST APRIL
APPENDIX 3

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 16:00 ON 21ST APRIL

[Map showing the proposed development and its impact on gardens and open spaces.]
APPENDIX 4

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 19:00 ON 21ST APRIL

[Diagram showing the影子投射 by the proposed development at 19:00 on 21st April]
APPENDIX 5

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 13:00 ON 21ST MAY
APPENDIX 6

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 16:00 ON 21ST MAY
APPENDIX 7

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 19:00 ON 21\textsuperscript{ST} MAY
APPENDIX 8

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 13:00 ON 21ST JUNE

[Diagram of the area showing the proposed development and its shadow cast on various nearby buildings and gardens.]
APPENDIX 9

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 16:00 ON 21ST JUNE
APPENDIX 10

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 19:00 ON 21ST JUNE

[Diagram showing the proposed development and its shadow on gardens nearby]
APPENDIX 11

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 13:00 ON 21ST JULY
APPENDIX 12

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 16:00 ON 21ST JULY
APPENDIX 13

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 19:00 ON 21ST JULY
APPENDIX 14

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 13:00 ON 21\textsuperscript{ST} AUGUST
APPENDIX 15

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 16:00 ON 21ST AUGUST
APPENDIX 16

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 19:00 ON 21ST AUGUST
APPENDIX 17

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 13:00 ON 21ST SEPTEMBER
APPENDIX 18

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 16:00 ON 21ST SEPTEMBER
APPENDIX 19

SHADOW CAST BY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 18:00 ON 21ST SEPTEMBER