

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

t: 01954 713000
f: 01954 713149
www.scambs.gov.uk



Tuesday 31 January 2023

To: Chair – Councillor Peter Fane
Vice-Chair – Councillor Geoff Harvey
All Members of the Planning Committee - Councillors Henry Batchelor,
Ariel Cahn, Dr. Martin Cahn, Bill Handley, Dr. Tumi Hawkins,
William Jackson-Wood, Peter Sandford, Heather Williams and
Dr. Richard Williams

Quorum: 3

Substitutes Councillors Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Bunty Waters,
if needed: Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Brian Milnes,
Richard Stobart, Dr Lisa Redrup and Helene Leeming

Dear Councillor

You are invited to attend the next meeting of **Planning Committee**, which will be held in the **Council Chamber - South Cambs Hall** on **Wednesday, 8 February 2023** at **10.00 a.m.**. **A weblink to enable members of the press and public to listen to the proceedings will be published on the relevant page of the Council's website , normally, at least 24 hours before the meeting.**

Members are respectfully reminded that when substituting on committees, subcommittees, and outside or joint bodies, Democratic Services must be advised of the substitution ***in advance of*** the meeting. It is not possible to accept a substitute once the meeting has started. Council Standing Order 4.3 refers.

Yours faithfully
Liz Watts
Chief Executive

The Council is committed to improving, for all members of the community, access to its agendas and minutes. We try to take all circumstances into account but, if you have any specific needs, please let us know, and we will do what we can to help you.

Agenda

- | | Pages |
|---|-------|
| 1. Chair's announcements | |
| 2. Apologies
To receive apologies for absence from committee members. | |

3. **Declarations of Interest**

1. **Disclosable pecuniary interests (“DPI”)**

A DPI is where a committee member or his/her spouse or partner has any kind of beneficial interest in the land under consideration at the meeting.

2. **Non-disclosable pecuniary interests**

These are interests that are pecuniary involving a personal financial benefit or detriment but do not come within the definition of a DPI. An example would be where a member of their family/close friend (who is not their spouse or partner) has such an interest.

3. **Non-pecuniary interests**

Where the interest is not one which involves any personal financial benefit or detriment to the Councillor but arises out of a close connection with someone or some body /association. An example would be membership of a sports committee/ membership of another council which is involved in the matter under consideration.

4. **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

To authorise the Chairman to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 18 January 2023 as a correct record.

5 - 10

5. **22/04303/REM - Land Between Haverhill Road And Hinton Way, Stapleford**

Reserved matters application for additional access points, layout, scale, landscape and appearance following outline planning permission 20/02929/OUT (Outline planning for the development of land for a retirement care village in Use Class C2 comprising housing with care, communal health, wellbeing and leisure facilities, public open space, landscaping, car parking, access and associated development and public access countryside park with all matters reserved except for access)

11 - 112

6. **21/04087/FUL - Former Barrington Cement Works, Haslingfield Road, Barrington**

Erection of 113 dwellings (re-plan of northern parcel of development site for an increase of 37 dwellings above approved scheme ref: S/3585/18/RM)

113 - 188

7. **22/04018/OUT - Fenny Lane Farm, Fenny Lane, Meldreth**

Outline Application with all matters reserved other than access for the erection of nine self-build dwellings

189 - 216

8. **22/04826/HFUL - 77 Church Lane, Girton**

Demolition of a detached garage and construction of a single storey side extension and rear extension and loft extension with rear facing dormer window

217 - 222

9. **Appeals against Planning Decisions and Enforcement Action**

223 - 240

Exclusion of Press and Public

The law allows Councils to consider a limited range of issues in private session without members of the Press and public being present. Typically, such issues relate to personal details, financial and business affairs, legal privilege and so on. In every case, the public interest in excluding the Press and Public from the meeting room must outweigh the public interest in having the information disclosed to them. The following statement will be proposed, seconded and voted upon.

"I propose that the Press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following item number(s) in accordance with Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that, if present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act."

If exempt (confidential) information has been provided as part of the agenda, the Press and public will not be able to view it. There will be an explanation on the website however as to why the information is exempt.

Notes

- (1) Some development control matters in this Agenda where the periods of consultation and representation may not have quite expired are reported to Committee to save time in the decision making process. Decisions on these applications will only be made at the end of the consultation periods after taking into account all material representations made within the full consultation period. The final decisions may be delegated to the Corporate Manager (Planning and Sustainable Communities).

- (2) The Council considers every planning application on its merits and in the context of national, regional and local planning policy. As part of the Council's customer service standards, Councillors and officers aim to put customers first, deliver outstanding service and provide easy access to services and information. At all times, we will treat customers with respect and will be polite, patient and honest. The Council is also committed to treat everyone fairly and justly, and to promote equality. This applies to all residents and customers, planning applicants and those people against whom the Council is taking, or proposing to take, planning enforcement action. More details can be found on the Council's website under 'Council and Democracy'.

This page is left blank intentionally.

Agenda Item 4

South Cambridgeshire District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Wednesday, 18 January 2023 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Peter Fane – Chair
Councillor Geoff Harvey – Vice-Chair

Councillors: Henry Batchelor Ariel Cahn
Dr. Martin Cahn Bill Handley
Peter Sandford Heather Williams
Dr. Richard Williams

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:
Vanessa Blane (Senior Planning Lawyer), Christopher Braybrooke (Planning Compliance Manager), Laurence Damary-Homan (Democratic Services Officer), Jon Finney (Principle Development Management Engineer [Cambridgeshire County Council]) Phil McIntosh (Interim Delivery Manager), Kate Poyser (Principal Planner [Strategic Sites Team]) John Shuttlewood (Principal Planning Enforcement Officer) and Nick Yager (Senior Planner)

Councillor Dr Lisa Redrup was in attendance remotely as a substitute.

1. Chair's announcements

With the regular Vice-Chair sending apologies for absence, the Chair proposed that Councillor Henry Batchelor fill the role of Vice-Chair for the meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Bill Handley and agreed by affirmation. The Chair also informed the Committee that he would withdraw for the hearing of application 22/01972/FUL (Great Shelford) and proposed that, with Councillor Batchelor taking the Chair for the duration of the application, Councillor Peter Sandford assume the role of Vice-Chair for the item. This was seconded by Councillor Bill Handley and approved by affirmation. The Chair also made a number of housekeeping announcements.

2. Apologies

Councillors Geoff Harvey, Dr Tumi Hawkins and William Jackson-Wood sent Apologies for Absence. Councillor Dr Lisa Redrup was present virtually as a substitute.

3. Declarations of Interest

With respect to Minute 6, Councillor Peter Fane declared that he would withdraw from the Committee and speak as a local Member. Councillor Dr Richard Williams declared that he had no disclosable interest but was familiar with the area and would be coming to the matter afresh.

4. **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

By affirmation, the Committee authorised the Chair to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 14 December 2022 as a correct record.

5. **22/03561/FUL - Bourn Quarter, Bourn Airfield, St Neots Road, Bourn**

The Principal Planning Officer (Strategic Sites Team) presented the report and presented a number of updates:

- Paragraph 3.2 stated 6 units, this was amended to state 7
- Paragraph 1.2 stated November 2020, this was amended to state November 2021
- Comments were received from Anglian Water who raised some points regarding drainage but had no objection
- The Highways Authority confirmed that they had no objection

The Committee asked a question of clarity on why condition 33 had been included and were informed that it was recommended by Environmental Health.

The Committee was addressed by two agents of the applicant, Jeremy Aitchison and Mike Beadman. The Committee had no questions for the public speakers.

The Committee debated the application and agreed that there were no reasons for refusal. It was noted that the previous issues with the application had been overcome. Councillor Heather Williams, seconded by Councillor Dr Martin Cahn, proposed that the Committee move to a vote- this was agreed by affirmation.

By unanimous vote, the Committee **approved** the application subject to the conditions and informatives laid out in the report and update report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, as well as the agreed additional informatives.

6. **22/01972/FUL - 7 De Freville House, High Green, Great Shelford**

In line with his declaration of interest, the Chair withdrew from the Committee. As agreed in Minute 1, Councillor Henry Batchelor assumed the role of Chair and Councillor Peter Sandford assumed the role of Vice-Chair.

The Senior Planner presented the report and informed the Committee that an amended cycle plan had been received which showed additional cycle storage. An update on paragraph 8.21 was also given and the Committee was informed that there was an entrance on High Green Road as well as Granhams Road. The reasons for the officer's recommendation of refusal were detailed by the Senior Planner. Members asked questions of clarity on the previous permissions on the site and the impact of a change of use on the highway and the Principal Development Management Engineer offered the Cambridgeshire County Council Highways Authority's perspective on the issue.

The Committee was addressed by an opposing resident, Dr Martin Stephen, who raised his concerns over the application- there were no questions of clarity. The agent of the applicant, Chris Edge, made a statement and responded to questions on the access to the store. Councillor Greg Price of Great Shelford Parish Council spoke on behalf of the Parish Council and detailed why they were supportive of the application; a question was raised to Councillor Price on the perceived likelihood of illegal parking. Councillor Peter Fane addressed the Committee in support of the application. He informed Members that Councillor William Jackson-Wood, the other local Member, and the County Councillor, Councillor Brian Milnes, were also supportive of the application and answered Members'

questions on access and the local context. The Chair noted that a number of written submissions had been received.

In the debate, comments were made both in support and opposition of the application. The Chair stated that there were both harms and benefits to the application and it was up to the Committee to strike a balance of the material considerations. Members stated that approval of the application would enhance the character and vitality of the village, citing policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. Some Members agreed with the reason for refusal 1, as laid out in the report, and felt that the advice from the Highways Authority carried significant weight for refusal. Others felt that the level of on site car parking was sufficient and, if the application was approved, it would be unlikely to cause indiscriminate parking. In response to a question, the Interim Delivery Manager informed the Committee that, as the additional cycle storage was not within the site it could not be considered as satisfying the cycle storage provision requirements.

As there was a divide in opinion, the Committee agreed by affirmation that, if it were minded to approve the application, the reasons for approval and contravention of the officer's recommendation would be as follows:

"In weighing all material planning considerations in the planning balance Member's considered the application should be approved for the following reasons;

1. Members were of the view that securing a tenant within a vacant commercial premises, which had been vacant for a number of years, had significant positive benefits for the character and vitality of the village.
2. The proposal is considered to provide an appropriate level of on site car parking. Although the level of on site car parking would not meet with the indicative standards as set out in Policy TI/3 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2018, Members of the planning committee considered, on balance, sufficient provision is provided. Given Members were of the opinion an appropriate level of on site car parking will be provided, it is unlikely to result in indiscriminate parking within the public highway (including the Mandatory Cycle Lane). Furthermore, statutory powers exist to enforce against any illegal parking within the Mandatory Cycle Lane. On this basis, although the comments from the Highway officer were noted and debated, Members did not agree with the conclusion of the highway officer.
3. Although Members of the planning committee acknowledged some conflict with the car parking standards set out within Policy TI/3 of the Local Plan and the concerns of the Highway Authority, in weighing the overall planning balance, Members were satisfied this did not outweigh the benefits of the proposal, in particular the occupation of a long time vacant commercial unit which would enhance the character and vitality of the village, in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and the NPPF. Members were satisfied that the proposal could also be the subject of conditions which would make it acceptable in planning terms."

The Committee also agreed by affirmation that, if it were minded to approve the application, the approval would be subject to the following conditions and informative:

"1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason - To ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development, which have not been acted upon.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

3. The materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

4. Prior to first use, the car parking layout shown on drawing no. PP103 REV A shall be implemented in its entirety and retained thereafter, unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the locality, especially for people living and/or working nearby, in accordance with Policy HQ/1 and TI/3 of the adopted Local Plan.

5. Notwithstanding the submitted plans, prior to first use, details of cycle parking provision shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The cycle parking facilities installed in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure cycling provision as a sustainable means of transport is properly provided in accordance with South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 policies HQ/1 and TI/2 and TI/3.

6. Prior to first use a Delivery and Servicing Management Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Deliveries to the site shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and highway safety in accordance with South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 policies HQ/1 and TI/3.

7. The use hereby permitted shall not operate other than between the hours of 07:00- 23:00 Mondays to Fridays (inclusive) and 07:00-23:00 Saturday/ Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan.

8. The premises shall be used for Class E(a) Display or retail sale of goods only and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class E) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) without the grant of express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In granting this permission the Local Planning Authority has had regard to the special circumstances of this case and wishes to have the opportunity of exercising control over any subsequent alternative use.

Informative

The granting of this planning permission does not indemnify against statutory nuisance

action being taken should substantiated noise complaints be received. For further information please contact the Environment Planning Team.”

To mitigate the risk of indiscriminate parking, Councillor Bill Handley made a proposal, seconded by Councillor Dr Martin Cahn and agreed by affirmation, for the inclusion of the following informative:

“The applicant is strongly encouraged to secure a consultation regarding the implementation a Traffic Regulation Order for waiting restrictions within the public highway adjacent to the application site. This is in order to provide a deterrent to customers parking within the public highway to access the store.”

By 5 votes (Councillors Henry Batchelor, Ariel Cahn, Peter Sandford, Heather Williams and Dr Richard Williams) to 2 (Councillors Dr Martin Cahn and Bill Handley), the Committee voted to **approve** the application, subject to the agreed conditions and informatives and in contravention of the officer’s recommendation laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

7. **22/03852/FUL - Grass Area, Dolls Close, Balsham**

Councillor Peter Fane returned as the Chair and Councillor Henry Batchelor resumed his role as Vice-Chair

The Senior Planner presented the report. Members asked a question of clarity on why the application had been brought forward and officers provided local context to explain the assessed need for the development.

In the debate, the need for the application was revisited. Members felt that the scheme was acceptable and noted that there had been no changes to it since it was previously approval and subsequent lapse of permission. Councillor Heather Williams, seconded by Councillor Henry Batchelor, proposed a vote. This was agreed by affirmation.

By affirmation, the Committee **approved** the application subject to the conditions, and in accordance with the officer’s recommendation, laid out in the report from the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

8. **22/04826/HFUL - 77 Church Lane, Girton**

The Interim Delivery Manager provided an update on the application and informed the Committee that further consultation was required. The Senior Planning Lawyer advised that the Committee defer the application until the consultation had been completed.

By affirmation, the Committee **deferred** the application.

9. **Member Site Visit Protocol**

The Interim Delivery Manager presented the report and the Committee noted the changes to the protocol based on their comments at the meeting held on 14 December 2022. Members agreed with the changes, but debate was held on the ability for Parish Councils to request a site visit. Councillor Heather Williams, seconded by Councillor Bill Handley, proposed that an amendment to paragraph 3.5 (i) be made and include the wording “or Parish Council” for those who could request a site visit. The Committee agreed to the proposal by affirmation.

With the amendment, the Committee **noted** the report and **confirmed** the protocol.

10. **Enforcement Report**

Councillor Heather Williams left the meeting

The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer presented the report and raised a number of points based on previous comments of the Committee; Members were informed that a map-based search system for cases was not possible at the time but would be explored further. The Planning Compliance Manager was introduced to the Committee and Members were informed that he would be presenting future Enforcement Reports.

The Committee **noted** the report.

11. **Appeals against Planning Decisions and Enforcement Action**

The Interim Delivery Manager presented the report and informed Members that some decisions on appeals listed had come in since the publication of the report- these were to be presented at the next meeting. Requests were raised for appeals awaiting decision to not be repeatedly listed month to month and for any information on notable issues arising in appeal cases to be raised to the Committee.

The Committee **noted** the report.

12. **Restricted Minute**

By virtue of paragraph 7 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, the Committee agreed, by affirmation, to the exclusion of press and public to discuss the restricted Minute. By affirmation, the Committee authorised the Chair to sign the restricted Minute as a correct record.

The Meeting ended at 2.15 p.m.

Agenda Item 5



Planning Committee Date	8 February 2023
Report to	South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee
Lead Officer	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
Reference	22/04303/REM
Site	Land Between Haverhill Road And Hinton Way Stapleford Cambridge
Ward / Parish	Stapleford
Proposal	Reserved matters application for additional access points, layout, scale, landscape and appearance following outline planning permission 20/02929/OUT (Outline planning for the development of land for a retirement care village in Use Class C2 comprising housing with care, communal health, wellbeing and leisure facilities, public open space, landscaping, car parking, access and associated development and public access countryside park with all matters reserved except for access)
Applicant	Rangeford Villages Ltd
Presenting Officer	Michael Hammond
Reason Reported to Committee	Major application, Reserved matters application to original departure application, Wider public interest.
Member Site Visit Date Key Issues	N/A <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Design (layout, scale, landscape and appearance)2. Highways/ Access3. Car Parking

4. Cambridge South East Transport (CSET)

Recommendation **APPROVE** subject to the prior completion of a deed of variation to the S106 agreement and conditions

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The application seeks reserved matters consent for the development of the land for a retirement care village in Use Class C2 comprising housing with care, communal health, wellbeing and leisure facilities, public open space, landscaping, car parking, access and associated development and public access countryside park. The reserved matters consist of additional access points, layout, landscaping, scale and appearance. Matters that fall outside of the definition of these reserved matters (as defined in the Development Management Procedure) have already been considered and approved by the outline consent (20/02929/OUT). The application has been referred to Planning Committee as the proposal relates to significant concerns locally and is considered in the public interest for the application to be discussed at Committee.
- 1.2 The original outline consent was refused by the Council in accordance with officer recommendation at the Planning Committee meeting of 13 April 2021. Following a public inquiry, planning permission was subsequently allowed at appeal (ref: APP/W0530/W/21/3280395) on 29 December 2021 (See Appendix 1). A copy of the appeal decision notice is attached to the committee papers.
- 1.3 The outline planning permission included a series of parameter plans to form an envelope within which the detailed design of reserved matters could proceed. These parameter plans covered land use and building heights, access and movements and landscaping. Officers have checked the proposed drawings submitted under this reserved matters application and can confirm that they comply with these parameter plans.
- 1.4 The reserved matters application has been the subject of pre-application advice with officers, including the advice of the Landscape Officer and the Urban Design Officer. The applicant also entered into two Design Review Panels at pre-application stage, the minutes of which are included as Appendices 2 and 3.
- 1.5 Officers consider that the proposed retirement village element accords with the parameter plans approved at the outline stage which dictate the extent and scale of the built form on the site. The proposed design, coupled with the adjacent dense landscaping, is considered sufficient to allow the development to assimilate successfully into its context and surroundings and respectful of the character and appearance of the area. The choice of materials, typology and architectural approach through the

use of character zones is considered to help provide a soft transition between the edge of the village, the adjacent countryside park proposed and the green belt and countryside in the wider area.

- 1.6 The proposed countryside park would allow for recreational access and a significant biodiversity net gain as required by the outline permission. The simple palette of biodiversity interventions and limited physical interventions proposed on this part of the site would help the proposed countryside park blend into the green belt setting and wider landscape.
- 1.7 The parameter plans approved under the outline planning permission showed a 15m wide corridor to allow for the route of the Cambridge South Eastern Transport Busway Scheme (CSETS) which is a Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) transport project. The route shown on the parameter plans traversed through the application site, running east-west, effectively forming a boundary between the retirement living and countryside park elements of the proposal. GCP have raised an objection that the reserved matters application because it does not reflect the emerging alignment for the CSETS corridor (which differs to that in the approved parameter plans). The reserved matters nevertheless fall to be assessed against the terms of the outline planning permission and the incorporated parameter plans. Nevertheless, the applicant has demonstrated that the detailed design of the proposed new care village is capable of accommodating the CSETS corridor without causing harm to the amenities of future occupiers of the development.
- 1.8 The applicants have indicated that they expect to commence the development as soon as possible. In recognition of the potential for an alternative alignment to the CSET corridor to result in abortive landscaping works in a part of the countryside park – officers are also recommending that the S106 agreement accompanying the outline planning permission is modified to provide for the phased delivery of the country park works and its assured completion. The deed of variation to the S106 agreement would effectively seek to split the delivery of the countryside park into two phases. The first phase (comprising approximately 14ha) would still need to be delivered prior to the first occupation of the retirement care village, as per the original Section 106 Agreement wording. The second, southernmost phase of approximately 5ha would need to commence by 1 April 2026 unless a Transport for Works Act Order for the CSET scheme has been made. In the event of an ongoing legal challenge or a Judicial Review to any Transport for Works Act Order, if submitted, then this deadline would be extended to 1 April 2027. The precise wording of this proposed Deed of Variation will need to be finalised amongst all parties and it is therefore requested that the Planning Committee grants delegated authority to officers to negotiate and agree this.
- 1.9 The proposed development has been amended during the application process to address consultee comments. As a result of the amendments, officers consider that the proposal creates a well-balanced, less car dominated, more attractive and better functioning development which

would be responsive to the surrounding character and layout. The proposal would continue to deliver biodiversity enhancement, incorporate renewable energy and include provision of affordable housing.

- 1.10 Taking all factors into consideration, Officers recommend that subject to the prior completion of the Deed of Variation to provide for the phased delivery of the Country Park, the Planning Committee approve the application subject to conditions, the final wording of which is to be delegated to officers.

2.0 Site Description and Context

- 2.1 The site is located outside of the development framework boundary of Stapleford, in the Green Belt and open countryside. The south-eastern boundary of the site is approximately 60 metres from the edge of Stapleford development framework. The site is located in an area designated as improved landscaping under the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan.
- 2.2 Stapleford Conservation Area is approximately 350 metres south west of the site. The nearest listed buildings are no.57 Bar Lane, a Grade II listed building located approximately 240 metres south of the site, and Middlefield and Garden Wall, Haverhill Road, a Grade II* listed building located approximately 130 metres north of the site. The Church of St Andrew, a Grade II* listed building is located approximately 550 metres to the south west of the site. To the north east of the site are several scheduled ancient monuments; the Iron Age hill-fort at Wandlebury, a Bronze Age barrow and a Neolithic causewayed enclosure at Little Trees Hill and a Bronze Age tumulus at Wormwood Hill with a Neolithic longbarrow. The nearest of these is Little Trees Hill, approximately 650 metres from site.
- 2.3 The site lies within flood zone 1 (low risk) with some small areas of surface water flooding identified adjacent to Chalk Hill, Gog Magog Way and Haverhill Road.
- 2.4 The site is formed from an L-shaped parcel of agricultural land coving an area of approximately 24.37 hectares between Hinton Way and Haverhill Road, which form the north-west and south-east boundaries of the site. Most of the south-west boundary of the site abuts open agricultural land while the southern-most portion abuts the rear boundaries of existing residential properties of Gog Magog Way and Chalk Hill. The north-eastern boundary of the site abuts a farm track and mix of paddocks, garden land and agricultural land.

2.5 The site is used for arable agricultural uses and as such there is little existing vegetation within the site, aside from a small area of tree planting towards the sites northern edge. Most of the boundaries are formed by mature hedgerows. The topography of the site rises to the north with the lowest point of the site being approximately 20 metres above ordnance datum (AOD) rising to a highest point of approximately 43 metres AOD over a 600-metre distance.

3.0 The Proposal

3.1 This application seeks approval for the reserved matters of additional access points, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission 20/02929/OUT for a retirement care village in Use Class C2 comprising housing with care, communal health, wellbeing and leisure facilities, public open space, landscaping, car parking, access and associated development and public access countryside park. One of the conditions (no.19) of the outline permission limits the overall gross internal floor area to be delivered on the site to no more than 17,825sq.m.

3.2 The residential element of the retirement village would be made up of 147no. residential units (Use Class C2). This would consist of 20no. one-bedroom apartments, 91no. two-bedroom apartments, 18no. three-bedroom apartments and 18no. two-bedroom bungalows. The proposed buildings accommodating follow the building heights set by the parameter plans, whereby the scale of development steps from two-storey (9m maximum ridge height) in the south of the site, down to two-storey (8m maximum ridge height) in the centre and then down to single-storey (7m maximum ridge height) in the north of the site. The gross internal area of the development would be 17,780sqm.

3.3 The apartment blocks would consist of a mix of farmstead, central green and neighbourhood street apartments. These are typically rectangular in layout form with the only exception that farmstead buildings where they have been designed to have projecting wings to create courtyards. All of the apartment blocks would have pitched roof forms. The northern part of the site would consist of single-storey bungalows, laid out in a cul-de-sac style arrangement. Brickwork and slate roofs, with green roofs where applicable, are consistent across the retirement village although there would be a diverse variety of brick colour, finishes and accents across the proposed development.

3.4 In addition to the residential element, a two-storey pavilion building would be sited in the centre of the site. This would include a restaurant, café, bar, shop, gym, wellness area and swimming pool. The building would have a flat roof and the majority of this roof would host solar panels. 139no. Car parking spaces would be provided across the retirement village.

3.5 Structural planting is proposed around the perimeter of the retirement village element of the site in accordance with the provisions of the

approved landscape parameter plan. Immediately to the south of the pavilion building there would be a landscaped central green area. Two additional pedestrian accesses have been shown into the countryside park, one from the north-east corner of the countryside park from Haverhill Road and the other in the north-west corner of the countryside park from Hinton Way.

- 3.6 The application has been amended and further information has been submitted to address specific requests of technical consultees and further consultations have been carried out as appropriate.

4.0 Relevant Site History

Reference	Description	Outcome
20/02929/CONDA	Submission of details required by condition 5 (surface water drainage scheme) and 6 (foul water drainage scheme) of planning permission 20/02929/OUT	Pending consideration.
20/02929/CONDB	Submission of details required by condition 7 (Energy and Sustainability Statement) and 15 (Travel plan) of planning permission 20/02929/OUT	Discharged in Full – 28.11.2022
20/02929/OUT	Outline planning for the development of land for a retirement care village in Use Class C2 comprising housing with care, communal health, wellbeing and leisure facilities, public open space, landscaping, car parking, access and associated development and public access countryside park with all matters reserved except for access.	Refused – Appeal Allowed 29.12.2021
20/03141/SCRE	EIA - Screening opinion for a Proposed retirement village and 20 hectare green space	EIA Screening Not Required
S/0520/07/F S/0442/06/F	Erection of 18 affordable dwellings 17 houses 8 flats and change of use of agricultural land for new football pitch	Approved. Approved.
S/1672/91/F S/0211/91/F	Public golf driving range Public golf driving range	Refused Refused

- 4.1 An appeal (ref: APP/W0530/W/21/3280395) against the refusal of planning permission (20/02929/OUT) commenced on 27 August 2021 and led to a virtual inquiry on 7 – 10 and 14 December 2021. Following the conclusion of the inquiry, the Inspector allowed the appeal on 29 December 2021. A copy of the appeal decision notice is attached to the committee papers. The concluding paragraph (no.73) of the Inspector’s report read:

“Overall, but particularly through the supply of extra care housing, needed but not otherwise being met, biodiversity enhancement to Green Belt land sought by local plan and national policy but not being delivered and recreational provision, sought by national policy on Green Belt land, the benefits of this proposal would clearly outweigh even the disproportionate harms to the Green Belt and its openness which would result from the scheme. I so conclude and find in consequence that the proposal would comply with national policy and hence policy S/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.”

- 4.2 The allowed decision included 20no. conditions and a Section 106 Agreement. The Section 106 Agreement related to the maintenance, management and transfer of the countryside park element of the scheme.

5.0 Policy

5.1 National

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2021

Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20) Cycle Infrastructure Design

Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015)

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Environment Act 2021

ODPM Circular 06/2005 – Protected Species

Equalities Act 2010

5.2 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018

S/1 – Vision

S/2 – Objectives of the Local Plan

S/3 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 S/4 – Cambridge Green Belt
 S/5 – Provision of New Jobs and Homes
 S/6 – The Development Strategy to 2031
 S/7 – Development Frameworks
 S/8 – Rural Centres
 CC/1 – Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change
 CC/3 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments
 CC/4 – Water Efficiency
 CC/6 – Construction Methods
 CC/7 – Water Quality
 CC/8 – Sustainable Drainage Systems
 CC/9 – Managing Flood Risk
 HQ/1 – Design Principles
 HQ/2 – Public Art and New Development
 NH/2 – Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
 NH/3 – Protecting Agricultural Land
 NH/4 – Biodiversity
 NH/6 – Green Infrastructure
 NH/8 – Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining the Green Belt
 NH/10 – Facilities for Recreation in the Green Belt
 NH/14 – Heritage Assets
 H/8 – Housing Density
 H/9 – Housing Mix
 H/10 – Affordable Housing
 H/12 – Residential Space Standards
 SC/2 – Health impact Assessment
 SC/5 – Community Healthcare Provision
 SC/9 – Lighting Proposals
 SC/10 – Noise Pollution
 SC/11 – Contaminated Land
 SC/12 – Air Quality
 TI/2 – Planning for Sustainable Travel
 TI/3 – Parking Provision
 TI/8 – Infrastructure and New Developments
 TI/10 – Broadband

5.3 Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan 2008

CSF/1 – The Vision for the Cambridge Southern Fringe
 CSF/5 – Countryside Enhancement Strategy

5.4 Neighbourhood Plans

None relevant.

5.5 Supplementary Planning Documents

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020
Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

- 5.6 The following SPDs were adopted to provide guidance to support previously adopted Development Plan Documents that have now been superseded by the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. These documents are still material considerations when making planning decisions, with the weight in decision making to be determined on a case-by-case basis:

Landscape in New Developments SPD – Adopted March 2010
District Design Guide SPD – Adopted March 2010
Open Space in New Developments SPD – Adopted January 2009
Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009
Public Art SPD – Adopted January 2009
Listed Buildings: Works to or affecting the setting of SPD – Adopted July 2009

5.7 **Other Guidance**

Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy 2019 – 2023

6.0 **Consultations**

6.1 **Stapleford Parish Council – Objection.**

- 6.2 1st Comment: Objection. Stapleford Parish Council objects to the application as proposed due to concerns regarding scale, layout and density, appearance and building design principles, public amenity space, access, on-site parking, countryside park – access and parking, on-site landscaping, biodiversity, community facilities, pavilion name and affordable housing. Significant amendments are required to make the development acceptable and the Parish Council looks forward to working with Rangeford Villages to secure a design which reflect its location in the Cambridge Green Belt and its sensitive rural location at the edge of Stapleford village.

- 6.3 If the Council is minded to approve the application, the Parish Council would ask that a safeguarding condition is applied to secure an off-site parking strategy to be agreed between the developer, the District Council and the Parish Council for both the retirement village and the countryside park which ensures the safety of road users and the amenity of nearby residents by ensuring no ‘overspill’ parking is permitted in residential streets in Stapleford or in Haverhill Road.

- 6.4 Condition 16 of the outline planning consent requires the applicant to submit a Construction Method Statement. The District Council should

ensure that HGV and construction traffic should access the site via the A1307 to Haverhill Road only. Other access points result in construction traffic using narrow, 20mph roads which are in close proximity to the nursery and primary school and playgrounds where safety is a key concern. Construction should be limited to between 8am and 6pm on weekdays only (no Bank Holidays).

- 6.5 2nd Comment: Objection. Stapleford and Great Shelford Parish Councils are preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. NPPF requires Neighbourhood Plans to be supported by up to date and robust evidence. Therefore, the Parishes jointly commissioned AECOM to prepare Great Shelford and Stapleford Design Guidelines May 2019.
- 6.6 The Design Guidelines summarises the key characteristics of Great Shelford and Stapleford and provides specific design principles. As such, it gives a distinctive and robust 8 layer of detailed advice for developers and decision makers to ensure that development in Stapleford promotes high quality and sustainable development. As a locally prepared document, supported by the NPPF, it should carry significant weight in the decision making process.
- 6.7 The Design Guidelines reinforce and strengthen Stapleford Parish Council's objections to this proposal. Significant amendments are required to make the development acceptable, and the Parish Council looks forward to working with Rangeford Villages to secure a design which reflects its location in the Cambridge Green Belt and its sensitive rural setting at the edge of Stapleford village.
- 6.8 The Stapleford and Great Shelford Landscape Character Assessment 2019 identifies the view from Magog Down Hills as an important view.
- 6.9 The extended flat roofscape of the proposed pavilion with solar panels; the roof design, height, depth and bulk of the residential units; and the density of the footprint of the development, all create an environment in which significant landscaping within the development is impossible due to the non-permeable SuDS and extensive hard surfacing. The proposed boundary landscaping will not ameliorate this harmful impact. As such, the development will have a significant adverse impact upon the chalk landscape, particularly when viewed from a popular viewpoint and informal recreation area at Magog Down, contrary to The Design Guidelines.
- 6.10 New development proposals should be responsive to the historic layout of the villages, including plot widths, proportions, density, building lines and positions within the plots. The Design Guidelines principles state that proposed housing developments should include front gardens to maintain the open character of the streets and provide space for garden trees. In contrast, the density, form and bulk of the development as proposed by Rangeford creates a harsh and commercial urban form which detracts from the rural character of Stapleford and this important rural gateway. A

reduction in density of buildings will increase the legibility of residential roads and provide wider views through to and out of the village in accordance with the principles in The Design Guidelines. This openness and lower density should be secured through amendments to the current scheme.

- 6.11 Stapleford does not have examples of flat roof buildings and therefore Rangeford's prominent pavilion with solar panels is an alien and incongruous feature building. Typical roof design at the development site is single span and specifically does not include the 'M' gable roofs required to cover the depth of buildings proposed. The design has not had sufficient regard to the prevalent roof styles of the area identified in The Design Guidelines and is more typical of an urbanised/city/commercial location.
- 6.12 Local Plan policy H9, states that for developments over nine units a diversity of frontage, scale and form of development will be the best way to create a well-integrated development which fits into the existing urban fabric and compliments the existing character. Clearly, it is Stapleford Parish Council's view that Rangeford's design, due to its excessive depth and bulk of buildings, the monotonous street frontages, the compact street scene dominated by roads and on-street parking, with no space for meaningful planting and landscaping within the development, does not align with The Design Guidelines.
- 6.13 Rangeford's development has such an opportunity, through the design of the pavilion, to create a distinctive landmark building which positively enhances the village rather than detracts from it. However, the Parish Council considers that the pavilion has characteristics more akin to a retail supermarket and has no design references to any building in Stapleford.
- 6.14 The Parish Council has highlighted the conflict between the proposed open space and their use as SuDS. It is essential that 1.8 hectares of functional open space is provided within the site if the development is to meet the principles set out in The Design Guidelines.
- 6.15 In this rural area within the Green Belt, proposals should reflect the style and design of existing architecture represented in farmhouses, agriculture buildings, cottages and villas. In particular, new buildings on the edge of the village should be designed to minimise visual impacts, complementing the existing roofscape.
- 6.16 The compact nature of the development, the prevalence of on-street parking around the Green, the lack of front gardens, and the presence of non-permeable SuDs result in an unsafe environment for elderly residents which is dominated by hard surfacing and cannot be described as well landscaped.
- 6.17 **Great Shelford Parish Council – Objection:**

- 6.18 Only the access to the development off Hinton Way has been considered by Great Shelford Parish Council as the development is in Stapleford, but the access on Hinton Way affects residents of Great Shelford. After a brief discussion the parish council wish to comment that they are not sure if the gate at Hinton Way is required as it contravenes the Department of Transports Cycle Infrastructure Design published in July 2020 causing a delay for cyclists to get through the gate off a busy highway. Members strongly object to the barbed wire on top of the fence.
- 6.19 **County Highways Development Management – No objection.**
- 6.20 1st Comment: Objection: The Local Highway Authority believes that there would be sufficient access for maintenance vehicles to both the Countryside Park and the Residential Site by utilising the main vehicular access into the site from Haverhill Road or the emergency access from Gog Magog Way without the need for an additional vehicular access from Haverhill Rd as proposed in this application. The additional vehicular access would introduce a point of possible traffic conflict, being detrimental to highway safety.
- 6.21 The Local Highway Authority would request that a 2.0m footway link is provided from the end of the proposed footway to the north of the main access as indicated on approved Dwg. No. 406.09693.00002.14.H011.2, (Access Assessment Option 2), dated October 2020 of planning reference 20/02929/OUT to the proposed additional pedestrian access on Haverhill Rd. to the Countryside Park.
- 6.22 2nd Comment: No objection: Following a careful review of the documents provided to the Local Highway Authority as part of the above planning application, the effect of the proposed development upon the Public Highway should be mitigated if a condition to show a wheelchair user can traverse through the gates and a highways informative.
- 6.23 The Local Highway Authority recognises that the proposed development may impact on the deliverability of the strategic Cambridge South East Transport busway and as such would support the comments made by the Greater Cambridge Partnership in respect of the same. With respect to the proposed additional pedestrian access gates and the Equalities Act 2010, the provision of the proposed gates should be reasonable, their hinderance mitigated and weighed against safety within the site.
- 6.24 **Lead Local Flood Authority – No Objection.**
- 6.25 1st Comment: Objection: The reserved matters application is for access, layout, scale, landscaping and appearance of planning permission 20/02929/OUT. It is noted that some details on surface water management are included in the Design and Access Statement. However, the LLFA requires more detail to demonstrate that the surface water management strategy can be accommodated within the proposed site layout. A drainage layout drawing and supporting hydraulic calculations must be

submitted for review, including the agreed principles under permission 20/02929/OUT. Until it has been demonstrated that the proposed surface water system can be accommodated within the site layout, we are unable to support this application.

- 6.26 2nd Comment: Following confirmation of the information previously requested and sought for the discharge of condition application, the LLFA raises no objection.
- 6.27 **Urban Design – No objection.**
- 6.28 The submitted reserved matters plans appear to conform to the land use and heights parameter plans approved by the inspector at the appeal and therefore there is no objection to the scale and massing proposed.
- 6.29 The proposed layout design is a clear improvement on the previously submitted Masterplan at the outline application stage. The proposed three-character areas appear logical and will relate positively to the overall village Character in architectural terms.
- 6.30 The central green space configuration, and the way the site connects to the wider context along with the landscaped courtyard created between buildings have resulted in a good quality pedestrian friendly and green environment development. This central green space is an important element, and its design quality is key for the overall design quality of the scheme. Therefore, a condition should be imposed on the detailed design of the central green space.
- 6.31 The proposed approach towards the pedestrian and the cyclist movement within the site and the way the site is connected to its immediate and wider context is acceptable. Such approach will provide legible routes with adequate width to link the village with the Countryside Park.
- 6.32 The current parking arrangement is well laid out and incorporates a reasonable amount of landscaping to help break up the hard standing and screen the cars.
- 6.33 The contemporary architectural language proposed for the buildings' elevations along with the proposed palette of materials are acceptable. The contemporary representation of some architectural elements found on the village appear to add a suitable new addition to the village character.
- 6.34 Officers are generally supportive of the proposals in urban design terms. The proposal is well developed during the Pre-application process, which includes a Design Review by the Council's Design Review Panel and Youth Engagement Workshop, and issues raised are adequately addressed by the applicants. Officers have comments in relation to some elements of the scheme which can be dealt with through the following conditions; furniture and public art of the Central Green, materials, architectural details (balconies, windows, doors, surrounds, heads, cills,

eaves, verges, soffits and fascia), outdoor furniture, green roofs, bin and cycle stores.

6.35 Senior Sustainability Officer – No objection

6.36 In conclusion, the application is supported from a sustainable construction point of view, pending a detailed energy/carbon strategy, suitable water efficiency details and the requested overheating analysis and justifications.

6.37 Landscape Officer – No objection.

6.38 1st Comment:

1. The Cambridge Southeast Busway (CSET) link will be located to the north of the retirement Village, and we understand that the route is still under review. The details of pedestrian access, boundary fences and gates between the retirement village, the CSET and the countryside park should be provided through a condition once the route of the CSET is finalised.

2. The ecological and visual benefits of using biodiverse roofs on the bungalows and the pavilion were previously discussed in the DRP and pre app meetings but has not been pursued. If biodiverse roofs cannot be used due to site constraints or the constraints of the parameter plans this should be clarified in a short-written statement or addendum. Otherwise, we recommend that biodiverse roofs are used instead of sedum roof and biodiverse roofs are extended across the pavilion roof.

3. The landscape information includes planting schedules showing species, sizes and densities and planting strategy drawings. The proposed strategy is acceptable, but we recommend that, for the main shared courtyard and communal spaces detailed planting plans are provided through condition to ensure that high quality planting is provided in the more intensively used public and shared areas including:

- Courtyard between Pavilion (Block A) Blocks I and J
- Courtyard between Blocks C and D
- South facing shared garden area- south of pavilion (Block A)

4. The locations of site furniture and incidental play are shown on the plans and the type of benches etc are indicated in the specification. We recommend that the final site furniture details are provided through condition to make sure that the furniture is fully coordinated with other materials across the site. This should include materials for timber bin enclosures, foot bridges and pergolas.

5. The plans and specification show details of the paving types, brick retaining walls and brick bin enclosures. We recommend that the final paving and external wall materials are coordinated with the materials for the building facades and so a condition should be added requiring

submission of a palette and samples of paving and wall materials alongside the building façade materials.

6. Site signage is indicated in the illustrated specification, but full details of all signage and wayfinding should be provided through condition.

6.39 2nd Comment:

We support approval of the reserved matters application subject to further details being provided through conditions on; Block A planting plans, paving materials, details of minor artefacts and structures, green/ brown roofs and landscape implementation.

6.40 **Ecology Officer – No objection.**

6.41 1st Comment: There is insufficient ecological information to determine the application. Action required:

- Applicant to provide further details on the management of mown paths that are to accommodate cyclists and horses.
- Applicant to provide clarification of numbers and location of bat and bird boxes, and confirm that all boundaries will be permeable to hedgehogs.

6.42 2nd Comment: There is sufficient ecological information to determine the application. An ecological enhancement condition is recommended.

6.43 **Environmental Health – No objections.**

6.44 No objection subject to conditions relating to compliance with noise mitigation measures, collection and delivery hours, noise impact of plant/ renewable energy and an informative..

6.45 **British Horse Society – Objection.**

6.46 Equestrians using the path will not have a safe crossing to the countryside park. Insufficient car parking for the countryside park. The gate and path is not suitable for equestrians and should be amended. Highway safety concerns.

7.0 Third Party Representations

7.1 11no. representations in objection have been received. These raise the following issues:

- The site is a poor location for a retirement village.
- Concern, as an access gate, particularly more that standard pedestrian width and open and not lockable, rather than a lockable “kissing gate” style, on Hinton Way will facilitate use of the “leisure park” during the hours of darkness that at best will be anti-social or, at worse, criminal;

- The access gate on Haverhill Road should be in the north-east corner.
- Light pollution;
- Noise and construction disturbance. Suitable controls needed.;
- Noise and anti-social behaviour out of keeping with rural nature of area;
- Highway safety concerns on local roads due to exacerbation of existing issues caused by countryside park demand. Parking restrictions on this use needed.
- Speed limits on Haverhill Road should be changed.
- Insufficient car parking for retirement village, including people using community facilities. Increased parking pressure on surrounding streets.
- Insufficient car parking for countryside park;
- Public transport in the area is poor so people will rely on cars.
- Can the local minibus proposed by Rangeford be used by local residents too?
- The number of pool cars should be increased.
- Conditions regarding renewable energy and recycled water are necessary;
- Stress on water supplies, chalk streams and wastewater infrastructure;
- Drainage and flooding concerns.
- Will these houses be taken account of when considering Stapleford's contribution to housing in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan?
- Is the Council satisfied/ comfortable about the lack of on-site GP provision bearing in mind the current demand on the service?
- Assurance needed that all dependent infrastructure will be completed before work starts on other areas and that the developer will be bearing those costs. Assurance also needed that biodiversity is secured and enforced against.
- Regarding the noise assessment, there is confusion regarding the light green areas further from the bus lane showing as >90 db with the greater than prefix? An explanation should be given before the noise issue is considered, particularly around the "station/stops" areas.
- Noise assessment assumption states six bus movements per hour but previous public information stated 12 movements per hour.
- Hinton Way gate seems to show use by motorised vehicles.
- The design is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area. Fails to comply with local and national design policies.
- Design and density out of keeping with rural context.
- Red brick should be used to be in keeping with Stapleford.
- The development blocks historic, sensitive and locally significant views across open farmland and across to Magog Down.
- Public rights of way through the retirement village and countryside park needed to be added to the designated list and protected as public rights of way in perpetuity.

- Development breaches green belt and development will block open views.
- Basic information such as number of units, number of bedrooms, number of parking spaces etc clearly listed out would all have enabled an easier consultation process and a fairer assessment of the proposals.
- The rise in topography of the site means that the smaller buildings will still appear as tall as the taller buildings on the site. Disappointing that buildings have been built to maximum ridge heights. This doesn't gain any additional floorspace but does impact on the landscape and character of the area.
- The courtyard farmstead design is very similar to the apartments. Other than in name, the reference to farmstead design is notional at best.
- Strongly urge the Council to absolutely confirm that the floor space complies with restrictions (17,825sqm) set out in the outline permission.
- Some drawings show apartments as being smaller than they actually are.
- Disingenuous to say houses in area have long driveways as only a few do.
- Additional parking is clearly needed for the 190 staff members intended to be on site as well as visitor parking. Whilst it is recognized that South Cambs takes the view that restricting car parking will encourage sustainable travel without improving the sustainable travel operations serving a site, the reality of this in practice is that it simply leaves developments overrun with parked cars that haven't been accommodated for within the design.
- Horse rider safety concerns due to increased traffic along Haverhill Road and conflict with the Drift Track and link to Linton Greenway.
- The village already has a pavilion so the proposed central communal building should be renamed to avoid confusion.
- Grey water systems should be introduced for flushing toilets for instance.
- The variety of trees, shrubs and hedges need to be widened to attract wildlife.

7.2 A representation has been received in support from The Magog Trust. The comments are summarised as follows:

- The Rangeford Villages' Haverhill Road scheme represents a rare opportunity to deliver a new countryside park that will complement the existing habitats and conservation work we are doing on Magog Down. Over the course of a 2-5 year period, 47 acres of inaccessible, arable land will be opened up to nature restoration and public access, providing a new and valuable public asset for the generations to come.
- Since outline permission was secured, the Trust has worked in close collaboration with Rangeford Villages on the precise details of

the countryside park proposal, offering our expertise to ensure that the scheme delivers the optimal balance of habitat restoration and public recreation. The proposals will achieve a very significant level of biodiversity net gain, not just by reverting the site to a lowland chalk grassland - which is a UK Priority Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Habitat - using grass and wildflower seeds from Magog Down, but also through the planting of new hedgerows around the site. Rangeford has also benefited from our experience in the design of the new pedestrian routes, which will offer a variety of mown paths through the meadow.

- If approved, the application will ensure that The Magog Trust will become the Trustee and manager of the new countryside park, guaranteeing a complementary relationship between the Magog Downs and the new site.

7.3 An objection has been received from the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP). The objection raises the following issues:

- The route shown on the approved parameter plans, and subsequently accommodated for on the reserved matters drawings, is not the preferred route of the CSETS. The latest preferred route extends further to the north than shown on the parameter plans and into the area identified as countryside park on the plans. This route was consulted on in the summer of 2022 and it is understood from the GCP that they intend to submit a Transport and Works Act Order application in mid-2023.
- Requested that the determination of the reserved matters application should be delayed until the Applicant and the GCP have reached an agreement to accommodate the CSET Scheme within the development approved in outline on appeal.
- Failing this, the GCP consider the reserved matters application should be refused due to conflict with Policies S/2 (criteria F) and TI/2 of the Local Plan (2018).
- On the noise assessment, whilst GCP would agree with the conclusions that noise emissions from the CSET scheme will not exceed the existing noise levels when averaged over 1 hour, a further noise assessment is required based on an alignment that provides a realist basis for an operational busway to be constructed.
- There is a conflict between the Section 106 agreement and the CSET corridor.

8.0 Member Representations

8.1 Not applicable.

9.0 Local Groups / Petition

9.1 Not applicable.

9.2 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.

10.0 Assessment

10.1 The application comprises the submission of the matters for approval that were reserved when outline planning permission for the development of the site was granted. Those matters that were reserved are set out in condition 1 of outline consent 20/02929/OUT and form the:

- Details of the additional access points.
- Details of the layout of the site.
- Details of the scale of buildings.
- Details of the appearance of buildings.
- Details of landscaping.

Principle of Development

10.2 The principle of a retirement care village in Use Class C2 comprising housing with care, communal health, wellbeing and leisure facilities, public open space, landscaping, car parking, access and associated development and public access countryside park residential development on this site was established through outline consent 20/02929/OUT, allowed at appeal on 29 December 2021. The outline consent was accompanied by a Section 106 legal agreement to cover the implementation, maintenance, management and transfer of the countryside park element of the scheme.

10.3 The outline consent was allowed at appeal on the basis that:

“Overall, but particularly through the supply of extra care housing, needed but not otherwise being met, biodiversity enhancement to Green Belt land sought by local plan and national policy but not being delivered and recreational provision, sought by national policy on Green Belt land, the benefits of the proposal would clearly outweigh even the disproportionate harms to the Green Belt and its openness which would result from the scheme. I so conclude and find in consequence that the proposal would comply with national policy and hence policy s/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.” (Paragraph 73 of Inspectors Appeal Decision)

- 10.4 While third-party objectors have raised concern regarding the principle of the proposed development on the site and the principle of developing on the green belt through this RM application, this is not an issue that can be resisted at this stage in the planning process as there remains an extant outline permission which considered the principle of development acceptable. It also identifies that whilst there would be harm to the Green Belt and its openness from the development, this would be outweighed by the benefits identified above. Therefore, the only matters to be considered as part of this application are those that were reserved at outline stage and have been applied for which consists of the additional access points, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the development.
- 10.5 The principle of the development is therefore acceptable and in accordance with the Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004), the Business and Planning Act 2020 and the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Reserved Matters: Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping

- 10.6 Policy HQ/1 'Design Principles' provides a comprehensive list of criteria by which development proposals must adhere to, requiring that all new development must be of high-quality design, with a clear vision as to the positive contribution the development will make to its local and wider context.
- 10.7 Policy NH/2 'Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character' states that development will only be permitted where it respects and retains, or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and of the individual National Character Area in which it is located.
- 10.8 Policy NH/8 'Mitigating the Impact of Development In and Adjoining the Green Belt' states that development proposals within the Green Belt must be located and designed so that they do not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt. In addition, where development is permitted, landscaping conditions, together with a requirement that any planting is adequately maintained, will be attached to any planning permission in order to ensure that the impact on the Green Belt is mitigated. Development on the edges of settlements which are surrounded by the Green Belt must include careful landscaping and design measures of a high quality.
- 10.9 This reserved matters application has been the subject of extensive pre-application consultation with officers, including specialist inputs, and two Design Review Panels (DRP) (See Appendices 2 and 3). The development is effectively steered by the parameter plans listed in condition no.3 of the appeal decision.

- 10.10 The 'Land Use and Heights' parameter plan dictates the limits of the built development area for the proposed retirement village. In addition, through colour coding, it specifies the maximum building heights within this developable area, ranging from two-storey (ridge height up to 9m) in the southern most third of this area, two-storey (ridge height up to 8m) in the central area and then single-storey (ridge height up to 7m) in the northern most third. Furthermore, it identifies the extent of the countryside park element, the space afforded to the 15m CSETS corridor and the amenity open space provision around the developable area.
- 10.11 The 'Access and Movement' parameter plan specifies the three pedestrian points into the site (Haverhill Road, Hinton Way and Gog Magog Way) as well as the vehicular access into the retirement village from Haverhill Road.
- 10.12 The 'Landscape' parameter plan outlines the extent of where new structural planting, retained trees, potential location for surface water attenuation and the relationship of these to the extents of the countryside park area and amenity open space area.
- 10.13 This reserved matters application will be assessed taking into account the need to comply with the above parameter plans and will assess each matter in turn below. The matter of the additional access points is addressed in the Highway Safety section of this report.

Layout

Overall Site Layout

- 10.14 The overall site layout conforms to the approved parameter plans. The extent of the built form of the retirement care village is contained into the developable area and the land immediately surrounding this within the site is shown as open space for this care village, as established by the parameter plans. The plans have been amended to illustrate the relationship between the CSETS route and the development to underpin the applicant's conclusion that the development layout does not prejudice delivery of the CSET project. The remaining land to the north is shown as countryside park, again, in accordance with the parameter plans as approved. Consequently, the general arrangement of the different components of the proposal is considered to be acceptable.
- 10.15 It is acknowledged that an objection has been received from the Greater Cambridge Partnership. The parameter plans approved under the outline planning permission showed a 15m wide corridor to allow for the route of the Cambridge South Eastern Transport Busway Scheme (CSETS) which is a Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) transport project. The route shown on the parameter plans traversed through the application site, running east-west, effectively forming a boundary between the retirement living and countryside park elements of the proposal. GCP have raised an objection that the reserved matters application because it does not reflect

the current preferred CSETS corridor (which differs to that in the approved parameter plans). The applicants have submitted information to demonstrate that the retirement village layout is not significantly prejudiced by the proximity of the CSET route to the buildings or its use by traffic.

- 10.16 The reserved matters application is required to correspond with the parameters of the outline planning permission. The CSET route alignment will be determined by a separate process (under the Transport and Works Act) in due course. Nevertheless, recognising that the CSET project, if delivered, could result in the landscaping works to establish the Country Park being almost immediately destroyed, officers nevertheless consider it expedient to vary (by way of a deed of variation) the existing S106 agreement alongside this reserved matters application to provide for the works to take place in two phases. This would safeguard the public benefits addressed by the Planning Inspector (and referred to in the representations from the Magog Trust) whilst avoiding potentially wasteful and abortive landscaping works being undertaken.
- 10.17 The Deed of Variation to the Section 106 Agreement for the site would phase the delivery of the countryside park into two phases. The northern-most phase of approximately 14ha would be the first phase and would need to be delivered prior to the first occupation of the retirement care village, as per the original Section 106 Agreement wording. Given GCP's proposed programme timetable for CSET, it is proposed that The southern-most phase of approximately 5ha would need to commence by 1 April 2026 unless a Transport for Works Act Order for the CSET scheme has been made. In the event of an ongoing legal challenge or a Judicial Review to any Transport for Works Act Order, if submitted, then this deadline would be extended to 1 April 2027. The final wording of this proposed Deed of Variation will need to be agreed amongst all parties and it is therefore requested that the Planning Committee grants delegated authority to officers to negotiate and agree this.

Retirement Care Village

- 10.18 The proposed layout of the retirement care village would consist of three broad character areas, generally guided by the heights dictated in the parameter plans.
- 10.19 The southern third and central area of the site would consist of a more formal arrangement whereby central green apartments and farmstead apartment blocks are arranged in a formal pattern around the central green. The character area would be terminated by the pavilion building which essentially frames the central green area.
- 10.20 Transitioning to the north, the building footprints would begin to reduce and the edges of the built footprint consisting of neighbour street apartments of differing sizes, separated by landscaped parking courts. Immediately north of the pavilion building would be two farmstead buildings with an asymmetrical relationship to one another creating a

- courtyard. The variance in building footprints, use of parking courts and subsequent spacing in this northern area is considered to create a somewhat informal feel to this part of the site.
- 10.21 At the northern end lies what is described as “the close”, whereby a series of semi-detached bungalows would be laid out in a cul-de-sac style arrangement at a much lower density compared to the remainder of the development. A naturalistic area containing denser grassland, swales, tree planting and a multi-use walk would separate “the close” and the apartment buildings immediately to the south.
- 10.22 Although only indicative and not part of the approved drawings, the indicative masterplan shown at the outline stage consisted of one large continuous apartment block occupying a significant proportion of the southern third of the site. The remainder of the development shown indicatively was arranged in an inharmonious manner that lacked character spatially.
- 10.23 Through the pre-application discussions and design review panel feedback, the layout shown through this reserved matters application is considered to demonstrate a far more cohesive and considered typology approach to the character of the development when compared to the outline indicative masterplan.
- 10.24 The Urban Design Team has explained that they consider the three character areas to appear logical and relate positively to the overall village character architecturally. The central green space configuration, and the way the site connects to the wider context along with the landscaped courtyard created between buildings is considered to create a good quality pedestrian friendly and green environment development. This central green space is an important element, and its design quality is key for the overall design quality of the scheme. The Urban Design Team have recommended a condition to control the detailed design of the central green space.
- 10.25 In terms of connectivity, the proposed development would provide a pedestrian friendly environment that encourages permeability both within the site itself, as well as clear legibility to the north to access to the countryside park/ chalk hill down and to the south-west to Stapleford. The layout of internal roads has been proposed in a way to calm traffic and avoid the over-domination of private vehicles.
- 10.26 Policy H/8 requires housing density in new settlements and urban extensions to achieve a housing density of 40 dwellings per hectare (dph) and in Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centre villages and Group Villages to achieve a density of 30dph. The policy states that density may vary where justified by the character of the locality, the scale of the development, or other local circumstances. Stapleford and Great Shelford is identified as a Minor Rural Centre.

- 10.27 The built development area, as defined by the parameter plan, measures at 3.12ha, with an additional 1.8ha of land adjacent to this area specifically dedicated for open space associated with the retirement village element. This brings the total area of land for the retirement village element to 4.92ha. The proposed 147no. dwellings would have a net density of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) across this part of the site.
- 10.28 The density of development proposed would accord with the density standards of Policy H/8. The layout of the proposal would be considered to preserve the character of the landscape and the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. The scheme achieves an efficient use of land without an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding landscape. The development footprint spatially and quantitatively would fall within the confines of the parameter plans approved under the outline decision. This density is therefore considered to be appropriate for this edge of village location and in accordance with Policy H/8 of the Local Plan.
- 10.29 It was accepted in the Inspectors appeal decision that the development of the site would cause substantial harm to the principle of the Green Belt and its openness. Notwithstanding this harm, again, in weighing the planning balance the Inspector concluded that the harm identified was outweighed by the benefits (Very Special Circumstances) accruing from the proposed development. Therefore, given the proposed development conforms to the approved parameter plans, harm to the Green Belt is not required to be reassessed in the context of the Green Belt tests for inappropriate development, in relation to this reserved matters application.
- 10.30 Overall, the proposed site layout for the retirement care village approach provides a successful balance of density across the site to the greatest degree given the land available and working with the site constraints. The creation of separate character areas transitioning from a more formal approach to a semi-rural approach is considered to help the development successfully assimilate into its surroundings.
- 10.31 There are very few physical interventions associated with the proposed countryside park save for delivery of the landscape regime outlined. The proposed gates into the countryside park would be of timber construction and would have a rural appearance. Post and wire fence would be used along much of the western perimeter but this would not appear out of character within the site context. The landscaping proposals are addressed in the landscape section of this assessment.
- 10.32 Officers consider the general layout and arrangements of the site to be acceptable and compatible with its location and surrounding development, and to accord with policies HQ/1 and NH/2 of the Local Plan (2018).

Scale

- 10.33 The existing residential areas are immediately to the south on Gog Magog Way, Haverhill Road and Chalk Hill. These majority of these properties are two storey semi-detached dwellings, with some single-storey bungalows varying designs and footprints.
- 10.34 The proposed buildings would be no more than two-storeys in scale, although with buildings 9m in height nearest to the southern part of the site, meaning the height would be taller than the nearby residential properties. The overall scale of the apartment blocks in particular would contrast with the existing development nearby. This is due to the respective width and length of these buildings when compared to a typical semi-detached or detached plot. The proposed bungalows would be single-storey in scale and representative of a typical domestic bungalow, more akin to the existing built form of the village. However, the retirement care village would, due to the overall contrast in scale and form to its immediate surrounds, be clearly legible and distinctive to the adjacent built up suburban area of Stapleford. Therefore, from a scale perspective, it is not considered harmful that the proposed apartments contrast with the surrounding area. The proposal would be viewed in a unique context, rather than as an ordinary residential development extension to a village. The overall scale of development across the site complies with the maximum ridge heights of the parameter plans.
- 10.35 The overall scale of the development would conform with the parameter plans and provide an appropriate contrast to the existing built form which respects the local and wider character of the area in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/8 of the Local Plan.

Appearance

- 10.36 The proposed residential apartment blocks have been designed as a mix of Neighbourhood Street apartments, Central Green apartments and Farmstead apartment blocks. These would all have pitched roofs which is considered to be in keeping with the appearance of buildings in Stapleford.
- 10.37 The use of hanging tiles at first-floor level, exaggerated chimneys and white gault brick will help give the farmstead style buildings a rural feel.
- 10.38 The Neighbourhood Street apartments, through recesses and a traditional fenestration with red brick and clay tiled roof, will complement the semi-formal character on this part of the site.
- 10.39 The Central Green apartments would include gable ends clad in a red brick to assist with way finding across the site and provide a successful means of breaking up the length of the massing of these longer blocks.

- 10.40 The pavilion building, through the use of long facades of glazing, large areas of balcony and continuous flat roof, would read as the community use aspect of the development through its distinct appearance.
- 10.41 The proposed bungalows would have a mix of two different brick types, accents and recesses depending on their siting on the site. It is considered that this ensures the cul-de-sac element of the proposed development does not appear unduly monotone in appearance.
- 10.42 The Urban Design Team has stated that the contemporary representation of some architectural elements found on the village appear to add a suitable new addition to the village character.
- 10.43 Officers recommend conditions requiring submission and approval of the architectural details of the buildings (balconies, windows, doors, surrounds, heads, cills, eaves, verges, soffits and fascia), and the materiality aspect of the three-character areas (including external walls, roofs, and paving) to ensure the delivery of high-quality architecture.
- 10.44 Overall, and subject to the recommended conditions, the appearance of the development is considered to be of a high quality and respect the character of the area would accord with Policy HQ/1 and NH/8 of the Local Plan.

Landscape

- 10.45 Policies NH/2, NH/6 and SC/9 are relevant to the landscape and visual impacts of a proposal. Together they seek to permit development only where it respects and retains or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and its National Character Area. Policy NH/8 also requires sites on the edge of settlements surrounded by Green Belt to include careful landscaping.
- 10.46 The District Design Guide SPD (2010) and Landscape in New Developments SPD (2010) provide additional guidance. The NPPF provides advice on achieving well-designed places and conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
- 10.47 Policies NH/2, NH/4 and HQ/1 seek to preserve, protect and enhance existing trees and hedges. Para. 131 of the NPPF seeks for existing trees to be retained wherever possible.
- 10.48 As stated earlier, the proposed layout, and thus space available for landscaping, conforms to the associated parameter plans. Dense structural planting along the perimeter of the retirement care village part of the site is proposed. This would be in the form of two elements, a woodland edge whip planting followed by larger woodland whip planting which will over time develop into mature planting. This planting is

considered to be sufficient enough to help provide a successful semi-rural to rural transition between the site and its surrounding context.

- 10.49 Within the retirement care village, there would be a central green area which would sit immediately adjacent to Pavilion building (Block A) which is considered a suitable location given this is where the hub of activities on the site would be. In addition, courtyards and threshold planting is proposed between apartment blocks which is proportionate to the level of development proposed. A growing area is also proposed in the southern part of the site for the benefit of future occupants. The levels of hardstanding are not considered to dominate the visual character of the site and provide an acceptable balance of car parking provision and soft landscaping.
- 10.50 The Landscape Team has raised no objection to the reserved matters subject to further details regarding hard and soft landscaping being secured through conditions.
- 10.51 The proposed countryside park would be formed predominantly of chalk grassland seeding with small areas of meadow seeding and hedge planting along the borders. Access within the countryside park would be through a series of mown paths. The existing Traver's Copse feature would be enhanced with additional tree planting. A small chalk scrape habitat feature and a viewing area, given the topography of the site compared to the wider area, are proposed in the centre of the site. The general approach to the landscape on the countryside park is akin to the Magog Down near (north-east) of the site itself as the Magog Trust are likely to manage the proposed countryside park in the long term. The proposed landscaping arrangement is focussed towards biodiversity enhancements whilst still providing recreational access to the park and through it to the adjoining public routes. This arrangement is considered to be appropriate and achieves the outcomes sought within the outline permission.
- 10.52 Overall, the proposed development, subject to conditions, is a quality design that would be compatible to its surroundings and be appropriately landscaped. The proposal is compliant with South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) policies NH/2, NH/6 and SC/9 and the NPPF.

Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design

- 10.53 Policy CC/3 'Renewable and Low Carbon Energy', requires that Proposals for new dwellings and new non-residential buildings of 1,000m² or more will be required to reduce carbon emissions by a minimum of 10% through the use of on-site renewable energy and low carbon technologies.
- 10.54 Condition no.7 of the outline permission (20/02929/OUT) required it to be demonstrated that a minimum reduction of 10% of carbon emissions can be achieved on site. An application (20/02929/CONDB) to discharge this condition was made in October 2022. The Sustainability Officer reviewed

the Energy and Sustainability Statement and confirmed that the development would achieve a reduction of 59.32% and this condition was subsequently discharged. The principles demonstrated to achieve this are reflected in the details submitted with this reserved matters application.

- 10.55 Policy CC/4 'Water Efficiency' requires that all new residential developments must achieve as a minimum water efficiency to 110 litres pp per day and for non-residential buildings to achieve a BREEAM efficiency standard equivalence of 2 credits. Paras 152 – 158 of the NPPF are relevant.
- 10.56 Condition no.14 of the outline permission requires details of water efficiency to be submitted and agreed prior to occupation of the retirement care village. The matter of water efficiency will be managed through the discharge of this condition when made.
- 10.57 The applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy, noting the application type, the proposal is compliant with Local Plan policies CC/1 and CC/3.

Biodiversity

- 10.58 The National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and the Councils' Biodiversity SPD (2022) require development proposals to deliver a net gain in biodiversity following a mitigation hierarchy which is focused on avoiding ecological harm over minimising, rectifying, reducing and then off-setting. This approach accords with policy NH/4 which outlines a primary objective for biodiversity to be conserved or enhanced and provides for the protection of Protected Species, Priority Species and Priority Habitat.
- 10.59 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer. The benefit of biodiversity net gain identified as part of the justification for the allowing of the outline appeal permission was on the basis of a net gain of at least 240%. The Ecology Officer has reviewed the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan submitted with this reserved matters application and agrees with the findings that with the conversion of the arable field to calcareous grassland the development will achieve a 289% net gain in habitat units and 117% net gain in hedgerow units.
- 10.60 The Ecology Officer requested further information regarding the management of mown paths through the countryside park. A slightly different grass mix for the mown path areas, that is harder wearing than the calcareous grasslands that will be established on the rest of the site, is proposed. The Ecology Officer has confirmed that it is unlikely that the change in seed mix for the grass paths will impact the overall biodiversity gain in a significant way. The Ecology Officer has also requested a

condition to secure details of bat and bird boxes, and hedgehog connectivity.

- 10.61 The applicants have suitably addressed the matter of biodiversity, and subject to condition the proposal is in accordance with Local Plan policy NH/4.

Water Management and Flood Risk

- 10.62 Policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 of the Local Plan require developments to have appropriate sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems and minimise flood risk. Paras. 159 – 169 of the NPPF are relevant.
- 10.63 The site falls within flood zone 1 and is therefore at a low risk of flooding. There are some small areas of surface water flooding identified adjacent to Chalk Hill, Gog Magog Way and Haverhill Road.
- 10.64 Flood risk is a matter dealt with at outline stage when establishing the principle of development. The principle of developing the site has been established through the grant of outline planning permission. Conditions were also imposed on the outline planning permission which relate to submission of further details of the surface water drainage scheme. Reserved matters applications require supporting details to demonstrate that surface water drainage arrangements could be provided appropriately within the proposed layout of the site, being linked to matters of layout and landscaping and in the context of planning conditions regarding surface water drainage.
- 10.65 Outline consents typically impose a condition requiring a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, along with details of its maintenance. A discharge of conditions application then provides the full technical details, calculations, maintenance details etc., as required by the condition, to discharge the relevant requirements and approve an appropriate drainage scheme for a development in full.
- 10.66 In reference to this application, condition no.5 of the outline consent required the submission of a surface water drainage scheme by way of a pre-commencement condition. In consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency, condition no.5 has been discharged in full.
- 10.67 In terms of foul water drainage, condition no.6 of the outline consent requires the submission of a scheme for foul water drainage by way of a pre-commencement condition. In consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and Anglian Water, condition no.6 has been discharged in full.

- 10.68 Officers are satisfied that the drainage arrangements already approved by the Council are compatible with the proposed site layout and therefore the site will be adequately drained.
- 10.69 The applicants have suitably addressed the issues of surface water management and flood risk and the proposal is in accordance with Local Plan policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 and NPPF advice.

Access, Highway Safety and Transport Impacts

- 10.70 Policy HQ/1 states that proposals must provide safe and convenient access for all users and abilities to public buildings and spaces, including those with limited mobility or those with impairment such as sight or hearing.
- 10.71 Policy TI/2 requires developers to demonstrate adequate provision will be made to mitigate the likely impacts of the proposed development and, for larger developments, to demonstrate they have maximised opportunities for sustainable travel, and provided a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.
- 10.72 Para. 111 of the NPPF advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Strategic Transport Implications

- 10.73 The parameter plans approved under the outline planning permission showed a 15m wide corridor to allow for the route of the Cambridge South Eastern Transport Busway Scheme (CSETS) which is a Greater Cambridge Partnership transport project. The route shown on the parameter plans traversed through the application site, running east-west, effectively forming a boundary between the retirement living and countryside park elements of the proposal. An objection has been received from the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) to this reserved matters application. The objection states that the route shown on the approved parameter plans, and subsequently accommodated for on the reserved matters drawings, is not the preferred route of the CSETS. The latest preferred route extends further to the north than shown on the parameter plans and into the area identified as countryside park on the plans. This route was consulted on in the summer of 2022 and it is understood from the GCP that they intend to submit a Transport and Works Act Order application in mid-2023. The GCP have requested that the determination of the reserved matters application should be delayed until the Applicant and the GCP have reached an agreement to accommodate the CSET Scheme within the development approved in

outline on appeal. Failing this, the GCP consider the reserved matters application should be refused due to conflict with Policies S/2 (criteria F) and TI/2 of the Local Plan (2018).

- 10.74 The parameter plans approved under the outline planning permission showed a 15m wide corridor to allow for the route of the Cambridge South Eastern Transport Busway Scheme (CSETS) which is a Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) transport project. The route shown on the parameter plans traversed through the application site, running east-west, effectively forming a boundary between the retirement living and countryside park elements of the proposal. Although the GCP have raised an objection that the reserved matters application does not reflect the preferred CSETS corridor (which differs to that in the approved parameter plans), the reserved matters application is not capable of considering an alternative/preferred alignment. The CSETS route alignment is not safeguarded in the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan or SCDC Local Plan. Nevertheless, the applicant has demonstrated that the original CSETS corridor as set out within the parameter plans for the outline planning permission, can be accommodated within the overall site layout and co-exist with the proposed development without causing harm to the amenities of future occupiers of the development.
- 10.75 The matter of potential abortive works to part of the proposed countryside park as a result of the CSETS corridor, if delivered, and the need for a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 Agreement has been addressed in the layout section of this report in paragraphs 10.14 – 10.17.

Access

- 10.76 The matter of access to the site was dealt with at outline stage with appropriate details secured through conditions. This consisted of the main vehicle access entering the retirement care village from Haverhill Road and an emergency vehicle access and pedestrian access from Gog Magog Way in the south-west corner.
- 10.77 The layout of the reserved matters application is consistent with the points of access consented at outline stage. The Local Highway Authority has considered the layout of the site and found it acceptable in highway safety terms.
- 10.78 Whilst the matter of access was considered under the outline permission, a matter referred to as “additional access points” was specifically reserved. This relates to two indicative locations of two pedestrian access points into the countryside park from Haverhill Road and Hinton Way shown on the approved parameter plans. Under this reserved matters application, details of the precise locations and the types of access have now been provided.

- 10.79 The Highway Authority had originally raised objection to the proposals. This was due to the additional pedestrian access on Haverhill Road being of a design and width that would allow for vehicles to enter and exit the Highway. The intention was that this access would be used occasionally by maintenance vehicles associated with the countryside park. Nevertheless, the Highway Authority were of the view that this would introduce a point of possible traffic conflict, being detrimental to highway safety. The Highway Authority suggested that instead vehicles could use the approved vehicle access into the retirement village and the crossings internally between the retirement care village and countryside park to undertaken maintenance by vehicles.
- 10.80 In response to this, the gates onto the countryside park from the public highway have been amended to 1.5m wide timber gates to prevent access from vehicles. A 4.2m wide timber gate would instead be installed internally between the retirement village and the countryside park as suggested by the Highway Authority. The Highway Authority has raised no objection to this arrangement.
- 10.81 The Local Highway Authority has recommended a condition requiring it to be demonstrated that wheelchair users and an equestrian would traverse through the gates at the Haverhill Road additional access point prior to occupation. The British Horse Society have also objected to the access arrangement. A 1.5m wide gate would in principle be wide enough for equestrians on a bridleway in accordance with the BHS Access Advice (July 2020). It is therefore considered that subject to the highways condition, the access arrangements into the Countryside Park are acceptable.
- 10.82 It is noted that Great Shelford Parish Council have raised a concern that the gates would contravene the Department of Transport's Cycle Infrastructure Design published in July 2020 due to causing a delay for cyclists to get through the gate off a busy highway. However the gate design would be a 1.5m wide closing bolt gate and it is not considered that the opening of this from the public highway would be difficult or time consuming for cyclists at these entrance points. The Highway Authority has raised no objection to this arrangement.
- 10.83 Officers note the concerns raised by local residents in terms of the lack of dedicated car parking for the countryside park, the on-street car parking that this would cause on adjacent roads and the concern that this could pose a threat to highway safety for people using these roads. However, the Local Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposals. In addition, the layout and design of the countryside park is designed principally to enhance biodiversity and does not include any visitor attractions or community uses that would attract significant volumes of traffic from the wider area. The nature of the countryside park with a series of mown paths and habitat features would lend itself to serve a local catchment and would be walkable for most residents in the village.

- 10.84 Subject to condition, the proposal accords with the objectives of policies HQ/1 and TI/2 of the Local Plan and is compliant with NPPF advice.

Cycle and Car Parking Provision

- 10.85 Policies HQ/1 and TI/3 set out that car and cycle parking provision should be provided through a design-led approach in accordance with the indicative standards set out in Figure 11 of the Local Plan. Cycle parking should be provided to at least the minimum standards.
- 10.86 It should be noted that the retirement care village is to be used only for provision of extra care housing for which there is no specific standard in the Local Plan Policy TI/3. The nearest applicable standard to this use would be for standard residential dwellings (use class C3). Although these provide a helpful guide, these can only form indicative guidelines.

Cycle Parking

- 10.87 TI/3 requires 1 cycle space per bedroom. The supporting text advises that for residential purposes cycle parking should be within a covered, lockable enclosure and that for houses this could be in the form of a shed or garage, for flats either individual lockers or cycle stands within a lockable, covered enclosure are required. All cycle parking should be designed and located to minimise conflict between cycles, pedestrians and vehicles.
- 10.88 The retirement care village would have integral secure covered cycle storage provided in the lobby areas of each of the proposed apartment blocks, totalling 80no. spaces. The proposed bungalows would have dedicated sheds within private gardens for cycle parking. 20no. External cycle parking spaces are proposed adjacent to Block A which is the pavilion community building in the centre of the site. Sheffield stands are also proposed adjacent to each additional access point into the countryside park. Although not strictly cycle parking, mobility scooter parking with electric charging is proposed inside each of the blocks and bungalows which is supported.
- 10.89 The Urban Design Team have requested a condition for further details of cycle parking and mobility parking to be agreed prior to commencement of development. However, given the level of detail already provided in the proposed drawings, it does not seem reasonable to ask for any further detail. Instead, a compliance condition has been recommended for the cycle parking to be installed prior to first occupation of the development.

Car Parking

- 10.90 TI/3 requires 2 spaces per dwelling – 1 space to be allocated within the curtilage. The supporting text to the policy advises that the Council will encourage innovative solutions such as shared parking areas, for example where there are a mix of day and night uses, car clubs and provision of

electric charging points and that a developer must provide clear justification for the level and type of parking proposed and will need to demonstrate they have addressed highway safety issues.

- 10.91 The proposed retirement care village includes 139no. car parking spaces. This would consist of a mix of dedicated car parking in front of the bungalows, car parking courts for some of the apartment blocks and then car parking bays parallel to the internal streets within the development. The proposal does not specify exactly how car parking will be allocated across the proposed residential units. The applicant has explained that the lack of allocated car parking is due to the transient nature of occupiers personal circumstance and residents parking requirements changing over time.
- 10.92 Whilst this is below that stipulated in policy TI/3, in addition to the fact that the proposal is not a typical residential dwelling development, these are indicative standards and do not differentiate between provision for one-bedroom properties and larger 4 bedroom dwellings which are more likely to be occupied by a family. Paragraph 2 of policy TI/3 states that provision should take into consideration various factors such as car ownership levels, local services, facilities and public transport.
- 10.93 The majority of the dwellings (129no.) are two-bedroom in size, 20no. are one-bedroom apartments and 18no. are three bedroom in size. Condition no.17 of the outline permission specifies that the retirement care village shall only be occupied by persons aged at least 55 years, other than if a person is a spouse or dependent relatively or a widow/ widower or surviving dependent relatively of any person over 55 who has co-occupied a dwelling unit. The on-site pavilion building includes a restaurant, café, bar, shop, gym, wellness facilities and swimming pool and residents would have access to the countryside park immediately adjacent. Furthermore, there are services within Stapleford including shops, services and bus links to the city and the wider South Cambridgeshire area. An on-site minibus service will operate from the site to the wider area for residents and this has been agreed through the travel plan which has been discharged through condition no.15 (20/02929/CONDB) of the outline permission.
- 10.94 In light of the above, officers consider the proposed level of car parking is acceptable.
- 10.95 The Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD outlines the standards for EV charging at one slow charge point for each dwelling with allocated parking, one slow charge point for every two dwellings with communal parking (at least half of all non-allocated parking spaces) and passive provision for all the remaining car parking spaces to provide capability for increasing provision in the future.
- 10.96 Condition no.20 of the outline permission requires details of electric vehicle charging points to be submitted and approved prior to occupation.

As such this does not need to be revisited under this reserved matters application.

- 10.97 Subject to conditions, the proposal is considered to accord with policies HQ/1 and TI/3 of the Local Plan and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.

Amenity

- 10.98 Policy HQ/1 (n), sets out that proposals must protect the health and amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses from development that is overlooking, overbearing or results in a loss of daylight or development which would create unacceptable impacts such as noise, vibration, odour, emissions and dust.
- 10.99 The District Design Guide 2010 advises that to prevent the overlooking of habitable rooms to the rear of residential properties and rear private gardens, it is preferable that a minimum distance of 15m is provided between the windows and the property boundary. For two storey residential properties, a minimum distance of 25m should be provided between rear or side building faces containing habitable rooms, which should be increased to 30m for 3 storey residential properties. It advises that a 12 metre separation is allowed where blank walls are proposed opposite the windows to habitable rooms.

Neighbouring Properties

- 10.100 In considering the proposals and the site context, the only neighbouring properties anticipated to be potentially affected in terms of amenity are those immediately to the south and south-west on Haverhill Road, Gog Magog Way and Chalk Hill.
- 10.101 The proposed bungalows and Blocks A, B, F – J would be a significant distance from any residential properties and as such are not considered to give rise to any harmful amenity impacts.
- 10.102 Block C in the south-east corner of the proposed development would be at its closest point approximately 25m from the side (north) elevation of no.15 Haverhill Road which does not have any main habitable outlooks looking northwards towards the site. At this separation distance, it is considered that Block C would not harm the amenity of this neighbour in terms of overlooking, overshadowing or visual enclosure.
- 10.103 Block D would be approximately 45m at its closest point from the rear building lines of properties on Gog Magog Way to the south. It would be approximately 23m from the rear garden boundaries of these neighbours. Again, this separation distance and the length of these neighbours gardens is considered sufficient to ensure that no adverse overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impacts would arise on these neighbours.

- 10.104 Block E would be situated approximately 22m from the side (east) elevation of the nearest property immediately to the west at no.21 Chalk Hill. This neighbouring property has side windows which face towards Block E but these are not primary habitable windows. The proposed development of Block E would have side (west) facing windows but these would also be secondary windows to rooms and would only look towards the side elevation of this neighbour with oblique views of their garden. The south-facing windows of Block E would be set over 30m from the garden of no.8 Chalk Hill. The amenity of neighbours on Chalk Hill in respect of loss of privacy, loss of light and visual enclosure would be respected by the proposed development.
- 10.105 It is pertinent to note that there would be a circa 5m wide dense structural planting boundary between the proposed retirement care village and these neighbours which over time would soften and obscure views between these two sites.
- 10.106 The layout of the proposal is not considered to give rise to unacceptable noise impacts to neighbours given the extra care living use. The communal facilities element in the pavilion building would be set well away from neighbouring boundaries, as would the interior roads. The access from Gog Magog Way is an emergency access only and the levels of coming and going by non-motorised users along this path is not considered to pose a nuisance disturbance to the residents on Chalk Hill adjacent.

Future Occupants

- 10.107 Policy H/12 of the Local Plan states that new residential units will be permitted where their gross internal floor areas meet or exceed the Government's Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015) or successor document.
- 10.108 Given that the outline planning consent did not require the dwellings to be built to meet the residential space standards by way of a condition and this matter does not fall under the definition of the reserved matters for layout, appearance or scale, the development would not need to accord with national space standards or the District Design Guide specifications for garden sizes.
- 10.109 Regardless, all units exceed the gross internal floor space requirements detailed in Figure 8 of policy H/12.
- 10.110 The District Design Guide 2010 advises that each one or two-bedroom house should have private garden space of 50m² in rural settings; whilst ground floor apartments should have a minimum of 10m² private amenity space immediately outside their living accommodation, or use of a communal garden, where 25m² is allowed for each apartment. Upper floor apartments should have use of a private balcony, of a minimum of 3m²,

plus use of a communal garden, where 25m² is allowed for each apartment.

- 10.111 The upper-floor apartments would all have private balconies in excess of 3m². All ground-floor apartments, including the bungalows, would benefit from a private patio area of approximately 16m². In terms of on-site communal open space that residents could spill out onto, there would be approximately 875m² available by way of the northern courtyard (130m²), southern courtyard (230m²) and central green (515m²). Naturally, the countryside park immediately adjacent would also be available to future occupants. This layout is considered to be acceptable.
- 10.112 An Environmental Noise Survey has been submitted with the application to establish the existing background noise levels of the area. Results of the survey have been used to calculate minimum noise insulation requirements of the building façades, as well as to derive building services plant noise emission limits. The Environmental Health Team has reviewed this information and considers that subject to a compliance condition the future occupants would not be subject to harmful levels of noise.
- 10.113 A separate Noise Assessment has also been undertaken to assess the potential impact of the CSETS route on the proposed retirement care village. The nearest units to the CSETS route would be the proposed bungalows. Two of the bungalows would be approximately 9m and 14m respectively from the very edge of the indicative bus corridor route shown on the approved plans. It is pertinent to note though that the orientation of these bungalows would be such that the side elevations would face towards the indicative corridor and therefore not the main habitable outlooks for these. The nearest bungalows with rear habitable facing outlooks would be set approximately 17m from the edge of the corridor at the closest point.
- 10.114 The Noise Assessment demonstrates that the proposed busway noise emission levels using the assumptions stated within this document are not predicted to exceed the existing noise levels when averaged over 1 hour. Noise levels will increase to approximately 55 – 60dB during the period of the 10 second drive-by and are expected to be similar to vehicles on Haverhill Road and no additional noise mitigation measures would be necessary based on the results provided. It is therefore considered that the information provided is sufficient to demonstrate that the amenity for future occupiers based on this layout is acceptable.
- 10.115 There would be dense structural buffer planting situated between the edge of the indicative corridor route and the proposed bungalows. The presence of this, coupled with the limited period of bus drive-bys of approximately 10 seconds, is considered sufficient to demonstrate that future occupants would not be subjected to adverse levels of light pollution based on the layout provided.

Construction and Environmental Health Impacts

- 10.116 The land contamination, air quality and noise and vibrational impacts associated with the construction and occupation of the site are addressed by Local Plan policies CC/6 'Construction Methods', CC/7 'Water Quality', SC/9 'Lighting Proposals', SC/10 'Noise Pollution', SC11 'Contaminated Land', SC/12 'Air Quality' and SC/14 'Odour'. Paragraphs 183 - 188 of the NPPF are relevant.
- 10.117 The Council's Environmental Health Team have assessed the application and have no objections to the proposal. Condition no.16 of the outline consent secures a construction method statement. Condition no.8 requires a contaminated land assessment to be submitted and agreed. Condition no.9 requires detailing of any piling to be agreed in the event of foundations for the development requiring them. Condition no.10 addresses nitrogen oxide emissions associated with boilers and gas fired combustion. Condition no.12 requires details of external lighting to be agreed. Officers consider that with these in place, construction impacts and environmental health impacts would be adequately managed and minimized.
- 10.118 Regarding noise and disturbance impacts arising from occupation of the site, the quantum of development (and associated noise and disturbance from occupation) has already been assessed under the outline application and is considered acceptable. The Environmental Health Team has recommended a conditions restricting collection and delivery hours associated with the non-residential premises and for details of the noise associated with plant and equipment of air source heat pumps and renewable energy. Given that these details were not included at the outline stage, it is considered reasonable to include these conditions.
- 10.119 The proposal adequately respects the amenity of its neighbours and of future occupants. Subject to conditions as imposed on the outline consent and those proposed under this reserved matters application, the proposal is compliant with policy HQ/1 and the District Design Guide 2010. The associated construction and environmental impacts would be acceptable in accordance with policies CC/6, CC/7, SC/9, SC/10, SC/12 and SC/14 of the Local Plan.

Third Party Representations

- 10.120 The remaining third-party representations not addressed in the preceding paragraphs are summarised and responded to in the table below:

Third Party Comment	Officer Response
Concern, as an access gate, particularly more than standard pedestrian width and open and not lockable, rather than a lockable	It is not considered that the public access to countryside park would facilitate anti-social behaviour or criminal activities. This would be akin to the use of any public footpath or area at night time.

<p>“kissing gate” style, on Hinton Way will facilitate use of the “leisure park” during the hours of darkness that at best will be anti-social or, at worse, criminal;</p>	
<p>Light pollution, noise and construction disturbance.</p>	<p>See paragraphs 10.117 – 10.120</p>
<p>Noise and anti-social behaviour out of keeping with rural nature of area;</p>	<p>The use of the land and associated noise was addressed at the outline consent stage. Regardless, the proposed uses of a retirement village and countryside park and their layouts are not considered to cause noise or anti-social behaviour.</p>
<p>Highway safety concerns on local roads due to exacerbation of existing issues caused by countryside park demand. Parking restrictions on this use needed. Speed limits on Haverhill Road should be changed. Horse rider safety concerns due to increased traffic along Haverhill Road and conflict with the Drift Track and link to Linton Greenway.</p>	<p>The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the quantum of car parking proposed. The matter of vehicular access was addressed at the outline consent stage and the Highway Authority.</p>
<p>Insufficient car parking. Additional parking is clearly needed for the 190 staff members intended to be on site as well as visitor parking. Whilst it is recognised that South Cambs takes the view that restricting car parking will encourage sustainable travel without improving the</p>	<p>See paragraphs 10.83 and 10.90 – 10.94.</p>

<p>sustainable travel operations serving a site, the reality of this in practice is that it simply leaves developments overrun with parked cars that haven't been accommodated for within the design.</p>	
<p>Public transport in the area is poor so people will rely on cars. Can the local minibus proposed by Rangeford be used by local residents too? The number of pool cars should be increased.</p>	<p>The sustainable transport considerations of the development were considered at the outline consent stage. The travel plan approved under the outline condition includes the provision of car sharing. The minibus service would not be available to local residents.</p>
<p>Conditions regarding renewable energy and recycled water are necessary. Grey water systems should be introduced for flushing toilets for instance.</p>	<p>These are included as condition nos.7 and 14 on the outline consent.</p>
<p>Stress on water supplies, chalk streams and wastewater infrastructure; Drainage and flooding concerns.</p>	<p>These were considered at the outline consent stage and conditions nos. 5 and 6 address these points.</p>
<p>Will these houses be taken account of when considering Stapleford's contribution to housing in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan?</p>	<p>The site is included within the Housing Trajectory for South Cambridgeshire in the 'Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Five Year Housing Land Supply Report 2022'</p>
<p>Is the Council satisfied/ comfortable about the lack of on-site GP provision bearing in mind the</p>	<p>The impact on facilities was considered at the outline consent stage.</p>

current demand on the service?	
Assurance needed that all dependent infrastructure will be completed before work starts on other areas and that the developer will be bearing those costs. Assurance also needed that biodiversity is secured and enforced against.	The outline consent conditions and Section 106 agreement will continue to define the order of which infrastructure needs to be delivered. The proposed ecological condition and landscape condition associated with this reserved matters would have to be complied with and could be enforced against.
Regarding the noise assessment, there is confusion regarding the light green areas further from the bus lane showing as >90 db with the greater than prefix? An explanation should be given before the noise issue is considered, particularly around the "station/stops" areas.	This has since been confirmed as an error on the drawing and it has been clarified that the light green area would be <35db.
Noise assessment assumption states six bus movements per hour but previous public information stated 12 movements per hour.	The exact number of bus movements has not been agreed yet for the proposed bus route. Any future Transport and Works Act Application for the CSETS route, separate to this reserved matters application, will have to address the issue of noise by which point the exact number of movements will be known. The information submitted with this application is considered sufficient to make an informed judgement on the reserved matters application details at this stage.
Hinton Way gate seems to show use by motorised vehicles.	The gate is not wide enough to allow for motorised vehicles.
The design is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area. Fails to comply with local and national design policies. Design and density out of keeping with rural context.	This has been addressed in the main body of this report in the reserved matters section.

<p>Red brick should be used to be in keeping with Stapleford. The development blocks historic, sensitive and locally significant views across open farmland and across to Magog Down. Development breaches green belt and development will block open views. The rise in topography of the site means that the smaller buildings will still appear as tall as the taller buildings on the site. Disappointing that buildings have been built to maximum ridge heights. This doesn't gain any additional floorspace but does impact on the landscape and character of the area. The courtyard farmstead design is very similar to the apartments. Other than in name, the reference to farmstead design is notional at best.</p>	
<p>Public rights of way through the retirement village and countryside park needed to be added to the designated list and protected as public rights of way in perpetuity.</p>	<p>This is a matter for the Cambridgeshire County Council Public Rights of Way Team.</p>
<p>Strongly urge the Council to absolutely confirm that the floor space complies with</p>	<p>The information provided demonstrates that the development is within the size parameters.</p>

restrictions (17,825sqm) set out in the outline permission. Some drawings show apartments as being smaller than they actually are.	
Disingenuous to say houses in area have long driveways as only a few do.	It is acknowledged that not all houses in the area have long driveways. Regardless, the proposal is considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
The village already has a pavilion so the proposed central communal building should be renamed to avoid confusion.	The naming/ address of the building is a matter for the street name and numbering team and is dealt with outside the planning process.
The variety of trees, shrubs and hedges need to be widened to attract wildlife.	This addressed in paragraphs 10.58 – 10.61.

Other Matters

Stapleford Parish Council Comments

10.121 It is acknowledged that Stapleford Parish Council has made frequent reference to the Great Shelford and Stapleford Design Guidelines May 2019. This document was prepared as part of the emerging Great Shelford and Stapleford Neighbourhood Plan. At the time of assessing this application, the emerging neighbourhood plan has yet to formally reach pre-submission public consultation (Regulation 14) as no draft neighbourhood plan has been prepared. Paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) states that:

“Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);

b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and

c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).”

10.122 Taking the above paragraph 48 of the NPPF into account, it is considered that the emerging neighbourhood plan is at a very early stage in plan-making terms and therefore very limited weight can be afforded to this emerging neighbourhood plan or any evidence associated with it. Notwithstanding this, the proposed development has been assessed against the relevant local and national design policies and is considered to be acceptable.

Refuse Storage

10.123 Policy HQ/1 requires adequate bin storage to be provided for developments. The application has been accompanied by details of refuse storage. The refuse storage would consist of a series of external stores positioned across the site with 4no. located within the external car parking courts, 5no. along the main road within the site and then a series of smaller bin stores adjacent to each of the bungalows. The Design and Access Statement demonstrates that a refuse vehicle would be able to access each of these bin stores. This arrangement is considered acceptable. A compliance condition has recommended for this to be installed prior to first use of the development.

Broadband

10.124 LP policy TI/10 'Broadband' requires new development to contribute towards the provision of infrastructure suitable to enable the delivery of high-speed broadband services across the District. A condition is proposed to ensure this provision. While this is may not strictly fall under the remit of the reserved matters, it is practical for the applicant to provide adequate broadband for the proposed development and therefore, officers advise compliance with Policy TI/10.

Conclusion

10.125 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

10.126 The proposal seeks approval of the reserved matters (layout, landscaping, scale and appearance) in relation to the outline planning permission (20/02929/OUT). Given the nature of the application, only those considerations which fall within the scope of layout, landscaping, scale, appearance and additional access arrangements can be assessed.

10.127 Officers consider that the proposed retirement village element accords with the parameter plans approved at the outline stage which dictate the extent and scale of the built form on the site. The proposed design, coupled with the landscaping strategy, will allow the development to assimilate successfully into its context and surroundings and respect the character and appearance of the area. The choice of materials, typology,

scale and architectural approach through a distinctive set of character zones is considered to provide an appropriate transition of high quality built form between the edge of the village and the proposed countryside park and countryside beyond .

- 10.128 The proposed countryside park would allow for recreational access and a significant biodiversity net gain as required by the outline permission. The simple palette of biodiversity interventions and limited physical interventions proposed on this part of the site would help the proposed countryside park blend into the green belt setting and wider landscape.
- 10.129 The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposed non-vehicular access points along Haverhill Road and Hinton Way. Whilst the potential strategic transport implications for the CSETS corridor are acknowledged, the reserved matters demonstrate that the proposed development can accommodate the CSETS alignment in accordance with the parameter plan, overall layout of the site and without harm to residential amenity. Any alternative/preferred alignment would be assessed on its merits under the TWA application in due course. Notwithstanding this, a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 Agreement is recommended to provide for phased implementation of the Countryside Park avoiding potential abortive works within the CSETS corridor.
- 10.130 The proposal provides for 139no. car parking spaces, which is considered an appropriate level of car parking given the proposal is a retirement village. The countryside park element is not considered to attract a significant number of vehicle trips from the wider area and will instead naturally serve the local residential catchment of the village. Therefore, it is not considered that there would be adverse levels of car parking on adjoining streets.
- 10.131 For the reasons set out above, the reserved matters are considered to accord with the parameter plans of the outline planning permission. Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed reserved matters are recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Recommendation

- 10.132 **Approve** subject to:

- The planning conditions as set out below with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to officers; and
- Completion of a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 Agreement to provide for the phased delivery of the Countryside Park as set out in the report.

11.0 Planning Conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 No development of the retirement village above ground level shall take place until an assessment of the noise impact of plant and or equipment including any renewable energy provision sources such as any air source heat pump or wind turbine on the proposed and existing residential premises and a scheme for insulation as necessary, in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant and or equipment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any noise insulation scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be maintained in strict accordance with the approved details and shall not be altered without prior approval.

Reason: To provide an acceptable living environment for future occupants and to protect the amenity of adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 3 No development of the retirement village above ground level shall take place until the area shown (Central Green) on the Plan attached hereto has been laid out with (Drawing 742-ALA-00-XX-DR-L-0001, Rev P03 & 742-ALA-00-XX-DR-L-0003, Rev P03) and that area shall not therefore be used for any purpose other than what is stated in the drawings. Details, to include dimensions, materials and appearance, of the following shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall thereafter be implemented as approved.
- a) The public art;
 - b) The feature walls.
 - c) Pavilion terrace and petanque court.
 - d) Wayfinding signage.
 - e) Handrails.
 - f) Freestanding external lighting.
 - e) Written specifications of planting plans (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment);
 - f) Schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Reason: To ensure the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area and to ensure that future occupiers have access to a high quality living environment in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 4 Prior to the commencement of the retirement village, except for any underground enabling works, detailed planting plans shall be submitted for the Village green, terrace and parking areas south of block A, the courtyard between blocks A, I and J and perimeter planting to Block A including; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme;

Reason: To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018

5. No development of the retirement village above ground level shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings (including external walls, roofs, and paving) hereby permitted, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 6 No development of the retirement village above ground level shall commence until details of balconies, windows, doors, surrounds, heads, cills, eaves, verges, soffits and fascia have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 7 Prior to commencement of the retirement village above ground level, details of the biodiverse (green, blue or brown) roof(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any superstructure works commencing on site. Details of the green biodiverse roof(s) shall include means of access for maintenance, plans and sections showing the make-up of the sub-base to be used and include the following:

a) Roofs can/will be biodiverse based with extensive substrate varying in depth from between 80-150mm,

b) Planted/seeded with an agreed mix of species within the first planting season following the practical completion of the building works (the seed mix shall be focused on wildflower planting indigenous to the local area and shall contain no more than a maximum of 25% sedum (green roofs only), Except on block A where a sedum roof is permitted

c) The biodiverse and sedum (green) roofs shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind whatsoever and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance or repair, or escape in case of emergency,

d) Where solar panels are proposed, biosolar roofs should be incorporated under and in between the panels. An array layout will be required incorporating a minimum of 0.75m between rows of panels for access and to ensure establishment of vegetation,

e) A management/maintenance plan approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority,

All works shall be carried out and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To ensure that biodiverse roofs contribute positive to ecological and sustainable objectives in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 8 Prior to the commencement of the retirement village above ground level, details of minor artefacts and structures (e.g. Street furniture, artwork, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, CCTV installations); proposed (these need to be coordinated with the landscape plans prior to being installed) and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 9 Prior to the commencement of the retirement village above ground level, samples of the paving materials to be used in the construction of all of the external landscape surfaces which includes footways, roads, parking areas, terraces and details of the courtyards, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 10 Prior to the commencement of development above ground level, a scheme of ecology enhancement shall be supplied to the local planning authority for its written approval. The scheme must include details of bat and bird box installation, hedgehog connectivity, and other

enhancements as applicable and in line with the Greater Cambridge Planning Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (2022). The approved scheme shall be fully implemented within an agreed timescale unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: To conserve and enhance ecological interests in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and the Greater Cambridge Planning Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (2022).

- 11 Prior to first occupation of any unit, a layout plan showing how a wheelchair user and an equestrian would traverse through the gates at points 1 on the Revised Typical Fencing and Gate Details plan must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 12 Prior to the first occupation of any unit, infrastructure to enable the delivery of broadband services, to industry standards, shall be provided for that dwelling.

Reason: To contribute towards the provision of infrastructure suitable to enable the delivery of high speed broadband across the district, in accordance with policy TI/10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 13 All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details, including the document titled 'Landscape and Ecological management Plan for Stapleford Retirement Village, Cambridge – Rev P04' dated 22.11.2022. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years from the date of the planting, or replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place as soon as is reasonably practicable, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area, enhances biodiversity and provides a high quality design in accordance with Policies HQ/1, NH/4 and NH/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 14 The development shall be constructed/operated in strict accordance with the noise mitigation measures recommended in the Stapleford, Cambridge, Rangeford Villages, Acoustics, Environmental Noise Survey, Revision 01 (Document reference: REP-1014086-5A-CS-20220624-

Noise control strategy-Rev0 and dated 5th September 2022) prepared by Hoare Lea and submitted with this application.

Reason: To provide an acceptable living environment for future occupants in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 15 Collection from and deliveries to any non-residential premises uses shall only take place between the hours of 07.00 to 23.00 Monday to Saturday and 0900 to 1700 on Sunday, Bank and other Public Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To provide an acceptable living environment for future occupants and to protect the amenity of adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018

- 16 The bin and cycle stores for the development hereby permitted shall be installed in accordance with drawing nos. STP-L3A-ZZ-ZZ-M3-A-90_001, 742-ALA-00-XX-DR-L-1027 REV P01, 742-ALA-00-XX-DR-L-1026 REV P01, 742-ALA-00-XX-DR-L-1025 REV P01 and 742-ALA-00-XX-DR-L-1024 REV P01 prior to the first occupation of any unit.

Reason: To ensure that the need for refuse, recycling and cycle parking is successfully integrated into the development in accordance with policies HQ/1 and TI/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

Background Papers:

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework SPDs



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 7-10 and 14 December 2021

Site visit made on 16 December 2021

by P W Clark MA(Oxon) MA(TRP) MRTPI MCMi

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/21/3280395

Land between Haverhill Road and Hinton Way, Stapleford, Cambridge CB22 5BX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Axis Land Partnerships against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02929/OUT, dated 2 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a retirement care village in Use Class C2 comprising housing with care, communal health, wellbeing and leisure facilities, public open space, landscaping, car parking, access and associated development and public access countryside park.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a retirement care village in Use Class C2 comprising housing with care, communal health, wellbeing and leisure facilities, public open space, landscaping, car parking, access and associated development and public access countryside park on Land between Haverhill Road and Hinton Way, Stapleford, Cambridge CB22 5BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/02929/OUT, dated 2 July 2020, subject to the twenty conditions appended to this decision.

Procedural matters

2. The application is made in outline with all matters reserved apart from access. Details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved for later consideration in the event of the appeal being allowed. Parameters plans covering land use and building heights, access and movement and landscaping were submitted with the application. I was invited to consider the imposition of these by condition so that they would form an envelope within which the detailed design of reserved matters could proceed.
3. During the consideration of the appeal the appellant requested the substitution of one drawing for another. Material has been provided which demonstrates that this revised plan has been given as much publicity as the original application. I received a number of comments on the revised plan all indicating that their earlier representations remained valid in the light of the revised plan. I am therefore satisfied that nobody would be prejudiced if I were to base my decision on the revised plan, which is what I have done.

4. Before the conclusion of the Inquiry a signed s106 agreement was submitted. This makes provision for the transfer of the public access country park element of the proposal to a body charged with its maintenance together with a sum of £349,950 (index-linked) to be used for its management and maintenance. I am satisfied that these obligations would 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 and so, would comply with the relevant provision of the CIL regulations. I have therefore taken these obligations into account in making my decision.

Main Issues

5. It is common ground that, by definition, the development would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Accordingly, the first two main issues in contention are;
 - Whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, together with any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal
 - The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt.

The second of these issues is closely related to the third issue, namely;

- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

The first issue is closely related to the fourth issue;

- The benefits of the proposal.

Reasons

Inappropriate development

6. Some forms of development are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These include material changes in the use of land such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation. For that reason, I take the view that the part of the proposal which is intended to be laid out and used as a public access country park would be not inappropriate development. The construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt and so the retirement care village element of the proposal would be inappropriate development. Because the countryside park would not happen without funding released by the development of the retirement care village, the two elements of the proposal must be regarded as a single development proposal which is inappropriate development.
7. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. When considering any planning appeal, authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. It makes no difference which, or how many, of the purposes of the Green Belt would be harmed and so I do not need to adjudicate between the parties on whether more than the purpose of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment would be harmed in this case. I concur with both parties that at least that one purpose would be harmed. It follows that this decision should ascribe substantial harm

to the Green Belt arising from this proposal. To that extent, the development would be contrary to Local Plan policy S/4 which requires a Green Belt to be maintained around Cambridge.

Openness

8. Openness is a fundamental aim of Green Belt policy, distinct from its five purposes. It may be considered in both a spatial sense and in a visual sense. In a spatial sense, the site sits in a stretch of green belt which extends uninterrupted by any built development between Hinton Way and Stapleford which form a backdrop to the west and southwest of the site, scattered mansions on Fox Hill to the north of the site and an area of open countryside extending east and south-east as far as Babraham and Sawston. Were it not for the scattering of buildings on Fox Hill and the isolated ribbon of dwellings in Gog Magog Way and Chalk Hill which abut the part of the site proposed for the care village and separate it from the continuation of Green Belt onto the village recreation ground and Greenhedge Farm to the south, the site as a whole and the part of the site intended for built development in particular would have open, undeveloped land on all four sides.
9. In visual terms, the openness is only slightly more constrained by the hedgerows around the site, the woodlands on Fox Hill and the topography of the site itself which prevents views across it from south-east to north-west and the topography of land to the east which limits visual openness to land more from the south than from the east. The zone of visual influence (ZVI) indicated on figure 05 of the appellant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) accurately reflects the area of visual openness which I experienced on my site visit.
10. Interpolation from figure 05 of the LVIA suggests that the part of the site which is proposed to be developed for the retirement care village would represent approximately 2.5-3% of the area of the ZVI. Its effect would be disproportionately noticeable because it would infill nearly half the extent of open land between Gog Magog Way and the partly settled Fox Hill and so would tend to turn the remaining undeveloped agricultural area of land between Haverhill Road and Hinton Way into an island of undeveloped agricultural land separated by the countryside park and built development from other areas of agricultural land. The vulnerability of the resulting island of Green Belt agricultural land is emphasised by the Council's own suggestion, in its emerging local plan consultations, that part of this area of Green Belt be released for development.
11. The landscaping proposed would not be a remediation in the sense implied by national guidance (provisions to return land to its original state or to an equivalent (or improved) state of openness). It would not reduce the quantitative or qualitative effect on openness but it would be a visual benefit to be taken into account in the overall balance, which I consider later in this decision.
12. I therefore conclude that the adverse effect of the proposal on openness would be disproportionately greater than would be implied by the absolute extent of the part of the site proposed for development as a retirement care village (3.12ha site coverage within an enclosure of about 4.91 ha). The appellant's

advocate describes this extent of land as substantial¹. I concur. The proposal would therefore contravene Local Plan policy NH/8(1) which, amongst other matters, requires any development proposal within the Green Belt to be located so as not to have an adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt.

Character and appearance

13. There are two ways in which this issue needs to be examined. One is in relation to the character and appearance of the site in the landscape. The other is in relation to the character and appearance of the village to which the part of the site intended for a retirement care village would be attached. There is also a subsidiary issue, related to character and appearance, which is that there are heritage assets in the vicinity which give rise to statutory duties of consideration.

Landscape

14. Conventionally, impact on landscape is also assessed in two parts; firstly the physical effects on the landscape and secondly, the visual effects. In terms of the physical effects on the landscape, the site sits on the transition between two local character areas, one relating to the settled river valley, the other relating to the less settled hills which rise above the valley. Boundaries between landscape character areas are seldom abrupt, although, of necessity, the authors of landscape studies have to place a boundary somewhere. In reality, there is usually a gradual evolution from one landscape character area into another. The context of this site is no exception.

Physical effects

15. Two recent landscape character assessments place the boundary between the two local character areas in different places, either side of the site. The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Study produced in 2015 as part of the evidence base for the extant South Cambridgeshire Local Plan adopted in 2018 places the boundary between what it calls Landscape Character Area 4B Granta Valley and Landscape Character Area 3B Gog Magog Hills along the edge of the built extent of Stapleford village, hugging the 20m contour line but rising to the 30m contour line further to the east of the site. The Greater Cambridge Landscape Assessment, produced in 2021 as part of the evidence base for the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan places the boundary between what it calls Landscape Character Area 3D Cam and Granta Tributaries Lowland Farmlands and Landscape Character Area 7B, Gog Magog Chalk Hills along the track which hugs the northern boundary of the site. In effect, one landscape character assessment places the site within the valley; the other places it on the hills.
16. This difference between two expert studies shows that the transition between these two character areas cannot be precisely located. It probably occurs somewhere on the site itself. From my site visit I observe that below the 25m contour the site is relatively flat, which one would expect in a character area comprising a valley. The steepest gradients, which one would expect in a character area comprising hills, occur above the 30m contour. I conclude that, if a boundary line has to be drawn between the two character areas, it should be drawn along a line approximating to the 25m contour.

¹ Paragraph 8 of his closing submissions

17. Nobody claims the site to be within a valued landscape in the terms of NPPF paragraph 174a. I concur. National policy therefore simply seeks recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, not necessarily its preservation unaltered in all circumstances.
18. Both landscape character assessments agree that it is a characteristic of the valley character area that it is well settled with a relatively dense rural settlement pattern in which numerous villages have developed due to the proximity of fresh water. Likewise, both agree that, in the chalk hills there is relatively little settlement due to the shortage of water and that although the majority of the land is used for arable crop production, recreation also contributes to the character of the area which contains a country park, nature reserve, picnic site and golf course. It would therefore be consistent with the landscape character of the area that the retirement care village be located within the settled river valley character area, rather than the chalk hills character area and that the remainder of the site be used as a countryside park.
19. The part of the site intended for the care home lies largely above the 20m contour but below the 25m contour. I am therefore satisfied that the uses proposed and their disposition on the site, which can be secured by imposing the parameter plans as a condition of permission, could be made consistent with the existing landscape character of the area.
20. Nevertheless, the two landscape experts who gave evidence on behalf of the parties agree that there would be physical harm to the landscape. They disagree (but not to any great degree) about the significance of the harm both initially (in year one) and on maturity (in year fifteen), largely, it would appear, because one views the site as located entirely within the chalk hills landscape area, whereas the other considers the site as split between the two character areas. I concur with the latter view.
21. That they identify harm at all seems to result from a loss of hedgerow (although it would be replaced on a different alignment) and a view that a change of use from an agricultural field to (in part) a built use would be harmful by definition. However, the published landscape character assessments are clear that settlements (and hence, built form) are an integral feature of at least one of the character areas involved.
22. What is involved is a shift in the percentage of each character area which is composed of buildings and of undeveloped land. Obviously, if, over time, the composition of an area's character were to shift entirely from one component to another, the loss of heterogeneity in favour of homogeneity would be harmful. But that is not the case here. The extent of change resulting from built development would be transformative on the relevant part of the site itself but would be relatively small in relation to the extent of the local character area involved and negligible in relation to the national character area known as NCA 87 East Anglian Chalk.
23. In relation to the countryside park element of the proposal, I am not convinced that any physical harm to the landscape of the hills would necessarily arise from the change from an agricultural field to a recreation use, since recreation uses are identified as one of the characteristics of the character area. Although the change would be transformative on the site itself, it would again be relatively small in relation to the extent of the local character area involved and

negligible in relation to the national character area known as NCA 87 East Anglian Chalk.

24. The expert witnesses' identification of a moderation of harm over time seems to result from an appreciation of the rawness of development in early years, not softened by landscaping until the latter comes to maturity. That seems to me to be less of a consideration of physical change to the landscape and more of a consideration of a visual issue. I now turn to these.

Visual effects

25. The parties identified three viewpoints on site and thirteen viewpoints off-site from which an evaluation of the visual impact of the development on the character of the landscape could be made. They are generally agreed on the effects of the proposal, which parallel the effects of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt. The impact on most views is assessed as moderate or minor adverse both in the short and long term. My site visit largely confirmed the judgements of the experts.
26. The most damaging effects would occur where the development would block a view of a treed skyline (as in views north from the part of Haverhill Road within the existing built-up area) or where the extent of intrusion of urban form into undeveloped countryside was most apparent (as in views towards the site from the cemetery approach road or from the track east of Stapleford leading to Babraham). The landscape experts agree that these would be major/moderate adverse effects initially, reducing to moderate or minor adverse impacts on maturity. But none of these amount to landmark views.
27. There are two locations which do offer landmark views. One is from Little Trees Hill adjacent to the ancient monument there. The other is from the highest point of the site, a point not currently accessible to the general public but which would undoubtedly become a landmark viewpoint were the country park proposal to come to fruition.
28. The view from Little Trees Hill is extensive. The development site is visible within the view. The development proposed would be visible within the view. But I do not accept the verdict of both parties' experts that the development would have a major/moderate adverse effect in year 1, reducing to a moderate adverse effect as planting matures, because the character of the landscape seen in the view is not exclusively undeveloped countryside. It is a view of a settled landscape within which Stapleford features prominently. Nor is the site, as a piece of undeveloped countryside, the focus of the view. It lies in the middle ground of an extensive view which encompasses a wide variety of features. I accept that, in the short term, the rawness of a new development would distract the eye from an appreciation of the wider view and so cause some harm to its perceived character but, in the longer term I would expect the development to merge into a part of one of the components of what is seen in the view and would cause little or no harm to its character.
29. The viewpoint which would be made accessible were the countryside park to be created is much closer to Stapleford and so currently presents a dramatic contrast between the agricultural land in the foreground and the village immediately behind. Were the development to be permitted and to proceed, the greater proximity of the developed part of the site would significantly reduce the sensation of the location being in the open countryside. Although

the countryside park would still be open to undeveloped land to the south-east, it would tend to feel more enclosed between the existing arm of development extending along Hinton Way and the new residential care home development extending along Haverhill Road.

Stapleford village

30. Finally, I turn to the effects of the proposal on the character of Stapleford itself. Critics of the proposal suggest that the residential care home would have a bulk and scale greater than that of the two-storey housing in the immediate vicinity of the site. But there is no reason to presume that an institution like a care home need have the appearance of an institution. It would be within the Council's power to ensure that details submitted as reserved matters articulated the building so as to make it compatible with its neighbours. In any event, the homes in Gog Magog Way and Chalk Hill are formed into semi-detached pairs and short terraces of four which have a bulk and scale greater than that of an individual house.
31. Critics of the proposal also suggest that it would be inappropriate and incongruous for an institution offering public facilities to be sited on the edge of the village. But I observed that it is in the nature of Stapleford that this is the case; the church is on the edge of the village and so too is Stapleford Barns, the local arts centre which offers a performance space. The village appears to be polycentric, with its facilities scattered and placed at its edges. The proposal would therefore conform with that character.

Character conclusions

32. In summary, I conclude that the uses proposed and their disposition on the site, which can be secured by imposing the parameter plans as a condition of permission, could be made consistent with the existing landscape character of the area; that the physical harm to the landscape would be relatively small; visual harm to the character of the countryside would be somewhat greater but there is no reason to presume that the built development would be inconsistent with the character of the village. Other than the unavoidable fact that the proposal is sited outside the Stapleford development framework, I find little or no conflict with the other provisions of policy S/7 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 which, amongst other matters, require development to be of a scale, density and character appropriate to the location.
33. I also find little or no inherent conflict in principle with policy HQ/1 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. Amongst other matters, this requires proposals to preserve or enhance the character of the local urban and rural area, to be compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale, density, mass, form, siting, design, proportion, materials, texture and colour in relation to the surrounding area. Although there would be some conflict with Local Plan policy NH/2 which requires development to respect and retain the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape, such conflict would be relatively minor.

Heritage

34. Not far from the site are a number of heritage assets; the Stapleford Conservation Area, approximately 350m south-west of the site; 57 Bar Lane, a grade II listed building located within the village approximately 240m south of

the site; Middlefield and Garden Wall, a grade II* listed building located within Fox Hill approximately 130m north of the site and the church of St Andrew, a grade II* building located within the village approximately 550m to the south-west of the site. There is no suggestion from either party that these heritage assets or their settings would be adversely affected by the development proposed. I concur with that.

35. In the countryside to the north-east of the site is a cluster of scheduled ancient monuments; the iron age hill fort at Wandlebury, a bronze age barrow and a neolithic causewayed enclosure at Little Trees Hill and a bronze age tumulus at Wormwood Hill, with a neolithic longbarrow. They form part of a wider prehistoric landscape of national significance.
36. Those consulted by the Council on this application made no suggestion that the development would have any adverse impact on any of these heritage assets but the Council has adopted the suggestion of the appellant's own heritage consultant that the development would cause a low to medium less than substantial harm to the significance of the bronze age barrow on Little Tree Hill through effects on its setting. As I saw on my site visit, its setting, in a prominent position on the brow of the hill overlooking the valley below is an important element of its significance. The appellant's consultant argues that the retirement village element of the proposal impinges on this wider view and so would cause some harm to the appreciation of the setting.
37. I am not convinced of that because the wider view of the valley below Little Tree Hill is not a view of a virgin landscape. It is a view of a settled landscape, in which buildings, including those of the existing settlement of Stapleford, feature prominently. There is no explanation of why the existence of buildings within the landscape which forms the setting of the heritage asset should cause it harm, nor was it evident from my site visit that they did. What was evident was that the significance of the ancient monument's setting lies in its elevation above the valley and the absence of development on the hillside leading up to it, not in any absence of development within the valley below.
38. Nevertheless, other than by the evidence of my own eyes, the statement of the appellant's heritage expert was not contradicted and must be respected. Moreover, it is government policy that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of the degree of harm which would be caused.
39. So; although I conclude that the harm to the ancient monument would be negligible, insufficient to amount to a conflict with policy NH/2(b) of the adopted Local Plan which requires proposals to conserve or enhance important natural and historic assets and their setting and so insubstantial as to be only noticeable to observers with enhanced sensibility; in accordance with government policy, I attach great weight to that negligible harm to the asset's conservation. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, to which I now turn.

Benefits

40. Seven categories of benefit can be identified. They are;
 - The provision of special care housing in a situation of critical shortage

- The consequent release of existing housing stock
- Enhanced beneficial use of Green Belt through provision of countryside park, manifest in
 - Biodiversity enhancements and
 - Recreational benefits
- Enhanced landscaping
- Employment provision
- The economic multiplier effect
- Social cohesion

Each of these is examined in turn.

Special care housing

41. A key fact noted on page 133 of the adopted Local Plan is an ageing population with growth forecast between 2001 to 2021 of 95% for the 60-74 age group and 108% for those 75+. National Guidance advises that the need to provide specialist housing for older people is "critical". Jessamy Venables's calculations of future need and provision within the housing market area local to this site were not seriously challenged. They show that by the year 2024, there would be a gross need for 1,226 private sector extra care dwelling units but that only 882 would have been supplied or be in the pipeline, leaving a shortfall of 331 extra care dwellings. Without replenishing the pipeline of supply, the shortfall would thereafter rise to 805 dwellings by 2041.
42. Jessamy Venables made a similarly unchallenged estimate of the need for care home beds in the market area. This showed that by the year 2024, there would be a gross need for 770 elderly care home beds within the market area but a supply and pipeline of only 652, leaving a shortfall of 118, rising to 342 by the year 2034. The Council's own analysis for its emerging local plan suggests that Jessamy Venables's figures may be underestimates.
43. The proposed development would therefore provide about 9% of the total demand for extra care dwellings and about 14% of the total demand for care home bedspaces in the market area in 2024², or about 33% of the estimated shortfall in provision of dwellings, 93% of the shortfall in bedspaces. The Council's committee report accepts that there can be no doubt that the development could make a very significant contribution towards meeting local need and gives significant weight to the issue. Its statement of case (paragraph 5.21) upgrades that assessment to very significant weight. I have no reason to disagree.

Release of existing housing stock

44. Part of the demand for extra care housing arises from a desire by elderly people to downsize from larger family houses. There is not an exact 1:1 relationship but one effect of providing extra care accommodation is that larger family accommodation is released back into the market. The Council has

² The Council made the point that delivery by 2024 is uncertain but there is no suggestion that any different proposal would achieve delivery sooner.

applied the appellant's estimate of the release of 1 dwelling into the market for every 3 residential care units (dwellings or care beds) to arrive at a figure of 73 existing homes released into the market.

45. Despite this calculation, the Statement of Common Ground agrees that the proposal could equate to the release of 134 existing housing units into the local housing market. The Council's committee report argues at paragraph 298 that because the Council has a five-year housing land supply, limited weight should be applied to this benefit.
46. The Local Plan target is for 19,500 new homes. For a 20-year plan period (2011-31), this equates to an annual target of 975 new homes. The release of existing stock into the housing market therefore represents about 14% of one-year's supply. Although any increase in housing availability within one of the least affordable areas of the country is of benefit, I agree with the Council in its committee report that the extent of this benefit in the context of an already adequate housing supply would be of limited weight but, in paragraph 5.22 of its Statement of Case, the Council upgrades its assessment to one of significant weight.

Biodiversity benefits of proposed countryside park

47. The Council has had the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan in place since February 2008. Policy CSF/5 (2) provides that;

A Countryside Enhancement Strategy will be prepared for the area bounded by the Cambridge City boundary, Babraham Road, Haverhill Road, and the edge of the built up area of Great Shelford and Stapleford. The Strategy will comprise:

- f. New copses on suitable knolls, hilltops and scarp tops.
 - g. Management and creation of chalk grassland.
 - h. Management of existing shelter belts.
 - i. New mixed woodland and shelter belts.
 - j. Creation of a landscape corridor along Hobson's Brook.
 - k. Reinforcement and planting of new hedgerows.
 - l. Roadside planting.
 - m. New footpaths, cyclepaths and bridleways creating routes through the area and linking to Wandlebury Country Park / The Magog Down.
48. Supporting paragraph C3.1 explains that the scale of development in the Cambridge Southern Fringe both within Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire will require substantial mitigation measures over a wide area of countryside to the south of the built-up area to mitigate the impact of development. It thus makes it clear that the Countryside Enhancement Strategy is intended to be linked to, and funded by, development, a point confirmed in response to my direct question to the Council's witness in the

current appeal. Despite there being a plethora of studies³, the Council's witness also confirmed, in response to my direct questions, that in the nearly fourteen years since this plan was adopted not much of this policy has been achieved and that there is no programme for its implementation.

49. The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy⁴ notes that overall, Cambridgeshire has a smaller proportion of natural habitats than most counties in Britain. Paragraph D7.1 of the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan confirms that the biodiversity of the area is generally poor, with no designated sites in the Action Plan area. The lack of habitat networks combined with intensive farming will have contributed to the low biodiversity value. In the introduction to the Council's Doubling Nature Strategy published in 2021, the Chair of the Council's Climate and Environment Advisory Committee records that South Cambridgeshire is one of the poorest areas in the country in terms of biodiversity and has one of the smallest areas of land managed for nature, relative to its size. The Council's declaration of an ecological emergency in July 2019 may be seen as a dramatic gesture but is based upon fact. All these points demonstrate the significance of this issue.
50. The appellant's claim that the countryside park would transform a large monocultural agricultural field into a rich chalk grassland ("a significant and rare type of habitat", "one of the UK's most biodiverse habitat types") with various elements of scrub, hedgerow and tree planting was not contested. Nor was the claim contested that the countryside park would achieve a biodiversity net gain of 234%, which compares favourably with the 10% requirement of the recently enacted Environment Act 2021 and the 20% of the Council's emerging Local Plan.
51. The countryside park proposed in this appeal would lie within the area of improved landscaping proposed by policies CSF/5 (2(f-m)). It would not cover the whole area of the intended Countryside Enhancement Strategy, which approximates to 530ha but the approximately 19ha of the countryside park would amount to about 3.6% of the area of the intended enhancement strategy. It would increase the chalk grassland resource in this part of Cambridgeshire by 18.7% and there would be synergies with the nearby Magog Down, according with the recommendations of the Lawton report for the creation of linked ecological resources to enhance the benefit of each individual resource.
52. The section of the Council's committee report which deals with the environmental benefit of the country park (paras 284-285) concludes that the countryside park would deliver clear and significant benefits. It asserts that significant weight should be given to its provision as does the Council's Statement of Case (paragraph 5.24). During the Inquiry, the Council's witness was persuaded to upgrade that assessment to very substantial weight. I concur.

³ Listed in paragraph 3.61 of Colin Brown's evidence; Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan (policy CSF/5) – 2008; Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy – June 2011; Greater Cambridge Green Infrastructure Opportunity Mapping Report – Sept 2021; South Cambridgeshire Doubling Nature Strategy – 2021; The Cambridge Nature Network – A Nature Recovery Network for Cambridge and its Surrounds – March 2021

⁴ A document published in 2011 by a partnership including the local planning authority

Recreational benefits of countryside park

53. The countryside park proposed as part of this appeal would deliver more than ecological benefits and improved landscaping. It would also deliver a change of use from agricultural land to a countryside park. As Dr Painter remarks in paragraph 1.34 of his evidence, it would be a secondary benefit that the countryside park would provide new socially inclusive recreational space for the local community that will have enhanced footpath connectivity to existing local recreation areas but that observation (that the benefit would only be secondary) should not cause the benefit to be overlooked or discounted.
54. The recreational effect goes beyond the requirements of policy CSF/5 but NPPF paragraph 145 recommends that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access, to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. The benefit is therefore recognised in public policy, even if not a requirement of the local plan.
55. The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy points out that in respect of Publicly Accessible Open Space the area is presently deficient in ANGSt⁵ at the 500ha plus standard⁶ around Cambridge and to the south, west and east of the area, and at the 100ha plus standard⁷ to the south, east and then in an arc around the Longstanton/Oakington area. There are areas of deficiency in ANGSt at the 20ha plus standard⁸ on the northern and southern fringes of Cambridge and significant deficiencies in the far west of the area. At the 2ha plus standard⁹ there are significant deficiencies across the whole area. This proposal would help meet the 2ha and (almost) the 20 ha standards in the local area.
56. In relation to the built development proposed (about 110 homes and a care home of 110 bedspaces on about 3.12ha site coverage within an enclosure of about 4.91ha), the proposal compares favourably with accepted schemes at Great Knighton (a 48 ha country park supported by 2,550 new homes on the Green Belt) and at Trumpington Meadows (a 60 ha countryside park supported by 1,200 new homes on Green Belt land). The Council's committee report (para 295) and its Statement of Case (paragraph 5.23) both contend that significant weight should be given to the social benefits of the countryside park. Notwithstanding the potential, which was identified during the Inquiry, for increased public access (particularly by bicycles) to be in conflict with ecological aims, I concur with that assessment.

Enhanced landscaping

57. The landscape parameter plan accompanying the application indicates an area of proposed new structural planting around the part of the site proposed for built development. It would vary in depth from about 3m to 8m with deeper pockets at the northern and eastern corners of the site. This is presented as a mitigation of the intrusion of development into the openness of the Green Belt

⁵ Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards

⁶ One accessible 500 hectare site within ten kilometres of home

⁷ One accessible 100ha site within five kilometres of home

⁸ At least one accessible 20ha site within two kilometres of home

⁹ An accessible natural greenspace of at least 2 ha in size,, no more than 300m (5minutes' walk) from home

but, over time, it would become an attractive feature in its own right which deserves recognition as such.

Employment provision

58. There would be employment created during the period of construction of the development, estimated at around 190 full-time-equivalent (FTE) jobs and about 70 FTE jobs involved in the operation of the development once completed. There is no information about the need for jobs to be created locally. The Council's committee report argues that the economic benefits would be of limited weight. Its Statement of Case (paragraph 5.25) ascribes moderate weight to this benefit but I recognise that NPPF paragraph 81 advises that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity.

Economic multiplier effect

59. New residents of the retirement village will contribute additional local spending and will utilise and support local services and facilities helping to ensure their viability and their continued existence. Neither party quantifies this effect. I recognise that older people tend to spend less per head than younger people and so I conclude that this benefit would be of moderate significance.

Social cohesion

60. The council's statement of case recognises that the communal facilities proposed as part of the scheme will draw the wider community together. It allocates significant weight to this benefit.

Other matters

61. The proposal provides a 15m wide corridor to allow for the route of what is variously termed the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) or the Cambridge South Eastern Transport Busway Scheme (CSETS). This provision is not presented as a benefit of the proposal; there is no suggestion that the proposal would dedicate or donate the corridor to the promoters of the scheme. Nor is it suggested that the proposal would be dependent on the busway scheme or its two stops proposed on Haverhill Road and Hinton Way. Rather, the corridor is intended to show compatibility between the appeal scheme and the Busway Scheme.
62. The promoters of the Busway scheme objected to the appeal scheme at application stage because the corridor shown on the parameters plan did not coincide with the preferred route which the promoters of the Busway approved on 25 June 2020. They also sought to have the proposal contribute to the construction of the Busway project through a s106 planning obligation. No further representations were made at the appeal stage.
63. Both parties to the appeal agree that the Busway scheme is at a very early stage of preparation. A Transport and Works Act Order is some years away. The appellant's view, not contradicted by the local planning authority, is that, if planning permission for the appeal scheme is granted, a different alignment for the Busway, avoiding the part of the site to be developed for a retirement care village can be envisaged. A potential operator of the retirement care village

confirmed¹⁰ that the uncertainties surrounding the alignment of the busway would not prevent the appeal scheme from proceeding. I have no reason to disagree or to find that the busway scheme would represent an insuperable obstacle to the granting of planning permission.

Planning balance

64. The Local Plan's development strategy is set out in policy S/6 of the adopted Local Plan; "The need for jobs and homes will be met as far as possible in the following order of preference, having regard to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt: a. On the edge of Cambridge; b. At new settlements; c. In the rural area at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres." The edge of Cambridge is closely surrounded by Green Belt and four of the five Rural Centres and five of the Minor Rural centres are in the Green Belt so there is an inherent tension between the adopted plan's preferred locations for development and both its and national policies for the protection of the Green Belt.
65. The appellant has carried out two alternative site assessments. They are open to methodological criticism so I do not say that they prove beyond doubt that no alternative, less harmful, site for this proposal could be found but what can be said without fear of contradiction is that the local planning authority has not identified any preferred alternative site for this proposal. Nevertheless, that observation does not moderate the conclusion I have reached that the harm that the proposal would cause to the Green Belt and to its openness would be disproportionately greater than the substantial extent of built development comprised in the proposal would imply.
66. Those harms to the principle of the Green Belt and to its openness are the main harms identified in this case. Physical harm to the landscape would be relatively small; visual harm to the character of the countryside would be somewhat greater but there is no reason to presume that the built development would be inconsistent with the character of the village. Harm to the setting of the ancient monument would be negligible (but of great weight) and is easily outweighed by the identified benefits.
67. The Council's approach within its adopted Local Plan is that C2 housing comprises a part of its overall housing requirement and that it has identified sufficient land for housing development to satisfy its requirements for the next six years. That assertion is not contested and I have no reason to conclude otherwise but it is not sufficient. Uncontested evidence given in this appeal is that unless sites are specifically allocated for C2 development, the developers of such schemes are unable to compete for sites in the housing land supply market with the providers of C3 general housing accommodation and so, the delivery of C2 development will be restricted.
68. Despite a plethora of studies¹¹, the Council's approach has not delivered and is not expected to deliver special care housing in anything like sufficient quantities. No policy nor any allocation in the adopted plan requires a specific

¹⁰ Inquiry document 3

¹¹ Cambridgeshire Older People's Accommodation Strategy (2016), Cambridgeshire County Council; Older People's Housing, Care and Support Needs in Greater Cambridge 2017-36 by the Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research November 2017; Cambridgeshire Older People's Strategy (Cambridgeshire County Council website 2016); Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Adult Social Care Market Position Statement 2018/2019 are listed in the appellant's Planning Need Assessment. Jessamy Venables's evidence adds Cambridgeshire County Council's publication Older People's Accommodation with Care – planning for future demand (2021) and the recently published Housing Needs of Specific Groups – Cambridgeshire and West Suffolk (October 2021)

proportion of dwellings to be delivered as special care housing. Although special care housing is mentioned in the justificatory text to the Ida Darwin Hospital site, none has actually been delivered in the development of that site. Policy SS/8(6) provides that development of Cambourne West “could also include nursing and residential care homes” but none has been delivered.

69. Although there are some schemes in the pipeline which will reduce the outstanding need within the housing market area from an expected 1044 dwellings and 436 bedspaces in 2022 to an expected 838 dwellings and 118 bedspaces in 2024, by 2041 the unsatisfied need for dwellings is expected to remain at 805 extra care dwellings. Government advice is that housing need alone does not amount to the very special circumstances required to justify inappropriate development within the Green Belt but, in this case, that housing need is combined with a lack of effective action to meet the need. Moreover, it is not the only circumstance which should be brought to bear in the planning balance.
70. There is a similar plethora of studies demonstrating the need for improvements to biodiversity in the local area. In contrast to special care housing, there is a specific policy in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan to address the issue. Consequently the failure to make progress in resolving the issue is a much more egregious consideration arguing forcefully that very special circumstances apply here.
71. Dr Painter’s description of the recreational benefit of the scheme as secondary should not blind us to the fact that it would be disproportionately large in relation to the extent of built development proposed. Although perhaps incidental to the primary purpose of the countryside park in providing ecological benefits to offset Green Belt harms, its scale of provision in relation to the part of the site to be built over would represent a somewhat special circumstance.
72. The other benefits of the scheme are less outstanding but nevertheless contribute to the balance. They are the benefits of the release of existing housing stock, of enhanced landscaping, of employment provision, of the economic multiplier effects of increased local expenditure and of increased social cohesion.
73. Overall, but particularly through the supply of extra care housing, needed but not otherwise being met, biodiversity enhancements to Green Belt land sought by local plan and national policy but not being delivered and recreational provision, sought by national policy on Green Belt land, the benefits of this proposal would clearly outweigh even the disproportionate harms to the Green Belt and its openness which would result from the scheme. I so conclude and find in consequence that the proposal would comply with national policy and hence policy S/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

Conditions

74. In the event of the appeal being allowed, the parties suggested that 32 conditions would be necessary to make the scheme acceptable. I have considered these suggestions in the light of national guidance and the model conditions set out in appendix A to the otherwise superseded Circular 11/95: the use of conditions in planning permissions, preferring the wording of the latter where appropriate.

75. The first two conditions are statutory requirements concerning the submission of reserved matters and placing limitations on the duration of the permission. The third condition is needed to establish a framework within which details of reserved matters can be considered. The fourth condition is necessary because the site lies within an area of national archaeological significance.
76. The fifth suggested condition was to require an ecological management plan for the period of construction. However, the site as existing has little ecological interest; it is one of the benefits of the scheme that it would provide such interest, so there is no necessity for this condition separate from a general condition (16) requiring a construction management plan.
77. The sixth suggested condition required the submission of a landscape and ecological management plan. But, until the details of landscaping required to be submitted as a reserved matter are approved, it cannot be known that they would lack an included management plan or would require the submission of one, so this condition would be premature to be applied at this stage.
78. The seventh suggested condition would have required a traffic management plan and routeing agreement for the construction period to be agreed in consultation with the Highway authority but the matters required to be included largely duplicate provisions of the Highways Acts and there is no evidence that such would be required independently of a general condition (16) requiring a construction management plan. Likewise, suggested condition 15 sought to require a scheme of dust suppression during construction but is not required independently of a general condition (16) requiring a construction management plan.
79. The eighth suggested condition would require the submission of details of a surface water drainage scheme. Such would be necessary to ensure that the development is adequately drained and would not necessarily be required as a reserved matter so must be specified independently. The appellant's submitted Flood Risk Assessment advises that swales will need to be provided in the countryside park to divert overland flows of water away from the retirement care village and so this condition applies to all parts of the site. Suggested condition 22 would require the submission of details of the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage scheme but it would be premature to impose this condition until the details of the drainage scheme are known not to include maintenance arrangements. Suggested condition nine, requiring a foul water drainage scheme to be designed, approved and implemented need only apply to the parts of the site with built development.
80. It is a development plan requirement that development be 10% more energy efficient than required by the Building Regulations and so, suggested condition 10 is necessary (imposed as condition 7). Similarly, suggested condition 23 requires the development to be more water efficient than required by the Building Regulations in pursuit of a development plan policy and so is necessary (condition 14). Suggested condition 11 would require an investigation of potential contamination, suggested condition 24 would require its remediation and certification and suggested condition 28 would require the remediation of any unexpected contamination found during construction. The appellant's own Geosphere Environmental report recommends a targeted intrusive ground investigation to determine the risk of gassing from chalk bedrock and the installation of monitoring wells for ground gas which

- demonstrates the need for these conditions which are combined as condition (8).
81. Suggested condition 12 sought to require a noise insulation scheme but there is no evidence that noise from Haverhill Road would be so great as to require one, so it fails the test of necessity. Suggested condition 13 sought details of a phasing plan, claiming a need to protect the living conditions of neighbouring properties but there is no evidence to show how a phasing plan would achieve that, so also fails the test of necessity. Suggested condition 14 sought to impose limitations on the use of piling during construction and is necessary to protect local residents against that contingency.
 82. Suggested condition 16 seeks a Low Emission Strategy in accordance with section 3.6 of the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD2020. Section 3.6 of the specified document deals with lighting schemes, contaminated land, noise pollution, air quality and odour control. Inspection of the SPD suggests that the condition is seeking to obtain electric vehicle charging points, a travel plan and support for public transport. Insofar as these are necessary to the development under consideration, they are covered by other, specific, conditions which would be duplicated by a Low Emission Strategy condition and so the latter is not necessary.
 83. Suggested condition 17 would require the use of low Nitrogen Oxide combustion boilers, in accordance with a specific local plan policy and so is necessary (condition 10). Suggested condition 18 would require details of the installation of fire hydrants, a detail which would not necessarily be secured in the submission of reserved matters relating to layout and so, is a necessary condition. Likewise, details of lighting would not necessarily be included in the submission of reserved matters and so requires a specific condition (12) as intimated by suggested condition 19.
 84. Suggested conditions 20 and 21 would require the layout of the approved access and the visibility splays indicated on the approved access drawing to be in place before the use of the retirement care village commences. This would be necessary for the safe operation of the development and so is included as condition (13).
 85. Suggested condition 25 would require a noise impact assessment and insulation scheme for any plant installed at the retirement care village. However, the necessity for this condition will not become apparent until reserved matters are submitted and so, it would be premature to impose it now.
 86. Suggested condition 26 would require the submission, approval and implementation of a travel plan. This is a local plan requirement and so condition (15) is necessary. Suggested condition 27 would require the accesses to be constructed with adequate surface water drainage in place in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority but, as this would duplicate condition (5) a separate condition is not necessary.
 87. Suggested conditions 30, 31 and 32 are necessary to limit the outline permission to the terms of the development for which outline permission was sought and are imposed as conditions (17, 18 and 19). Condition (20) was not suggested by the parties but is implied in suggested condition 16 and

recommended in paragraph 6.3 of the appellant's submitted Air Quality Assessment.

88. With these conditions in place, the appeal is allowed for the reasons given earlier.

P. W. Clark

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Josef Cannon, of counsel Instructed by Richard Pitt, 3C Shared Services

He called

Dinah Foley-Norman BA(Hons) DipLA CMLI Stephen Connell BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service Director, GC Planning Partnership Ltd
--	--

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Matthew Reed QC Instructed by Matt Hare, Carter Jonas

He called

Jonathan Billingsley MA(Oxon), BPhil, CMLI Jessamy Venables BSc(Hons) MSc MRICS Robert Belcher FRICS(retired) Dr Duncan Painter CEnv MCIEEM Colin Brown BA(Hons) MRTPI	Consultant, the Landscape Partnership Director, Carterwood Consultant, Carterwood Managing Director, Applied Ecology Ltd Partner, Carter Jonas LLP
---	--

Matt Hare BSC MSc MRTPI took part in the discussion on conditions

DOCUMENTS submitted during the Inquiry

- 1 Draft planning obligation agreement
- 2 J Billingsley position statement
- 3 E-mail from Daniel Perfect of Rangeford Villages
- 4 Regina (Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council) v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government [2021] EWHC 1082 (Admin)

CONDITIONS

- 1) Details of the additional accesses, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans.
 - Location Plan – Ref. J0027450_011 dated 06.08.2020
 - Parameter Plan: Access and Movement – Ref. J0027450_010 dated 06.08.2020
 - Parameter Plan: Landscape ref. J0027450_009 dated 06.08.2020
 - Parameter Plan: Land Use and Building Heights Ref. J0027450_008A dated 26.10.2021
 - Access Assessment Option 2 - 406.09693.00002.14.H011.2 dated Oct 2020
 - Emergency Access Option – ref. 406.09693.00002.14.012.2 dated Oct 2020
- 4) No demolition/development shall take place on site until a Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions - and:
 - i) the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;
 - ii) the programme for post investigation assessment;
 - iii) the provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;
 - iv) the provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 - v) the provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 - vi) the nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.
- 5) No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a surface water drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before any part of the retirement care village is occupied.
- 6) No built development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a foul water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be

implemented in accordance with the approved details before any built development on site is occupied.

- 7) No development above ground level shall proceed until details of the means by which a minimum reduction of 10% of carbon emissions (to be calculated by reference to a baseline for the anticipated carbon emissions for the built development as defined by Building Regulations) can be achieved on site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be fully installed and operational prior to the first occupation of any part of the built development and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 8) No development shall take place until:
- a detailed scheme for the investigation, recording and remediation of contamination and ground gassing from chalk bedrock on the site has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

No building on site shall be occupied until

- The scheme of investigation, recording and remediation has been implemented on site in accordance with the approved details and;
- A verification report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

If, during remediation or construction works, any additional or unexpected contamination is identified, then remediation proposals for this material should be agreed in writing by the local planning authority before any works proceed and shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of any part of the development hereby approved.

- 9) In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place the applicant shall provide to the local authority for approval details of the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.
- 10) No gas fired combustion appliances shall be installed until details demonstrating the use of low Nitrogen Oxide (NO_x) combustion boilers, (i.e., individual gas fired boilers that meet a dry NO_x emission rating of ≤40mg/kWh), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Should the proposals include any gas fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP) System, the details shall demonstrate that the system meets the following emissions standards for various engines types:
- a) Spark ignition engine: less than or equal to 150 mg NO_x/Nm³
 - b) Compression ignition engine: less than 400 mg NO_x/Nm³
 - c) Gas turbine: less than 50 mg NO_x/Nm³

The details shall include a manufacturers Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x) emission test certificate or other evidence to demonstrate that every appliance installed meets the emissions standards above.

The approved appliances shall be fully installed and operational before the development is occupied or the use is commenced and retained as such.

- 11) Prior to the commencement of development of the retirement care village a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The retirement care village shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
- 12) Details of any external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development hereby permitted takes place. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 13) No part of the retirement care village hereby permitted shall be occupied until the vehicular access and the visibility splays shown on approved drawing number 406.09693.00002.14.H011.2 have been constructed in accordance with the details shown on the approved drawing.
- 14) No part of the retirement care village shall be occupied until details of a water efficiency specification for the relevant part, demonstrating an ability to achieve a design standard of water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day, based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach set out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 15) Prior to first occupation of any part of the development hereby approved, details of a travel plan to encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel other than the private car shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The relevant part of the development shall be carried out and carried on in accordance with the relevant approved Travel Plan.
- 16) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Amongst other matters, the Statement shall provide for:
 - i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - v) wheel washing facilities;
 - vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
 - viii) delivery, demolition and construction working hours.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

- 17) The retirement care village hereby approved shall only be occupied by persons aged at least 55 years. In addition, a spouse or dependent relative of that person, or a widow/widower or surviving dependent relative of that person who has co-occupied a dwelling unit permitted to be constructed as part of the development with that person shall also be permitted to occupy the development.
- 18) The retirement care village hereby approved shall only be used for provision of extra care housing and care home purposes falling within Use Class C2 of the Town and Country Planning Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended).
- 19) No more than 17,825sq.m of floor area shall be provided on the appeal site.
- 20) No part of the retirement care village hereby approved shall be occupied until it has been fitted with electric vehicle charging points in accordance with a scheme which shall have been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

This page is left blank intentionally.

The Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel



Stapleford Retirement Village (PPA/22/0009)

23rd June 2022, Virtual Meeting

Confidential

The [Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth](#) sets out the core principles for the level of quality to be expected in new development across Cambridgeshire. The [Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel](#) provides independent, expert advice to developers and local planning authorities against the four core principles of the Charter: connectivity, character, climate, and community.

Attendees

Panel Members:

Maggie Baddeley (Chair) - Planner and Senior Associate, Tibbalds

Georgina Bignold (Character, Architecture) – Director, Proctor & Matthews Architects

Hero Bennett (Character, Climate) - Principal Sustainability Consultant, Partner, Max Fordham

Angela Koch (Character, Community) – Founder, Imagine Places

Vanessa Ross (Character, Landscape) – Chartered Landscape Architect, Director, arc Landscape Design and Planning Ltd.

Applicant:

Will Coote – Rangeford (applicant)

Daniel Perfect – Rangeford

Anne Marie Nichols – Life 3A (Architect)

James Gardner – Ares (Landscape Architect)

Halina Timms – Ares (Landscapes Architect)

Matt Hare – Carter Jonas (Planning Consultant)

Richard Abbott – Stace (Scheme Project Manager)

Brian Farrington – Hoare Lee

LPA Officers:

Joanne Preston (JP) - Principal Urban Designer / Design Review Panel Manager

Katie Roberts (KR) – Executive Assistant / Design Review Panel Support Officer

Ammar Alasaad (AA) – Senior Urban Designer

Helen Sayers (HS) – Principal Landscape Architect

Michael Sexton (MS) – Principal Planning Officer

Scheme Description and Background

Site

The site lies outside but adjacent to the development framework boundary of Stapleford and in the Green Belt. The site comprises agricultural land.

Planning History

An outline planning application (20/02929/OUT) was made by a land promoter in July 2020 for the site, proposing 'a retirement care village in Use Class C2 comprising housing with care, communal health, wellbeing and leisure facilities, public open space, landscaping, car parking, access and associated development and public access countryside park with all matters reserved except for access'. This application was refused by South Cambridgeshire District Council in April 2021, on the grounds of harm to the Green Belt.

An appeal against the decision was lodged and subsequently allowed by the Planning Inspectorate in December 2021. The decision letter's conditions include reference (in condition 3) to a series of approved parameter plans. Condition 3 states that the development 'shall be carried out in accordance with' those approved parameter plans that are for: access and movement; landscape; and land use and building heights ('up to' ridge heights). No more than a total floor area of 17,825sqm of floor area is a limitation stated in condition 19.

The Proposal

In advance of a future reserved matters approval (RMA) application, the current applicant (Rangeford Villages) entered into a planning performance agreement in April 2022 with the local planning authority for pre-application advice for a retirement village (55 years or older) (use class C2) for circa 150 homes following the granting of the outline permission. Officers have attended three meetings with the applicant to date which have been focussed on the design and layout of the scheme. The feedback of officers has been broadly taken on board throughout the process to date.

The pre-application proposals have not been the subject of any local community engagement yet but the applicant has appointed a public engagement consultant and

has agreed to work with the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning service's Youth Engagement process. It is relevant to note that the intention is that the Magog Trust will be responsible for the future stewardship of the country park element of the scheme, as per the Section 106 accompanying the outline permission, and the applicant has advised that to date, there has been some liaison with the Trust.

Declarations of Interest

There is no declaration of interest to report.

Previous Panel Reviews

This is the first time the scheme has been reviewed by the Panel.

Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel views

Introduction

The proposal presented to the Panel by the Rangeford Villages team seeks to demonstrate how the approved access arrangements and parameter plans have been used as the starting point for progressing a masterplanning layout for a 154-dwelling retirement village, alongside advancing the proposals for the accompanying country park. It is understood from Rangeford Villages that their intention – subject to the outcomes of this review, and stakeholder and proposed local community engagement – is to submit an RMA application at the end of the summer. It is also understood that the prospective applicant is not proposing to submit any non-material or minor material amendments to e.g. revise outline permission conditions, or substitute alternative parameter plans. The Panel's comments are made within this context, therefore focusing on the overall draft masterplan and the approaches taken to date to: creating a sustainable development; providing green and blue infrastructure in an emerging detailed landscape strategy; defining and designing various character areas and individual buildings; and relating the proposed buildings to the retirement village's boundaries. Specific attention has also been paid by the Panel to: the approach being taken towards parking provision; and daylight, sunlight, shading, overheating other considerations in the various amenity spaces, and in the internal layouts of buildings and homes.

At this stage, only limited information has been provided to the Panel regarding the consideration of materiality.

Climate

The emerging sustainability strategy and the limited degree to which it has influenced the proposal as presented and to date could be much improved on. Whole life carbon considerations should be a fundamental and directive component underlying the evolving RMA submission and all aspects of the Village's detailed design. As a starting point, every opportunity should now be taken to demonstrate through full assessment how design development has minimised heat loss through proposed building envelopes, typologies and construction methods; designing out

detached bungalows and creating more courtyard buildings typologies based on the thermal qualities of farmsteads would be positive steps to take in this regard.

In terms of energy considerations and building orientation, it is seen as fundamental by the Panel that the applicant seeks to reduce fast-rising energy cost burdens - and embodied and operational carbon - through the masterplan and detailed design.

While noting that a 'Fabric First' approach is to be taken, the Panel would have preferred to have been told that certified Passivhaus and passive design principles were being fully followed. Recognising that the dual aspect apartments will help with cross-ventilation and to manage overheating, the Panel considers further integral elements of a preferred strategy would be to seek to reduce the number of single aspect apartments to a minimum, and there ought to be none that are north-facing (a recommendation reinforced by their current very deep plans). Feature glazing should be used in more limited ways, likewise to reduce potential overheating, for example by raising sill heights in bedrooms (also preferable from a privacy perspective).

Looking in detail at the scheme's roofscape and pitch orientations would increase the scope for PV provision (including on the flat-roofed pavilion), while simultaneously reviewing all potential building materials would assist in achieving a significant reduction in embodied carbon in the building structure. A development of this scale should be aiming to include PVs on every roofscape.

The Panel notes how whole-life carbon analysis has informed the selection of the SIPs panel system but care should be taken to use a supplier that sources low carbon materials. It is also suggested that minimising the use of concrete and steel, and making use of cement replacements, would be appropriate, in particular for the pavilion.

The Panel has also identified a number of landscape issues in relation to the proposed masterplan layout that raise key climate resilience-related concerns. It is clear that green and blue infrastructure are not yet fully integrated, nor are they leading the masterplanning and landscaping strategy; sustainable drainage features currently are confined to the spaces that are left over between proposed buildings and in buffer zones. One example of the consequences of this missed opportunity is that there appears to be no clear design rationale for many of the sustainable drainage system (SuDS) areas - for example, the L-shaped swale located within the southern courtyard. Instead, the Panel considers that taking a unified approach to green and blue infrastructure would lead to a successful landscape and open space

strategy, that in turn incorporates well-designed SuDS features into the landscape, in the street scene and in parking areas.

With regard to the detail of built form, the most major climate-related concern relates to the design of the pavilion. While it is noted that there is an approved parameters plan that restricts ridge height, the positive environmental contribution that the roofscape of this central amenities' building could make is considered to be particularly important. Currently designed as a flat roof, it is disappointing that it is not a green or brown roof, nor is it being proposed for PV panels. Given that the height limitation may well ultimately and in any event be exceeded by the installation of rooftop plant and machinery, the Panel recommends reconsideration of the currently proposed design and possible materials, preferably for a green or brown roof. The benefits of this approach are likely to significantly outweigh any perceived harm resulting from a slight increase in building height.

As matters of more detail, the proposed use of drought-resistant species is endorsed by the Panel; site-wide water use and its recycling should also be referenced and incorporated in the RMA submission – water butts should be provided at the outset for each bungalow, for example.

Character

The Panel's overarching suggestion for advancing current thinking on the retirement village's character is that the design team should undertake a detailed analysis of who will be living here; at present, it is not at all clear why the vast majority of accommodation will be in the form of very large two-and three-bedroom apartments and bungalows. Once this is understood, a 'day in the life' assessment should be undertaken – not only of residents but also everyone who will work here, visit or pass through on their way to and from the country park. The Panel would expect this analysis to lead to a very significant redesign of most, if not all elements of the current masterplan layout and the individual buildings within it.

The Panel's most fundamental concern relating to the current character of the proposal arises from the masterplan and the scale and location of the 154 car parking spaces shown. Many of these almost entirely undesignated spaces line either side of the 'main street' for much of its length. As a direct consequence of this domination by car parking, the layout of the retirement village is fragmented, and

open spaces are broken up unacceptably. The barrier to pedestrian movement that is created by the current parking arrangement on the main street is exacerbated by level changes on-site. The intended ease of direct walking access to reach the pavilion is particularly undermined in this regard; pedestrians potentially with limited mobility are unacceptably forced to take circuitous routes instead. Where parking is provided in car parking courts, there are other issues - either a lack of surveillance, or apartments only having car parks to look out onto.

A fundamental review of the current approach to car parking is therefore seen to be necessary by the Panel, with a suggestion that relocating the majority of car parking spaces to the entrance of the retirement village site being explored, with the added benefit of avoiding stationary vehicles otherwise dominating the landscape. Walled courts and car barn-type structures could be explored, instead of the open courts, and on-plot parking. Changing car parking arrangements in the eastern parking court could also potentially provide an associated open space benefit, that of being able to expand on and bring rather narrow structural planting on the site's boundary further into the scheme at this point. Removal of the main street spaces is suggested to then allow the buildings around the proposed 'central village green' to be re-sited nearer to the open space, reflecting how traditional village greens are surrounded more closely by built form and overlooked.

Referencing the full extent of the site boundary treatment, and while respecting the approved parameter plan for landscape and the thickness of its 'proposed new structural planting' acting as a buffer to the retirement village, it adds further to the perception of the development being inward looking and self-contained, by very considerably reducing its visual connection beyond, and the enjoyment of the surrounding landscape by residents. Accepting that the younger planting that will be used will take time to grow, opportunities should be taken now, in the detailed landscape strategy, to create visual permeability into the site (from views locally and further afield, at key viewpoints) and out from the retirement village site for residents. To select these key viewpoints into and out of the site, reference should be made to the findings and conclusions of previous landscape and visual impact assessment work, as well as sun path analysis and understanding the associated shading by mature planting.

Noting that the local context has been reviewed for character area design references, and a modern interpretation is being taken forward that draws on e.g. the

local farmstead typology, the Panel suggests that the resulting rather tight courtyard spaces in the scheme are checked with comparative studies and tested for daylight levels; as spaces for a range of social and productive activities, they should be used more widely in the masterplan and their design fully understood as connective social spaces. Likewise, the rural edges to the retirement village would merit further study, with a possible successful outcome being a more deliberate arrangement of buildings. The Panel considers that the 'sandwiched' perimeter building typologies, accommodating the considerable number of new homes, are unlikely to provide attractive accommodation for a number of reasons. It is not clear how the identified local farmstead/courtyard typologies have informed this layout and how it supports residents in enjoying and connecting with the wider landscape. The buildings shown have very deep plans, with shared circulation space that is not designed as social space. There is an opportunity to offer comfortable and incidental meeting spaces outside the private home for the community in each building. The narrow ground floor circulation spaces/ corridors should instead play a role in creating ambient spaces that residents can use on leaving their homes but not their buildings. Highlighting the importance of achieving a high quality, well-designed pavilion that meets residents', staff and visitors' needs, the Panel suggests that a redesign should be undertaken, to reconsider its length and very large footprint, and potentially relate it instead to the plan and massing of farmstead typologies devised already elsewhere in the site within the context of this rural 'edge'. This review should include adding to its single entrance in the south eastern corner, which is highly inconvenient for residents living in the northern part of the site. Creating a building with a northern as well as a southern frontage and access option has merit, likewise considering reducing the scale of the restaurant and separating out individual use elements. These and/or changes to internal uses would be with the purpose of providing communal facilities elsewhere on the site, in locations for example that would provide retirement village occupiers with a range of very walkable destinations, and that could better serve others coming to the country park and from Stapleford. As a more detailed design matter and for reconsideration alongside the wider suggested block changes, the aluminium-framed feature gables throughout the site would not generally assist with wayfinding in the Panel's view, as some face onto parking courts and elsewhere, where the pitch of a roof has been rotated 90 degrees, it does not relate to key spaces and vistas.

Connectivity

There are key concerns arising from the draft masterplan layout and its poor physical connections to Stapleford and beyond by non-car modes. As currently designed, the retirement village has all the characteristics of a car-based development and does not encourage active travel modes sufficiently, contrary to the applicant team's stated objective of achieving a high level of Fitwel certification. While there is an existing public right of way off Gog Magog Way that will become an emergency access and a 24-hour public route through the retirement village to/from the proposed country park beyond, this is currently being designed as a footpath weaving through the western site boundary's planted buffer. The Panel is of the view that in this detached location and isolated form, the path's separation from the community means that it will not be well-used by retirement village residents for personal safety reasons - and it will be a security concern to them too. A detailed review of this route would be most worthwhile.

In addition, no direct pedestrian access is provided to the closest bus stops on Gog Magog Way from the south eastern corner of the retirement village site. While there will be minibus transport made available for retirement village residents, it is not clear how this service will operate. The Panel's view is that convenient and sufficiently close connections to the established and relatively extensive social infrastructure of Stapleford must be more clearly demonstrated.

The outcomes of the recommended 'day in the life' study should directly assist in being able to boost all aspects of the site's connectivity by active travel modes, once the needs and abilities of the residents, visitors, staff and neighbours are better understood.

The almost complete absence of reference to cycles, e-cargo bikes, mobility scooters and e-scooter use and storage should be addressed fully in the next iteration of the masterplan.

Community

It has only been possible for the Panel to gain a limited understanding of the people that the retirement village will cater for; the average age has been given and information provided on e.g. on how Rangeford Villages caters for ageing residents in terms of paid options for domiciliary care services. The Panel would have found it

helpful to have been able to explore how residents will live here, how they will be able to enjoy their own homes and their connection to landscape and nature, as well as understand with more clarity how they will use the on-site landscape and amenities. Gaining this detailed level of understanding is particularly pertinent, when the applicant advises that many people will choose to stay on-site all of the time, as their 'safe place'; it therefore remains unclear to the Panel at this stage how such resident-specific considerations have influenced the presented design. It is understood that the site is not a gated community and will allow full 24h access for the public; over-55 local residents will be able to use pavilion facilities. Not intended as an exhaustive list, the Panel suggests that consideration needs to be given to extensive scheme changes as a direct result of understanding residents' and community needs better, such as: defining shared and private outdoor spaces better; exploring semi-recessed balconies to encourage sitting out under shelter in poorer weather; providing wayfaring to suit varying levels of mobility, with seating that is fully integrated and sited to appreciate the landscape in different locations; adding cycling routes around the retirement village; and including an outdoor gym, as well as the proposed visiting children's informal play.

While the Panel clearly understands the topography-related reasoning underlying the siting of the proposed pavilion, and the intention that it is a central village amenity for retirement village residents, its current, relatively 'hidden' location, might not serve the local community well, despite over-55s from the surrounding area being encouraged to become members of some of its facilities, and there being public events held there at times. The lack of direct view of the pavilion from the footpath from Stapleford also undermines the potential to serve the local community well. In terms of landscape elements proposed between buildings, there are tokenistic gestures that if reconsidered, could create another new opportunity for promoting community health and wellbeing. The idea of raised growing beds for residents, with encouragement for them to take ownership of that part of the outdoor space, should be evolved further, not only to create growing areas dedicated to providing 'healthy living' produce for supplying the proposed restaurant but also one that would cater for people from the wider local community.

Summary

Overall, on analysis of the plans provided and somewhat contrary to the review presentation's stance, the proposed masterplan and emerging detailed designs do not yet constitute sustainable development.

The Panel's overarching suggestion for advancing current thinking on the retirement village's character is that the design team should undertake a detailed 'day in the life' assessment of everyone who will live in the retirement village, work there, visit or pass through it.

With reference to climate resilience, the landscape proposals for the retirement village must be formulated from a fully integrated green and blue infrastructure strategy that in turn influences the juxtaposition of buildings, streets and parking areas.

Developing a comprehensive sustainability and energy strategy is seen as a vital next step in ensuring that the retirement village is a well-connected, well-designed and low energy development that promotes a healthy and active way of life – one that creates a new community, closely connected to Stapleford. Prioritising walking and cycling and other forms of e-mobility other than the car is clearly necessary throughout the development, to help achieve all of these objectives, and to promote free-flowing and safe non-car movement by residents and visitors alike.

Overall, the findings from the recommended new 'day in the life' research should feed into implementing the Panel's recommendations for a fundamental reconsideration of the current masterplan, incorporating; an integrated green and blue infrastructure strategy; reviewed siting, orientation and internal layouts of individual buildings and their elements; a reduced, relocated number of car parking spaces; and clear, direct, fully accessible connections within and beyond the site boundaries.

The above comments represent the views of the Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel and are made without prejudice to the determination of any planning application should one be submitted. Furthermore, the views expressed will not bind the decision of Elected Members, should a planning application be submitted, nor prejudice the formal decision making process of the council.

Contact Details

Please note the following contacts for information about the Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel:

Joanne Preston (Joint Panel Manager)

joanne.preston@greatercambridgeplanning.org

+44 7514 923122

Bonnie Kwok (Joint Panel Manager)

bonnie.kwok@greatercambridgeplanning.org

+44 7949 431548

Katie Roberts (Panel Administrator)

Katie.roberts@greatercambridgeplanning.org

+44 7871 111354

This page is left blank intentionally.



The Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel

Stapleford Retirement Village, Stapleford (PPA/22/0009)

11 August 2022, Virtual Meeting

Confidential

The [Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth](#) sets out the core principles for the level of quality to be expected in new development across Cambridgeshire. The [Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel](#) provides independent, expert advice to developers and local planning authorities against the four core principles of the Charter: connectivity, character, climate, and community.

Attendees

Panel Members:

Maggie Baddeley (Chair) – Town Planner and Chartered Surveyor (planning and development)

Georgina Bignold (Character, Architecture) – Director, Proctor & Matthews Architects

Angela Koch (Character, Community) – Founder, Imagine Places

Vanessa Ross (Character, Landscape) – Chartered Landscape Architect, Director, arc Landscape Design and Planning Ltd.

Sarah Morrison (Character, Conservation) - Conservation Architect, Historic England

Paul Bourgeois (Character, Climate) - Industrial Lead at Anglia Ruskin University

Applicant and Design Team:

Will Coote – Rangeford (Applicant)

Daniel Perfect – Rangeford (Applicant)

Anne Marie Nichols – Life 3A (Architect)

James Gardner – Ares (Landscape Architect)

Halina Timms – Ares (Landscape Architect)

Matt Hare – Carter Jonas (Planning Consultant)

Richard Abbott – Stace (Scheme Project Manager)

Brian Farrington – Hoare Lee (Sustainability consultant)

LPA Officers:

Bonnie Kwok (BK) - Principal Urban Designer / Design Review Panel Manager

Katie Roberts (KR) – Executive Assistant / Design Review Panel Support Officer

Michael Hammond (MH) – Principal Planning Officer

Ammar Alasaad (AA) – Senior Urban Designer

Helen Sayers (HS) – Principal Landscape Architect

Tom Davies (TD) – Urban Designer/Youth Engagement

Scheme Description and Background

Site context

The site lies outside but adjacent to the development framework boundary of Stapleford and within the Green Belt. The site comprises agricultural land.

Planning History

An outline planning application (20/02929/OUT) was made by a land promoter in July 2020 for the site, proposing 'a retirement care village in Use Class C2 comprising housing with care, communal health, wellbeing and leisure facilities, public open space, landscaping, car parking, access and associated development and public access countryside park with all matters reserved except for access'. This application was refused by South Cambridgeshire District Council in April 2021, on the grounds of harm to the Green Belt.

An appeal against the decision was lodged and subsequently allowed by the Planning Inspectorate in December 2021. The decision letter's conditions include reference (in condition 3) to a series of approved parameter plans. Condition 3 states that the development 'shall be carried out in accordance with' those approved parameter plans that are for: access and movement; landscape; and land use and building heights ('up to' ridge heights). No more than a total floor area of 17,825sqm of floor area is a limitation stated in condition 19.

The Proposal

In advance of a future reserved matters approval (RMA) application, the current applicant (Rangeford Villages) entered into a planning performance agreement in April 2022 with the local planning authority for pre-application advice for a retirement village (55 years or older) (use class C2) for circa 150 homes following the granting of the outline permission. Officers have since attended several meetings and taken part in a workshop with the applicant, all of which have focussed on the design and layout of the scheme. The feedback of officers has been broadly taken on board throughout the process to date.

Officers have also visited one of the applicant's existing retirement villages

(Wadswick Green, Corsham), in order to better understand Rangeford's business model and design approach, including building layout and amenity space arrangements.

Rangeford Villages have undertaken a community engagement event on the pre-application proposals, and the applicant has agreed to work with the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service's Youth Engagement Team to ensure that the local youth population can have a meaningful input into the outdoor amenity space design.

Declarations of Interest

There is no declaration of interest to report.

Previous Panel Reviews

This scheme was first reviewed by the Panel on 23 June 2022.

Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel views

Introduction

The proposal, presented to the Panel by the Rangeford Villages team, seeks to demonstrate their responses to Panel recommendations at the last design review. In summary, revisions in the presented scheme include:

- The rotation of the northern block to provide a larger parking court;
- Detailing the design of parking courts, such that they have defensible planting and the main aspects of apartments do not overlook them;
- Centring the pavilion and 'pulling it apart' from the adjacent residential buildings immediately to the north, to improve permeability and access routes through the site;
- Reviewing site-wide routes and links to/from Stapleford, the pavilion and the country park, in terms of seeking to ensure maximum convenience for residents and other users;
- Replacing detached bungalows with semi-detached bungalows, while trying to retain a loose village grain. Sedum roofs are proposed on the flat roofs in-between;

- Using brick on gable ends, instead of metal fascia;
- Rotating on-street parking spaces on the western street to provide parallel parking, to improve the streetscape via a more spacious layout that can integrate swales and include incidental seating (13 fewer vehicle parking spaces are proposed overall);
- Trying to integrate sustainable drainage strategy (SuDS) features more, although 'bound by the parameters' and the limitations of the chalk soil on the siting of permeable features;
- Providing 20 fewer single aspect dwellings - apartments that are north-facing (now 6% of the total) are principally on the pavilion's first floor;
- Reducing the extent of glazing in master and second bedrooms, to help prevent over-heating;
- Proposing options for residents' cycle and mobility scooter parking, with integrated electric charging points;
- Introducing additional points of access into the pavilion, and bi-fold doors to the restaurant and well-being area, to increase openness; and
- Moving the petanque court onto the pavilion terrace.

There was no reference in this review to any scheme revisions having been made in direct response to community engagement feedback and comments so far.

There are other recommendations from the first design review that continue to be worked on, or that are being discussed with Officers, according to the applicant team.

They include:

- A whole life carbon assessment that is underway, that has already informed decisions such as using SIPs for bungalow construction;
- Exploring a green roof for the pavilion, within the height defined by the approved parameters plan;
- Considering the potential for rainwater harvesting appropriate for apartments;
- A Fitwell certification assessment that is being undertaken;
- Optimised roof design , locations and installation angles (between 30 to 45 degree) for PV (photovoltaic) panels to be demonstrated so maximum efficiency can be achieved, in conjunction with potential battery storage in the pavilion (and tying in with landscape lighting);

- Apartment building elevations being assessed block by block for overall distances, and window by window, to avoid overlooking;
- Introducing adjustable external shutters instead of reduction of window sizes to be considered preventing overheating in summer while supporting privacy, connections with the outdoors and landscapes as well as winter solar gain.
- Achieving distinct landscape character zones;
- Breaking up the on-street parking to the south of the central green;
- Looking into the outlook of each ground floor bedrooms and private outdoor spaces, with the hope of using landscape and shutters to provide choice and privacy; and
- The ratio of cycle to mobility scooter parking spaces.

It was previously understood from Rangeford Villages that their intention is to submit an RMA (Reserved Matters Application) at the end of the summer 2022; no update on timescale was provided in this second review. The applicant's team appears committed to not submitting any non-material amendments or minor material amendment application(s) (under S96A, or S73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended) e.g. to revise outline permission conditions, or substitute alternative parameter plans.

Climate

Overall, the Panel would welcome more information and reference to water, energy and construction material clearly demonstrating the commitment and desire for the project to be more sustainable, and achieve higher standards than current and proposed building regulations in every regard (it being understood from the applicant, for example, that the intention for U values is to go beyond Part L 2021, and meet the 2025 Future Homes Standard).

Noted by the Panel by its noticeable absence, there is an essential need for a sustainability and energy strategy document that also provides a design justification for scheme elements to date, and any further design development. Such a strategy is essential, not only for the development's delivery but also to demonstrate the scheme's benefits for future residents. The strategy should make it clear what options have been considered, and describe those that have been discounted and

why, before setting out the chosen approach itself.

This development can demonstrate Rangeford Villages' innovative and future proofed approach for energy, sustainability and affordability. Tightly related here is the use of sustainable construction materials and methods. For instance, in using more carbon neutral materials such as, but not limited to, cross-laminated timber (CLT).

As a key part of the energy strategy, the Panel recommends that consideration is given to using the [Energy Services Company](#) (ESCo) model. This in order to further reduce installation costs and residents' bills and enable lower maintenance and replacement costs. This is a model that is already being used successfully elsewhere in Cambridgeshire, including for smaller projects than here.

It is unclear why certain energy options have been discounted, such as ground or air source heat pumps. Noting that the applicant team is now considering the use and location of PV panels, photovoltaic thermal (PV-T) panels would maximise electricity production and provide hot water.

While passing mention has been made of mechanical ventilation and heat recovery (MVHR), this has only been in the context of a noise assessment concluding that opening windows could also be provided. The ability of all windows to be opened (tilt and turn) is considered critical in managing different comfort levels, overheating risks, security concerns, cross ventilation and connections with nature. Similarly, mention has been made of exploring options and the decision to utilise battery storage but only in the pavilion. The Panel suggests that elaborating on why this single point of storage is preferred to provision in each building block would be considered helpful.

The Panel is of the view that water collection and limiting its usage are key. There is the potential for the proposed retirement village to have an attractive landscape but water has to be collected properly: a water strategy is seen by the Panel as being absolutely key to the success of this development. Merely showing ubiquitous water butts, which in any event are inappropriate for apartment buildings, is an inadequate response in the knowledge that the landscape will have to be watered to be maintained. There are many creative ways that water can be collected and channelled across a site into planted areas, and this proposal needs to incorporate

the most appropriate system for doing so. An integrated blue and green infrastructure strategy is essential for this project to be termed one that is landscape-led. To this end, a key component that the Panel recommends for inclusion is the extensive provision of biodiverse green roofs that include water collection and do not just comprise sedum planting.

Character

The proposed pavilion is the hub of the development and the Panel remains concerned about the design qualities of this central part of the scheme. Without sections, it is difficult to understand how its two floors relate to each other; it is, however, unquestionably a huge building that requires reconsideration. In the previous design review, it was suggested that its facilities could be more distributed across the site and into the country park. While it is understood that this redistribution of uses has been considered but would present problems operationally, the Panel remains of the view that the proposed pavilion is not of sufficiently high-quality design. The approach taken to the current building creates many problems of bulk, scale and massing that in short, a farmstead typology could potentially help to resolve. Noting that its ground floor facilities are effectively fixed by the applicant's own design guide and the actual provision at Wadswick Green, the Panel nonetheless recommends that a farmstead/open courtyard typology would be more appropriate than the current sports pavilion-based commercial design approach. This view is held on the basis of the site's context, character and location and its outstanding long views: the building will be a prominent landmark. The Panel therefore refers the applicant team to [Historic England information on historic farmsteads in the Eastern Region](#) in this regard.

If it is decided ultimately however that the pavilion's contemporary design has to be retained, then issues around the roof height and the approved parameter plan's 8m maximum must be resolved. There is no doubt in the Panel's view that the extensive flat roof should be a biodiverse green roof that also collects water at least in part, and that it should otherwise provide space for PV/ PV-T panels. It is not considered an acceptable justification for not providing either or both, that the relevant approved parameter plan limits the ridge height to a substantial 8m. Unfortunately, the absence of sections in both reviews is unhelpful here. As discussed in the first design

review and repeated in the second design review, there is scope to amend the planning permission's conditions/parameter plans in order to achieve the most sustainable roof form. The Panel endorses the applicant's ongoing discussions with Officers around the degree of flexibility in potentially resolving the design of this key building and hub.

Also, if the current pavilion form is to be retained, the Panel suggests that options for a north/south 'split' - and pulling the single building apart - should be explored, whether only at ground floor, or preferably at both levels. A further option should also consider providing external, wrap-around generous veranda access to the pavilion's first floor apartments, instead of smaller terraces and central core. This would create better more sociable greened circulation space for residents, improve their connectivity with the facilities below and beyond, animate the facade of this key building and reduce the number of single aspect dwellings further. Given that residents in those apartments are likely to be the least mobile residents, often dependant on others to leave the home, enjoy the village amenities and wider landscape, the Panel's view is that this alternative to the internal corridor arrangement could be preferable.

There being fewer single aspect apartments is welcomed by the Panel, together with there being potentially more natural light provided in the long corridors of the residential buildings and on the pavilion's first floor.

It remains the Panel's view that providing more spacious circulation spaces with a good degree of daylight in the other residential buildings would be highly beneficial for the occupiers' well-being, and would help to strengthen the social fabric of the development – particularly in winter months.

With regard to promoting residents' well-being, the Panel retains its concern that the landscape buffer, where it is in closest proximity to apartment buildings e.g. on the eastern side of the development, could obstruct or even block outward-looking views. The Panel would recommend that the buffer planting plan is reduced and very carefully designed, using species that will not be overly reliant on cutting back to maintain structure, so as to ensure residents do not feel confined while in their homes.

The new silhouette of Stapleford and for instance seen from the country park and made up of the new buildings, existing buildings, trees and other landscape features should be considered as part of the design development.

Materiality has not been discussed in-depth to date; the above referred-to Historic England information could provide helpful guidance for a more granular approach. The nearby Conservation Area and Stapleford's existing development are points of reference that would help build materiality, including the possible introduction of clay was mentioned by the applicant's team. The Panel is mindful of how four types of bricks are already being considered and once chosen, it would be helpful if detailed elevations were provided. The extensive use of knapped flint – currently shown on bin stores – seems unwarranted in terms of detail at this stage, although with more analysis, its appropriate use could be incorporated successfully. Timber structures would appear at this point more appropriate for bin stores.

The intention to provide external flexible shutters for limiting overheating and heatloss in the colder winter months is endorsed by the Panel. External shutters could also assist with privacy choices and creating interest in the elevations.

Reflecting on sustainability and connectivity, the Panel would have found an insight into the proposed lighting strategy for the site helpful. Although noted by the Panel that a lighting strategy is not required at this stage by planning permission condition, it is considered to be an integral part of the development's character, landscape and designing out crime strategy and cluttering should be avoided.

Connectivity

Although the Panel finds the 'day in the life' analyses helpful for understanding how residents, employees and visitors will move around the site and access the country park, there are inadequacies in the assumptions made that need to be addressed if they are to have any realistic influence on design development. For example, none of the individuals uses a car for any part of their day, yet the scheme retains the character of a car-based development with copious amounts of surface parking. A more realistic understanding of movement patterns needs to be expressed and understood; the Panel considers that one potential outcome should then be a clearer

definition of route hierarchies within the site. It is currently unclear whether a mobility scooter can be used on all paths, for example.

The reduction in car parking spaces on the western street is endorsed by the Panel; one consequence is how it now provides an opportunity for additional tree planting to give shade to parked vehicles and to everyone passing by. While not significant in terms of numbers of spaces, the reduction in on-street parking on the western street has also facilitated an improved directness of the route from Stapleford to the pavilion. If the current level of parking provision cannot be reduced any further, the Panel recommends seeking to move as many spaces as possible into additional parking courts that could potentially be accommodated via the block-by-block review (looking at distances and overlooking) that is underway. This would be one means for improving the view of the development on its approach by car; at present, the 'fly-through' has highlighted how the view of the pavilion would be marred when spaces are occupied, by what could appear just to be a car park.

The Panel notes that a route remains within the landscape buffer on the western boundary of the site, linking Stapleford with the country park. A considerable concern remains that in principle, this is an unsuitable route for accessing the country park. To ensure safety, it would need to be well-lit, but this in turn could be damaging for wildlife. As in the first design review, it is suggested that the route be realigned; the Panel suggests it could potentially run alongside the swale that lies immediately to the east, however noting that some tree planting would assist to create shade for those using the path. The same route currently passes between two bungalow parking spaces at its northern end. A revised route at this point that is more suitable for visitors approaching/ leaving the country park at this point should be defined.

Employee and visitor cycle parking do not appear to have been provided for as yet.

To further enhance connectivity, a wayfinding strategy should be developed for the next layout iteration. The strategy should ensure that it will be clear to all site users which routes to where can be used by which mode, and what facilities are available at potential destinations.

Community

A key concern of the Panel is the omission in the revised scheme of an element of landscape that can contribute directly to creating a community. The proposed 'allotments' in the south eastern corner of the site should be more accurately termed 'raised timber beds' and have been explained in the review as not being for individuals' own use but as at Wadswick Green, they are to be used in conjunction with the pavilion's restaurant kitchen. This is despite their location being at some distance from the pavilion in this proposal. In terms of use, the beds do not currently constitute a community growing area either. While there is scope for the chosen area to be extended further into this 'leftover' corner of the site, it seems unlikely to thrive in the shadow of the extensive planting buffer immediately to the south east. It is not an ideal solution for dealing with this proximity that the applicant intends to maintain that buffer planting by cutting back. The Panel's overall view is that the raised beds are not of a character and intended use that will contribute positively to the new community. They are also seen by the Panel to be in an unsuitable location for their proposed purpose, one that should be reconsidered. Without a review of their function and their re-siting away from this location into a suitable position elsewhere on-site – one where there is similarly scope for their expansion - the Panel's conclusion is that the scheme's landscape-led justification is being unsatisfactorily undermined. The panel also questioned the size and anticipated use of the lawn areas in front of the pavilion, and recommend the need to provide shade to the seating areas.

Summary

The revised proposal has addressed some, but not all, of the Panel's key concerns that arose at the first design review. The reduction in car parking and its consequences is particularly welcome, alongside there being fewer single aspect apartments and only semi-detached bungalows.

Certain outstanding matters are however significant, as there is design development well-underway that should have been based on a cohesive energy and sustainability strategy, yet that strategy is not complete. Its absence is also preventing the proposal from being fully landscape-led; integrating a water collection component with proposed green infrastructure will be critical to achieving and maintaining the

proposed buffer planting and the extensive public green and private gardens throughout the new village. Until the proposed raised beds are re-considered and re-located, the landscape-led narrative is further undermined.

Other matters of concern that are currently being progressed relate to the siting and design of certain buildings and dwellings and the need to amend aspects of proposed parking provision still further. A further, fundamental element of design development is the recommended reconsideration of the proposed pavilion; for wide-ranging reasons relating to sustainability, character and community, the Panel's view is that adopting a farmstead typology could resolve many if not all of the identified deficiencies of the building as currently proposed.

1. Central Green
2. Parking Courts
3. Attenuation basin
4. Dining terrace
5. Arrival node
6. Courtyard
7. Bungalow close
8. Access to Chalk Hill Down
9. Access to Stapleford
10. Main site access
11. Allotments



Proposed site layout – extracted from the applicant's presentation document

The above comments represent the views of the Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel and are made without prejudice to the determination of any planning application should one be submitted. Furthermore, the views expressed will not bind the decision of Elected Members, should a planning application be submitted, nor prejudice the formal decision-making process of the council.

Contact Details

Please note the following contacts for information about the Greater Cambridge Design Review Panel:

Joanne Preston (Joint Panel Manager)

joanne.preston@greatercambridgeplanning.org

+44 7514 923122

Bonnie Kwok (Joint Panel Manager)

bonnie.kwok@greatercambridgeplanning.org

+44 7949 431548

Katie Roberts (Panel Administrator)

Katie.roberts@greatercambridgeplanning.org

+44 7871 111354

Agenda Item 6



Planning Committee Date	8 February 2023
Report to	South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee
Lead Officer	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
Reference	21/04087/FUL
Site	Former Barrington Cement Works, Haslingfield Road, Barrington, Cambridgeshire
Ward / Parish	Barrington
Proposal	Erection of 113 dwellings (re-plan of northern parcel of development site for an increase of 37 dwellings above approved scheme ref: S/3485/18/RM).
Applicant	Redrow (South Midlands)
Presenting Officer	Michael Hammond
Reason Reported to Committee	Departure Application Application raises special planning policy or other considerations
Member Site Visit Date	N/A
Key Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Principle of Development2. Noise3. Layout and Design
Recommendation	APPROVE subject to conditions and S106

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 Outline planning permission (S/2365/14/OL) including the reserved matter of access was granted on 27 October 2016 for the redevelopment of part of the former Cemex site adjacent to Haslingfield Road and Chapel Hill, Barrington to provide 220 dwellings. A Section 73 permission (S/0057/17/VC) seeking to vary condition no.1 (drawings) of the outline permission was granted on 13 April 2017.
- 1.2 Reserved matters consent (S/3485/18/RM) for the approval of appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale of the outline planning permission S/0057/17/VC was appealed under grounds of non-determination and allowed at appeal (APP/W0530/W/19/3227393) on 29 November 2019. A Section 73 application (20/02528/S73) which included a phasing plan and boundary treatment details, was approved in January 2021. Phase 1 of the development on the site has commenced.
- 1.3 Following the approval of reserved matters and commencement of development, the applicant now seeks to amend and re-configure the northern parcel of the site. This full application relates to the northern parcel (4.38ha) of the former Barrington Cement Works Site only.
- 1.4 The development as proposed would increase the number of residential dwellings on this part of the site from 76no. dwellings (as approved) to 113no. dwellings (as proposed), a proposed increase of 37no. dwellings. This would bring the total number of dwellings on the wider site up from 220no. dwellings (as approved) to 257no. dwellings (as proposed). This may be increased to 260no. dwellings if the application for an increase of 3no. dwellings on the south-eastern parcel, which has a resolution to approve from Planning Committee (10 August 2022), is permitted once the Section 106 is agreed and then implemented.
- 1.5 In terms of comparing the proposed drawings against those that were approved, there are a number of changes of which the most significant are:
 - On the southern frontage (adjacent to the railway line), the replacement of 15no. semi-detached dwellings with 25no. terraced dwellings;
 - The repositioning of the L-shaped block of flats (flat block B) from the centre of the southern frontage to the western edge of this perimeter;
 - Expansion and consolidation of the open space into a central green in the heart of the northern parcel;
 - Extension of the development footprint closer to the western edge of the site boundary;
 - Alterations to the layout, density and mix of housing types in the central and western portions of the development;
 - Reconfiguration of detached dwellings on northern edge of the site to accommodate an addition dwelling in this location.

- 1.6 The proposal would be contrary to Policy S/7 of the Local Plan insofar as being a major residential development outside of a development framework boundary. However, officers consider there to be limited conflict with Policy S/7 in terms of countryside encroachment given the extant permission that exists on the site for residential development and the lack of visual intrusion from the development of the formerly approved open space.
- 1.7 The provision of 113no. dwellings to a Group Village, which sets an indicative maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings or in exception about 15 dwellings on a brownfield site, would conflict with the aspirations of Policies S/2(e), S/6, S/7 and S/10 which set out and shape the settlement strategy for the district and seek to concentrate development in the most sustainable locations and villages with the greatest range of services and facilities.
- 1.8 However, the 2017 extant permission is a material consideration and it has already been determined that the development of 76no. dwellings, as part of the wider development of 220no. dwellings (or 223no. dwellings), would represent a sustainable form of development. There have been no significant changes to the services and facilities available to serve the development. The proposed additional 37no. dwellings to bring this parcel of the site up to 113no. dwellings would not, in the view of officers, result in the level of development becoming unsustainable.
- 1.9 The originally approved development had 31 affordable dwellings on the northern parcel and the proposed development would provide 45no. affordable dwellings, an increase of 14no. affordable dwellings. There would be a 11% net gain in biodiversity which would be secured by condition. Financial contributions towards the improvement of existing village facilities, education and libraries would be secured by way of a Section 106 Agreement. The proposed development would also be brownfield development and the density of housing (29.5 dwellings per hectare (dph)) would be consistent with Local Plan (2018) Policy H/8 which seeks to achieve 30 dph in rural locations, making this an effective use of previously developed land.
- 1.10 Officers acknowledged that there are concerns raised by the Urban Design Team regarding the proposal including the development appearing too suburban, additional car parking dominating the street scene and some conflict with guidance within the Council's District Design Guide SPD. However, the conflict must be weighed against the fact that there is an extant permission on this parcel of land which has a suburban layout and design and therefore cannot be said to be entirely out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area. The parking arrangements are not considered to be dominant in officer's view. In addition, the specific conflicts with the District Design Guide SPD exist on the consented scheme for this parcel. The proposal would still provide a significant over-provision of informal open space despite the removal of part of this to accommodate the development.

- 1.11 The proposal represents a significant departure from the development plan and has been advertised as such. Given the extant permission on the site, officers consider that the proposed addition of 37no. dwellings above what was previously approved on this parcel would be difficult to be considered to represent an unsustainable form of development. Nonetheless, the development is contrary to the Council's settlement strategy as a matter of principle.
- 1.12 Very limited other harm has been identified that would weigh against the proposal, while the use of planning conditions and a Section 106 Agreement can secure appropriate detailing, technical information and financial contributions such that the proposal would accord with Local Plan policies in all other regards.
- 1.13 Objections have been received from the operator (Cemex) of the Barrington Chalk Pit and the County Council Minerals and Waste Team. Cemex are concerned that introducing residential dwellings near to the railway line serving their site (Barrington Chalk Pit) will mean it is not possible to keep noise levels at residential boundaries below the 55db requirement set on the County permission (S/0204/16/CW). Subsequently, it is claimed that this would jeopardise the continued operations of the Chalk Pit, contrary to Paragraph 187 of the NPPF (2021) and Policy 16 of the County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021) as Cemex would not be able to comply with the requirements of their condition no.38. The key distinction between the assessment of this application and the County permission condition is that the County permission condition requirement of 55db applies to all residential "boundaries", whereas for the assessment of this application the 55db limit applies to future occupants living environments (i.e. internal spaces and gardens/ balconies).
- 1.14 It is pertinent to note that there is an extant permission on the site whereby the boundaries of some residential properties on both north and south sides of the railway line would experience noise levels in excess of 55db. The applicant has submitted information to demonstrate that the internal and external living environments for future occupants would be at or below the 55db noise limit. The balcony and ground-floor screens to the apartments in 'Flat Block B', the most affected receptors, would ensure that, for amenity purposes, the levels of noise experienced in these spaces would be acceptable. Therefore, the exceedance in noise levels at the boundaries of residential properties would be comparable to the extant permission and the lack of compliance with the adjacent County permission condition noise limit is considered acceptable in this instance.
- 1.15 Therefore, taking into account the 2017 permission and for the reasons set out in this report, the application is recommended for approval.
- 1.16 The application is what is known as a 'drop in permission', similar to what was submitted and considered at Planning Committee for the South-East

parcel (21/04088/FUL) in August 2022. On 2 November 2022 the Supreme Court judgement for the “Hillside” decision (Hillside Parks Ltd (Appellant) v Snowdonia National Park Authority (Respondent) was made. It is important to note that this decision very much turned on its own facts but was a decision which rendered an original masterplan unimplementable as a result of subsequent drop in permissions.

- 1.17 A Section 73 application has been submitted to vary the outline permission, as amended by other Section 73 applications, to facilitate the potential delivery of this application (21/04087/FUL) alongside residual development already permitted on site by permission 21/01474/S73 and to ensure the permissions can come forward without any inconsistency. In light of the Hillside decision, officers have sought Counsel advice on whether the process followed by the applicant to accommodate these permissions is acceptable. Overall, based on the advice received, officers are satisfied that the approach is sound and that the process is capable of accommodating the development sought without compromising the implementation of the original outline permission.

2.0 Site Description and Context

- 2.1 The application site is a 4.38ha parcel of land situated on the north of the wider former Barrington Cement Works site, to the north of the village of Barrington. The site is accessed off Haslingfield Road which borders the eastern edge of the site and is reinforced by established hedgerows. To the north-west is the Cemex quarry which is in the process of being remediated. To the south is the remainder of the development and to the north and east are open fields. To the south is Barrington Village.
- 2.2 The wider mineral site is adjacent to Barrington Chalk Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), notified for its geological special features. The site is within 4.2km of Eversden and Wimpole Woods SSSI and Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
- 2.3 The site lies outside the development framework boundary of Barrington.
- 2.4 Development on part of the wider site (not part of this application) has commenced.

3.0 The Proposal

- 3.1 Full planning permission is sought for the erection of 113no. dwellings (re-plan of northern parcel of development site for an increase of 37no. dwellings above approved scheme ref: S/3485/18/RM).
- 3.2 The application seeks to provide an alternative layout of the northern parcel to what was originally approved as the wider Barrington Cement Works site and consequently increase the number of dwellings on this parcel from 76no. dwellings to 113no. dwellings.

- 3.3 The main differences between the approved plans and the proposed plans for this parcel would be the replacement of 15no. previously approved semi-detached houses on the southern frontage, adjacent to the railway line, to 25no. terraced houses. Apartment block 'B' would be relocated further to the west. The arrangement of open space within the development would be predominantly re-configured and consolidated to a central green space. The density of the development across the parcel would generally be uplifted and the footprint of development increased further to the western boundary of the site. The layout of the residential development and car parking would subsequently be amended to accommodate this uplift in housing numbers.
- 3.4 The application has been amended to address comments from consultees and further consultations have been carried out as appropriate. The application originally proposed 114no. dwellings (increase of 38no. dwellings) but following amendments was reduced to propose 113no. dwellings (increase of 37no. dwellings).

4.0 Relevant Site History

- 4.1 The site has an extensive planning history. Of most relevance to this application are:

Reference	Description	Outcome
22/04540/S73	S73 variation of conditions 1 (Approved plans), 2 (Reserved matter details), 6 (Arboricultural Method Statement), 7 (boundary treatments), 8 (refuse storage), 10 (housing mix), 12 (energy statement), 13 (contamination), 14 (noise assessment), 17 (drainage strategy), 19 (access) and 23 (fire hydrants) pursuant to planning application 21/01474/S73 (Variation of condition 2 (reserved matters details) pursuant to planning application 20/02528/S73 (Variation of conditions 2 (Reserved matters), 5 (Construction Environment Management Plan and a Construction Method Statement), 6 (Airborne Dust), 7 (Site waste management plan), 8 (Tree protection measures), 9 (Boundary Treatment), 10 (Siting and design of the screened storage for refuse), 14 (Renewable energy statement), 15 (Contamination), 16 (Noise	Pending Consideration

	insulation scheme or noise mitigation Strategy), 19 (Surface water drainage scheme), 20 (Surface water), 21 (Remediation Statement - Contamination), 22 (Scheme for disposal for surface water), 24 (Visibility splays), 26 (Recording of Industrial Heritage), 27 (Foul water solution), 28 (Archaeological works) and 29 (Fire hydrants) pursuant to planning permission S/0057/17/VC))	
21/04088/FUL	Erection of 36 dwellings (re-plan of south eastern parcel of development site for an increase of 3 dwellings above approved scheme ref: S/3485/18/RM).	Pending Decision (resolution to approve at 10 August 2022 Planning Committee)
21/04524/S73	S73 Variation of conditions 1 (Approved plans), 2 (Reserved matter details), 6 (Arboricultural Method Statement), 7 (Boundary treatments), 8 (Refuse storage), 10 (Housing mix), 12 (Energy Statement), 13 (Contamination), 14 (Noise assessment), 17 (Drainage strategy), 19 (Access) and 23 (Fire hydrants) pursuant to planning application 21/01474/S73 (Variation of condition 2 (reserved matters details) pursuant to planning application 20/02528/S73 (Variation of conditions 2 (Reserved matters), 5 (Construction Environment Management Plan and a Construction Method Statement), 6 (Airborne Dust), 7 (Site waste management plan), 8 (Tree protection measures), 9 (Boundary Treatment), 10 (Siting and design of the screened storage for refuse), 14 (Renewable energy statement), 15 (Contamination), 16 (Noise insulation scheme or noise mitigation Strategy), 19 (Surface water drainage scheme), 20 (Surface water), 21 (Remediation Statement - Contamination), 22 (Scheme for disposal for surface	Approved 16.09.2022 (following Planning Committee resolution to approve 14 September 2022))

	water), 24 (Visibility splays), 26 (Recording of Industrial Heritage), 27 (Foul water solution), 28 (Archaeological works) and 29 (Fire hydrants) pursuant to planning permission S/0057/17/VC))	
20/02528/S73	Variation of conditions 2 (Reserved matters), 5 (Construction Environment Management Plan and a Construction Method Statement), 6 (Airborne Dust), 7 (Site waste management plan), 8 (Tree protection measures), 9 (Boundary Treatment), 10 (Siting and design of the screened storage for refuse), 14 (Renewable energy statement), 15 (Contamination), 16 (Noise insulation scheme or noise mitigation Strategy), 19 (Surface water drainage scheme), 20 (Surface water), 21 (Remediation Statement - Contamination), 22 (Scheme for disposal for surface water), 24 (Visibility splays), 26 (Recording of Industrial Heritage), 27 (Foul water solution), 28 (Archaeological works) and 29 (Fire hydrants) pursuant to planning permission S/0057/17/VC	Approved 20.01.2021
S/3485/18/RM	Application for approval of reserved matters for appearance landscaping layout and scale under planning permission S/0057/17/VC for development of 220 residential units	Not Determined – Appeal Allowed 29.11.2019
S/1427/19/RM	Reserved Matters application for the construction of 220 dwellings for the Appearance Layout Landscaping and scale (Duplicate application S/1385/18)	Approved 23.09.19
S/0057/17/VC	Variation of conditions S/2365/14/OL - S73 application to vary condition 1 pursuant to outline planning permission (S.2365.14.OL) relating to the development of 220 residential units	Approved 13.04.2017

S/2365/14/OL	Outline application for the demolition of all existing buildings and structures and redevelopment to provide up to 220 residential units formal and informal open space including allotments car parking for Barrington Primary School new pedestrian and cycle links to Barrington village and Foxton Station and associated works - details of vehicular site access arrangements are submitted for approval with all other matters (layout scale appearance and landscaping) reserved for future approval.	Approved 27.10.2016
--------------	---	------------------------

5.0 Policy

5.1 National

National Planning Policy Framework 2021
National Planning Practice Guidance
National Design Guide 2021

5.2 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018

S/1 – Vision
S/2 – Objectives of the Local Plan
S/3 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S/5 – Provision of New Jobs and Homes
S/6 – The Development Strategy to 2031
S/7 – Development Frameworks
S/10 – Group Villages
CC/1 – Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Change
CC/3 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments
CC/4 – Water Efficiency
CC/6 – Construction Methods
CC/7 – Water Quality
CC/8 – Sustainable Drainage Systems
CC/9 – Managing Flood Risk
HQ/1 – Design Principles
HQ/2 – Public Art and New Development
NH/2 – Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
NH/4 – Biodiversity
NH/5 – Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance
NH/6 – Green Infrastructure
H/8 – Housing Density
H/9 – Housing Mix

H/10 – Affordable Housing
H/12 – Residential Space Standards
SC/2 – Health Impact Assessment
SC/4 – Meeting Community Needs
SC/6 – Indoor Community Facilities
SC/7 – Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space & New Developments
SC/9 – Lighting Proposals
SC/10 – Noise Pollution
SC/11 – Contaminated Land
SC/12 – Air Quality
SC/14 – Odour and Other Fugitive Emissions to Air
TI/2 – Planning for Sustainable Travel
TI/3 – Parking Provision
TI/4 – Rail Freight and Interchanges
TI/8 – Infrastructure and New Developments
TI/9 – Education Facilities
TI/10 – Broadband

5.3 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (July 2021)

Policy 16 – Consultation Areas (CAS)

5.4 Supplementary Planning Documents

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020
Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

5.5 The following SPDs were adopted to provide guidance to support previously adopted Development Plan Documents that have now been superseded by the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. These documents are still material considerations when making planning decisions, with the weight in decision making to be determined on a case-by-case basis:

Health Impact Assessment SPD – Adopted March 2011
Landscape in New Developments SPD – Adopted March 2010
District Design Guide SPD – Adopted March 2010
Affordable Housing SPD – Adopted March 2010
Open Space in New Developments SPD – Adopted January 2009
Public Art SPD – Adopted January 2009
Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009

5.6 Other Guidance

5.7 Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy 2019 – 2023

6.0 Consultations

6.1 **Barrington Parish Council – No Objection subject to comments being adhered to**

November 2022 Comments

6.2 Additional evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the community facilities, off-site children’s play space, improvements to river walks , road safety and traffic management meet the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2021).

6.3 Again, we request s106 provision includes the matters and amounts indicated above to make the application acceptable to the Parish Council. If not, then the application is not acceptable to the Parish Council.

September 2022 Comments

6.4 BPC is clear that if the increased housing numbers are approved, the s106 provision needs to be at least commensurate with the existing agreement.

October 2021 Comments

6.5 BPC is concerned about social and demographic impacts upon Barrington which will result from these applications which together involve an 18.2% increase in housing numbers over and above those already approved. It is also concerned about surface water discharges into the village ditch system; the increased load on the foul sewer system which is already overloaded; and about the increased traffic impact especially around the school.

6.6 The revised development would have 260 housing units – Barrington currently has approximately 460 houses and 830 residents. Redrow is therefore proposing to build a site that will be a 56.5% increase imposed on the village with no doctor, one shop, and no cycle routes or footpaths to neighbouring villages. If we guesstimate Redrow house occupancy as 3 per unit – Redrow is now proposing to increase the population of Barrington by an additional 120 people on top of that already permitted - making a total increase of approximately 780 – almost a 94% increase in the size of the village population.

6.7 BPC therefore recommended refusal. If the LPA decides to approve the application then a substantial increase in and structural amendments to the 106 funding agreement are required to mitigate the effects upon Barrington.

6.8 **County Highways Development Management – No Objection**

November 2022 Comments:

6.9 No objection subject to inclusion of all provisions within current S106 agreement for wider site into any new S106 and the following conditions:

- Management and Maintenance of Streets;
- Traffic Management Plan; and
- Highways Informative

October 2021, August 2022 and November 2022 Comments:

6.10 Further information regarding visibility splays and footway widths required.

6.11 **County Transport Assessment Team – No Objection**

June 2022 Comments (informal)

6.12 Based on solely 21/04087/FUL (increase of 37no. dwellings) the proportionate amount required for the below contributions would be:

- Revised contribution towards improved crossing over Haslingfield Road = £18,500 and
- Revised contribution towards traffic calming on Barrington Road = £4,625

May 2022 Comments:

6.13 No objection subject to following mitigation:

- Travel Plan with welcome pack;
- Contribution of £20,000 (based on both 21/04087/FUL (increase of 38no. dwellings) & 21/04088/FUL (increase of 3no. dwellings) towards the implementation of an improved crossing over Haslingfield Road in the vicinity of Barrington Primary School; and
- Contribution of £5,000 (based on both 21/04087/FUL (increase of 38no. dwellings) & 21/04088/FUL (increase of 3no. dwellings) towards the implementation of traffic calming on Barrington Road within Foxton.

November 2021 Comments:

6.14 Insufficient detail has been presented to make a sound assessment. The issues (cycle parking, footpaths, trip generation, distribution and assignment, junction modelling and mitigation) related to the Transport Assessment will need to be addressed before the transport implications of the development can be fully assessed.

6.15 **County Education, Library and Strategic Waste – No Objection**

October 2022 Comments:

6.16 No objection subject to contributions towards early years education, secondary education, library enhancement and monitoring.

6.17 **Sustainable Drainage Officer – No Objection**

6.18 No objection subject to the following conditions:

- Surface Water Drainage Scheme;
- Long term maintenance of surface water drainage; and
- Foul water drainage;

6.19 **Lead Local Flood Authority – No Objection**

August 2022 Comments:

6.20 No objection subject to the following conditions:

- Surface Water Drainage;
- Overland Flows; and
- Informatives.

October 2021 Comments:

6.21 Object due to insufficient information.

6.22 **Environment Agency – No Objection**

6.23 No objection subject to following conditions:

- Contaminated Land Remediation Strategy;
- Contamination Verification Report;
- Contamination Monitoring and Maintenance Plan;
- Unexpected Contamination;
- Drainage Strategy Compliance; and
- Piling.

6.24 **Anglian Water – No Objection**

6.25 No objection subject to informatives.

6.26 **Urban Design Team – Object**

Frontage dwellings on the South Edge

6.27 For the built form of the frontage dwellings on the south edge which faces the railway line, a tightly packed series of terraces of 25 dwellings plus a relocated block of flats is proposed, replacing the pairs of semi-detached dwellings (15) in the consented scheme. There are very few gaps between the dwellings to enable north / south views to take account of the topography (higher land in the northern parcel). It's a concern that the quantum of development is very high here on this prominent site entrance road and is likely to give the area a suburban, rather than rural character.

- 6.28 Flat block B is not aligned to face the block of flats in the consented scheme on the opposite side of the rail track which is a pity as this mirroring effect had provided a visual connection between the north and south frontages which was a merit of the consented scheme.
- 6.29 Officers observe that the consented frontage dwellings on the south side the railway track are in a less dense arrangement - there are only 8 dwellings (some of these with a wide front rather than all in narrow form, as in the northern parcel) facing the railway track plus two blocks of flats with more gaps between the frontage buildings than the frontage buildings in the northern parcel.
- 6.30 It is considered that the proposals will mean that there isn't a very strong relationship between the built form on the opposite sides of the railway track which is a missed opportunity to reinforce visual connections between the north and south sites. In the future, when the rail track is decommissioned, the north and south sides will not have this obstacle and from the point of view of achieve community cohesion, its preferable to have a similar arrangement of built and natural forms to improve the closeness of the two sides to form a more harmonious community.

Dwelling numbers 200 - 213

- 6.31 It is a concern that the tightly packed, groups of terraces arrangement for the dwelling numbers 200-213 are too suburban looking. This proposed density and rhythm to frontages found along this edge to the countryside is like that along internal spine roads. It would be expected that at these western edges, the development would be more dispersed and varied to reflect the context.
- 6.32 There are indicators that the quantum of development is too high in this area of the site: firstly there are a few examples that the minimum back to back distances stipulated in the '*District Design Guide*' (2010) SPD for 2-storey dwellings are not being met. Please see below. Secondly, there is also only a distance of 2m between the windows on the front elevation and the front of plot parking spaces.
- 6.33 It is observed that the affordable housing is concentrated on the south edge and particularly on the west edge for dwelling numbers 200-213 in the '*Northern tenure plan*' drawing (ref. 8502-22-02-522 rev A). Housing should be tenure blind and affordable dwellings should be dispersed evenly across a residential layout to ensure inclusiveness and community cohesion for future residents. Officers defer to the views of the Strategic Housing team colleagues in this regard.

Parking

- 6.34 Front of plot parking is prevalent (16 parking spaces are proposed whereas there had been only 10 in the consented scheme) for the

frontage dwellings on the south edge of the site. Officers raised concern previously that parked cars will dominate the area and detract from the public realm. For this consultation, some improvements have been made in the revised layout with the provision of two trees and three landscaped strips in front of plots 153-156 and the provision of three trees and three landscaped strips in front of plots 153-156 to screen the parked cars from the public realm.

- 6.35 There is also only a distance of 2m between the windows on the front elevation and the front of plot parking spaces. The residents will suffer from a poor outlook, the noise of parked cars and suffer from headlights at night and car engine noise. It is recommended that this distance from the front elevation to the parking spaces is extended to be 3m.
- 6.36 The proposal is for the addition of three parking courts to the layout. It's a concern that such parking courts weaken the street scene, create a poor pedestrian environment, suffer from poor surveillance and provide an unsatisfactory approach to the dwellings.
- 6.37 Front of plot parking is prevalent (21 parking spaces are proposed) for these dwellings which are arranged in terraces. Officers raised concern previously that parked cars will dominate the area and detract from the public realm. For this consultation, some improvements have been made in the revised layout with the provision of soft landscaped strips and five trees are proposed in front of these houses to offer some screening of the parked cars from the public realm. Additional trees are proposed on the west boundary to this area to screen the view of these from the open space to the north.
- 6.38 There is also only a distance of 2m between the windows on the front elevation and the front of plot parking spaces. The residents will suffer from a poor outlook, the noise of parked cars and suffer from headlights at night and car engine noise. It is recommended that this separation distance is extended to be 3m.

Residential Amenity

- 6.39 Urban design officers assess that for the 19 house types, the minimum space standards are being met to comply with policy H/12 in the district Local Plan (2018).
- 6.40 The siting of several house numbers (containing windows to first floor habitable rooms on their first floors) would not be fully meeting the guidance about privacy and overlooking in paragraph 6.68 of the '*District Design Guide*' (2010) SPD where it writes "*for two storey residential properties, a minimum distance of 25m should be provided between rear or side building faces containing habitable rooms*" and "*Where blank walls are proposed opposite the windows to habitable rooms, a minimum of 12m*

between the wall and any neighbouring windows that are directly opposite.”

- 6.41 No information of where the communal amenity space for residents of Block B is located.
- 6.42 Officers measure that for plot 225 (Stratford 3-bedrooms house type), its rear garden is only 70m² in size. This would fall short of the minimum size stipulated (80m²) for rear gardens in paragraph 6.75 of the ‘*District Design Guide*’ SPD (2010).
- 6.43 It is a concern that that the revised refuse strategy drawing indicates some very long bin dragging distances for the residents to the bin collection points, in particular plots 177-178 (85m), plot 179 (90m), plot 180 (85m), plot 181 (70m) and plot 214 (50m).

Open Space

- 6.44 This application proposes the consolidation of the open spaces in the consented scheme to form one large (0.25 ha) central open green space and two smaller (0.08 ha and 0.03ha) open green spaces. To comply with policy SC/7 in the District Local Plan (2018), for this number and mix of dwellings, officers calculate that a minimum of 1,001m² of formal children's play space, 1,001m² of informal Children's play space and 1,076m² of informal open space should be provided. A generous amount of open space has been proposed which meets this criteria but the layout drawings have not indicated the presence of any children’s play equipment and so this is falling short of meeting this aspect of the minimum requirements of policy SC/7. However, officers do acknowledge that such an equipped play area is included in the southern parcel of the consented scheme.

Appearance

- 6.45 A similar looking (to the consented scheme) range of 19 house types, at 2 to 2.5 storeys in cream brick, buff brick and some render elevations with grey and brown roof tiles on hipped roofs is proposed for the house types for a traditional appearance. Officers do comment that hipped roofs are not a characteristic of Barrington but have no objections to this.
- 6.46 Urban design officers previously commented that page 18 of the submitted ‘Design and Access Statement’ only provides two street scene drawings for the large northern parcel. Officers welcome that a street scene drawing for plots 231 to 242 on the south edge, has been provided on the south edge. However, officers recommend that further street scene drawings for plots 200 to 213 on the west edge are provided for officer assessment.
- 6.47 In the revised elevation drawings for flat block B, 1.8m high, perspex acoustic fences have been added to the balconies and corner terraces on

3 elevations. Little further information is provided about the materials and details of these and so it is recommended that this is conditioned.

Connectivity

- 6.48 The northern parcel retains the same, single vehicular access point (from Haslingfield Road to the east) as the consented scheme but the layout of streets has been revised. Houses and a block of flats have also been relocated further to the west (in place of open space in the consented scheme) of the site. The main spine road (running south-west to north-east) is retained but now there are several culs de sacs replacing the large, circular perimeter road at the centre of the layout in the consented scheme.
- 6.49 There is no longer the footpath that ran through open space landscape at the north and west edges of the site in the consented scheme - it seems a pity to lose this connection through open space to the south and east of the northern parcel, for resident pedestrians. The extensions to the redline boundaries appear to open up public spaces on the west and east sides and so it is recommended to add a footpath across these spaces to mean a more permeable scheme.

Summary

- 6.50 Officers raise concerns, make recommendations and request further information. Officers have particular concerns that the tightly packed arrangement of dwellings for the southern edge and western edge areas within the northern parcel are not fully meeting policy HQ/1 (c) of the '*South Cambridgeshire District Local Plan*' (2018). Officers identify several dwellings whose siting would not be fully meeting the guidance about privacy and overlooking in paragraph 6.68 of the '*District Design Guide*' (2010).
- 6.51 **Conservation Officer – No Objection**
- 6.52 There are no material conservation issues with this proposal.
- 6.53 **County Archaeology – No Objection**
- 6.54 Previous minerals operations within this area will have removed any significant archaeological evidence and we do not consider archaeological investigations to be necessary in connection with this application.
- 6.55 **Historic England – No Objection**
- 6.56 No objection.
- 6.57 **Senior Sustainability Officer – No Objection**
- 6.58 No objection subject to the following conditions:

- Carbon Emissions; and
- Water Efficiency.

6.59 Landscape Officer –

December 2022 Comments:

- 6.60 The housing density has been increased particularly to the southwest and western edges of the site and the increase in density reduces the space for trees and other soft landscape along the street edges, in front of the terraced houses and in the parking courtyards behind the houses. More information is required on the proposed tree strategy to show that there is enough space for trees and the species are suitable for the site and its context.
- 6.61 The quality of the landscape design and materials across the site must be consistent and of high quality for all tenures. We note that the amount of asphalt surfacing increases around the affordable, rented, and shared ownership units and this requires revision.
- 6.62 The asphalt access route to units 208 to 213 must be revised to a block paving surface so that it is consistent with the access route to the south.
- 6.63 The palette of paving materials must be broadened to include at least two additional pre-cast concrete block pavior types. Asphalt must not be used on private driveways so that there is a clear distinction between public and private spaces and to improve the streetscape and house frontages.
- 6.64 Samples of all paving materials, including kerbs and edgings must be provided through the hard and soft landscape condition alongside brick samples for the building facades.
- 6.65 To address the lack of landscape information and the policies listed above a landscape strategy and statement are required and must include the following:
- how existing and proposed green infrastructure are connected and enhanced and how green infrastructure is made accessible for the public;
 - Proposed tree planting strategy across the site with tree species and sizes. Note street trees should be minimum 20-25cm girth.
 - Statement on play and amenity provision in relation to policy SC/7 with an illustrative plan for the central green space including play
 - Statement on pedestrian and cycle access with an illustrative plan showing access routes including routes in the perimeter green spaces

November 2021 Comments:

6.66 Overall, the site has become overdeveloped and has lost necessary open spaces on the edges. The landscape proposals have also become too suburban/urban and achieve an uneasy formality. The proposals are in conflict with local village character typologies and does not deliver on Policy S/2 (b)(d), Policy DP/2, Policy HQ/1, Policy NH/2

6.67 **Ecology Officer – No Objection**

January 2023 Comments:

6.68 An Appropriate Assessment is not required.

August 2022 Comments:

6.69 No objection subject to the following conditions:

- Construction Ecological Management Plan;
- Landscape and Ecological Management Plan;
- Biodiversity Net Gain Plan; and
- Scheme of ecological enhancement

November 2021 Comments:

6.70 Object as the following additional information is required:

- Evidence of the level of impact from the development on Eversden and Wimpole SAC together with any 'functionally linked' habitat;
- Evidence of assessment of recreational impact on the nearby SSSIs and any mitigation measures considered appropriate; and
- Submission of the Biodiversity Net Gain metric spreadsheet.

6.71 **Natural England – No Objection**

November 2022 Comments:

6.72 No objection following submission of lighting strategy.

August 2022 Comments:

6.73 Object as a lighting strategy is required.

October 2021 Comments:

6.74 The following additional information is required:

- Consideration of recreational pressure impacts to the relevant SSSIs – refer to the appended letter the 'Amendment to NE SSSI IRZs' for further details; and
- Further consideration as to whether barbastelle bats associated with Eversden And Wimpole Woods SAC could be adversely impacted by the proposals.

6.75 **Tree Officer – No Objection**

6.76 No objection.

6.77 **Environmental Health – No Objection**

August 2022 Comments:

6.78 The Environmental Health Team have reviewed the information submitted in the Northern Amendments Report, Former Barrington Cement Works, Haslingfield Road, Barrington, CB22 7RQ (Project Ref: LF/17104_NAR and dated August 2022) prepared for Redrow Homes Ltd by Barker Parry Town Planning Ltd and have the following comments.

6.79 In relation to the Responses to Issues Raised in sections 2.47 to 2.53, the County Council's comments regarding Minerals and Waste and Noise have been addressed, but conclude those comments cannot be taken into account.

6.80 In the Accon UK Environmental Consultants Technical Note – Former Cemex Cement Works, Barrington - Response To Cemex Objection, the conclusion states "In making this decision, it is apparent that South Cambridgeshire District Council did not consider condition 38 of planning permission S/0204/16/CW to be a relevant consideration."

6.81 Regarding the decision to recommend Discharge of Condition 16 (Noise Mitigation) of planning permission S/0057/17/VC, it should be noted that Condition 38 was considered in detail. However, when considering Condition 16 we concluded it can only be done in respect of this proposal only.

6.82 That is not to say the factors and arguments put forward by the Cemex objection are not true. From the point of view of Condition 38 compliance. Cemex will not be able to comply with their operating conditions if this development goes ahead as proposed.

6.83 Given the noise limits in operation, it is not possible for both uses to co-exist at this location without breaches occurring. Therefore, a pragmatic approach to revising noise levels and/or mitigation between both sites/parties will need to take place.

6.84 The Environmental Health Team reluctantly agree that Condition 38 couldn't be taken into account when the final decision on condition 16 was made. But it was considered at length during the Discharge of Condition decision making process.

6.85 It is considered both parties have equally valid arguments when taken individually, but it is not possible to resolve the current noise level deadlock, caused by incompatible noise limits alone.

6.86 In conclusion, there are no further comments to make regarding the revised documents submitted and my comments contained in the memo of October 2021 still stand.

October 2021 Comments:

6.87 No objection subject to the following conditions:

- Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan;
- Bonfires/ burning of waste;
- Noise Mitigation Compliance;
- Artificial Lighting;
- Noise impact of plant and renewable energy sources;
- Contaminated Land;
- Low Emissions Strategy;
- Emissions Ratings; and
- Informatives.

6.88 **Police Architectural Liaison Officer – No Objection**

6.89 No objection subject to further information being provided through condition regarding:

- Lighting;
- Cycle shed design;
- Gate positions to rear accesses;
- Fence heights for parking courts;
- Reuse Stores;
- Footpath visibility;
- Flat entry/ access control informative; and
- Post box informative.

6.90 **Fire Authority – No Objection**

6.91 No objection subject to fire hydrant condition or fire hydrant S106 clause.

6.92 **Health and Safety Executive – No Objection**

6.93 No objection.

6.94 **UK Health Security Agency – No Objection**

6.95 No objection.

6.96 **Sport England – No Objection**

6.97 No objection.

6.98 **Housing Strategy – No Objection**

November 2022 Comments:

- 6.99 It is noted that there is still one house type (two-bed apartment) that is not maximising its persons per bedroom as it's only compliant for three persons, not four.
- 6.100 The development is providing 40% Affordable Housing overall and a Local Lettings Plan should be put in place for each phase.

October 2021 and August 2022 Comments:

- 6.101 Further information is needed to make sure this scheme is delivering 40% affordable with a 70/30 split in favour of affordable rent over shared ownership.
- 6.102 **County Minerals and Waste – Objection**

August 2022

- 6.103 Having reviewed the further information, I confirm that the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority's position remains as set out in our letter dated 26 November 2021. We note that in the environmental health officer's opinion (12 August 2022) "both parties [Cemex and Redrow] have equally valid arguments when taken individually, but it is not possible to resolve the current noise level deadlock, caused by incompatible noise limits alone."

November 2021

- 6.104 Paragraph 4.5 of the applicant's Planning Statement deals with the development plan but fails to identify the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP) (July 2021). The applicant has therefore not recognised that most of the proposed development site is within the Consultation Area (CA) for the Barrington Quarry Waste Management Area and the Barrington Cement Works Railhead Transport Infrastructure Area.
- 6.105 MWLP Policy 16 states that:

"Development within a CA will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that the development will:

- (c) not prejudice the existing or future use of the area for which the CA has been designated; and
(d) not result in unacceptable amenity issues or adverse impacts to human health for the occupiers or users of such new development, due to the ongoing or future use of the area for which the CA has been designated"

- 6.106 The purpose of Policy 16 is to safeguard designated mineral and waste sites from development which would prejudice the operation of the designated site and also to protect development that would be adversely affected by the mineral or waste operations, for example residential development subsequently suffering amenity issues.
- 6.107 From the Northern Area Comparison, it appears that the proposed revised scheme would result in dwellings closer to the railway zone and railway line than the original scheme. The applicant's noise assessment shows that the noise levels on the balconies of flats in plots 251 – 259 would be above the limit set in condition 38 of permission S/0204/16/CW (the importation by rail and deposit of inert restoration material to restore the former quarry).
- 6.108 The Environmental Health Team have recommended a condition requiring the design and implementation of a noise scheme to protect the proposed residential units from noise from the railway, Chapel Hill and the quarry operations.
- 6.109 The MWLP is consistent with Paragraph 187 of the NPPF (2021).
- 6.110 The Environmental Health Team have stated that “the quarry activities may need to be curtailed in order to meet their own noise level conditions, if these proposed dwellings are permitted.” This would not be consistent with MWLP Policy 16 or the NPPF ‘agent of change’ principle.
- 6.111 Until this is addressed, we object to the application.
- 6.112 **S106 Officer – No Objection**
- 6.113 No objection subject to contributions towards:
- Football Pitch Contribution £20,181.82;
 - Sports Pavilion Contribution £25,227.27;
 - Tennis Court Contribution £20,181.82;
 - Associated Car Park Contribution £8,745.45;
 - Formal children's play space an offsite contribution £18,500;
 - Indoor Community Space an offsite contribution £215,272.73;
 - Community Fee contribution £5,886.36; and
 - Improvement to pedestrian footpaths and improvements to the river walks within the Parish of Barrington Contribution £8,409.09.
- 6.114 This is based on a pro-rata calculation in same approach as the original 220 dwelling development.

7.0 Third Party Representations

7.1 9no. representations in objection have been received. The objections have raised the following issues:

- Development too dense along boundaries;
- Increased flood risk from additional hard surfaces;
- Welcome genuinely affordable housing;
- Barrington Parish Council has pointed out forcefully that the centre of the village is a Conservation Area and there are few opportunity to insert new facilities into the area;
- The LEAP/NEAP and Trim Trail are only of benefit to the residents of the new development and are of no benefit the existing residents of the village due to their distance away from the rest of potential users and their children;
- There is no mention of the allotments in para 2.43 of the applicant's statement about the facilities being provided. Why is this? Surely it is germane to the developer's argument;
- The emerging Local Plan will restrict development in villages like Barrington in favour of larger agglomerations, so I believe the application should be denied on these grounds alone;
- The 17.72ha of open space could accommodate more on-site facilities like tennis courts, scout hut, angler provision etc;
- If approved, a condition requiring the unused open space to be for necessary communal facilities should be imposed;
- The village would be doubled in size if the incremental development on the south-east and northern parcels go ahead;
- Pressure on local infrastructure and facilities (e.g. drainage, water supply, sewage, medical provision, school places and village recreation facilities);
- The new build estate does not match the character of either village;
- The increase of dwellings is off too great a scale and mass;
- The modern housing estate will dominate and change the nature of the conservation area and listed buildings;
- Highway safety and traffic generation concerns;
- Additional traffic which will cause significant damage to the character of the village even before environmental considerations are considered;
- Permanent long-term harm to the village life and environment will occur;
- Other brownfield sites should be developed instead of this site;
- The countryside needs to be preserved and re-wilded, not developed;
- Traffic from this development will be further worsened if the East West railway (Oxford-Cambridge) goes ahead along the southern route, as the road serving the development (Haslingfield via Chapel Hill) will turn into a dead end, as there is no plan to provide either a level crossing or an underpass. As such the Barton route into Cambridge will only be accessible via Orwell and traffic through Barrington along the green will increase.
- Local cycle paths are poor so future occupants will be car dependent;
- Cemex promised that there would be a maximum of 220 houses;

- 7.2 An objection from CEMEX has been submitted. The issues raised are summarised as follows:
- Barrington Quarry, operated by CEMEX, has the benefit of Planning Permission (S/0204/16/CW). Condition 38 of this permission restrict noise levels at the boundary of any residential property attribute to the railway to 55dB LAeq;
 - The applicants noise assessment prepared by ACCON states that the target noise level of 55db will be exceeded on the balconies in plots 251- 259 (flats);
 - The Environmental Health Team have stated that “the quarry activities may need to be curtailed in order to meet their own noise level conditions, if these proposed dwellings are permitted.”;
 - The Noise Assessment methodology is flawed and as a result noise levels could reach 65db. These levels would exceed the restriction imposed by condition 38 on the Quarry Permission which the Council could remedy by enforcement action, potentially resulting in quarry operations being terminated;
 - The County Council have objected due to lack of compliance with MWLP Policy 16 and NPPF Paragraph 187; and
 - The Council must determine the application in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 70 and Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Section 38(6)). The NPPF is government planning policy and is a material consideration that must be taken into account. If national and local planning policies are not taken into account then CEMEX reserves its position to challenge such decision;

7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council’s website.

8.0 Member Representations

8.1 None.

9.0 Local Groups / Petition

9.1 None.

10.0 Assessment

Principle of Development

Five Year Housing Land Supply

10.1 The Council is currently able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.

10.2 The Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Five Year Housing Land Supply (April 2022) sets out that together, as Greater Cambridge the two planning authorities (South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City) can demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The trajectory sets out that Councils jointly have 6.5 years of housing land supply for the 2022-2027 five year period.

10.3 Therefore, unlike the 2014 outline permission on the wider Barrington Cement Works site, the titled balance is not engaged and the adopted Local Plan Policies are up to date and carry full weight.

Development Framework Boundary

10.4 The site is located outside of the development framework boundary of Barrington and does not abut the framework boundary.

10.5 Policy S/7 of the Local Plan states that outside development frameworks, only allocations within Neighbourhood Plans that have come into force and development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside or where supported by other policies in this plan will be permitted.

10.6 The supporting text to policy S/7 sets out the development frameworks define where policies for the built-up areas of settlements give way to policies for the countryside. This is necessary to ensure that the countryside is protected from gradual encroachment on the edges of villages and to help guard against incremental growth in unsustainable locations.

10.7 Barrington does not have a Neighbourhood Plan and there are no other policies within the Local Plan that would support the principle of the proposed development in its countryside location.

10.8 The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy S/7 of the Local Plan insofar as being a major residential development outside of a development framework boundary.

10.9 However, consideration must be given to the extent of the proposals conflict with Policy S/7 in terms of encroachment into the countryside and the sustainability of the location, with reference to the planning history for the site.

Countryside Encroachment

10.10 It is relevant to again note that there is an extant planning permission on this land for residential development as part of the wider Barrington Cement Works site.

10.11 The proposed development would result in the density of development increasing to 29 dwellings per hectare and the footprint of development

extending further towards the western boundary, which are the main differences in terms of countryside encroachment impacts compared to the extant permission.

- 10.12 The expansion of the development footprint would result in the western edge of the development having a slight urbanising effect on adjacent to the countryside. However, there would still be a sufficient open space buffer between the edge of the site and the quarry adjacent which would ensure that it does not appear that the countryside is harmfully encroached.
- 10.13 Whilst the density of development on this parcel would be increased, the layout, pattern of development and housing types would accord with what has been approved on the wider site, helping it to be read coherently, rather than something that has been incrementally added to. The density of development is below the policy requirement of 30dph sought in rural areas.
- 10.14 A dense tree belt would be retained along the Chapel Hill boundary and there would be a substantial level of open space to the south of the development. This serves a critical function in preventing the wider development from being perceived as countryside encroachment.
- 10.15 Taking into account the site history and context of the site, it is considered that the expansion of the built footprint into this open space to accommodate an additional three dwellings would not constitute significant countryside encroachment. As such officers consider there to be limited conflict with Policy S/7 in terms of countryside encroachment.

Settlement Strategy

- 10.16 Policy S/2 of the Local Plan sets out how the vision for the Local Plan will be secured through the achievement of six key objectives including to ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure (criterion e).
- 10.17 Policy S/6 of the Local Plan sets out the Council's development strategy and a hierarchical approach to new housing in the district, with a descending order of preference given to on the edge of Cambridge, at new settlements and only limited development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.
- 10.18 Policy S/6(4) sets out that development in the rural area will be limited, with allocations for jobs and housing focused on Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, and rural settlement policies providing for windfall development for different categories of village consistent with the level of local service provision and quality of public transport access to Cambridge or a market town.

- 10.19 Barrington is identified as a Group Village under Policy S/10 of the Local Plan, which states that residential development and redevelopment up to an indicative maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings will be permitted within the development frameworks of Group Villages. Development may exceptionally consist of up to about 15 dwellings where this would make best use of a single brownfield site.
- 10.20 The supporting text to Policy S/10 details that Group villages are generally less sustainable locations for new development than Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, having fewer services and facilities allowing only some of the basic day-to-day requirements of their residents to be met without the need to travel outside the village. All Group Villages have at least a primary school and limited development will help maintain remaining services and facilities and provide for affordable housing to meet local needs.
- 10.21 Whilst the proposal lies outside of the development framework boundary, officers acknowledge that the proposal of 113 dwellings significantly exceeds the limit set out for development at Group Villages (i.e., within the framework). It is also noted that the level of development exceeds that attributed to a Minor Rural Centre, which sets a limit of 30 dwellings.
- 10.22 The proposal therefore conflicts with the aspirations of Policies S/2(e), S/6, S/7 and S/10 which set out and shape the settlement strategy for the district and seek to concentrate development in the most sustainable locations and villages with the greatest range of services and facilities.
- 10.23 The Council's Services and Facilities Study (March 2014) sets out that Barrington has a primary school, village store (post office), village hall/community centre and other services including a public house and recreation ground. There is no secondary school or general practitioner and limited opportunities for employment.
- 10.24 The no.75 bus service, which offers bus services every 30-minutes between Wrestlingworth and Cambridge, runs along Barrington High Street in the centre of the village with the nearest stop being Childerley, Highfields Road, approximately 820 metres from the entrance to the site. However, it is pertinent to note that under the approved development on the wider site, there is a requirement to deliver a northbound and a southbound bus stop on Haslingfield Road near to the site.
- 10.25 Officers conclude that Barrington has a reasonable but limited range of services and facilities, placing a potential need for residents to travel outside of the village by car for shopping and employment, although the increased emphasis and ability to work from home and shopping deliveries is acknowledged.
- 10.26 However, in considering the outline application S/2365/14/OL at appeal in 2015, the Council would have considered the same issue, albeit the

Council was unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply at the time. In terms of the range of services and facilities available the position has not changed significantly since that time.

- 10.27 Officers therefore consider that, as a matter of course, the development of 113no. dwellings in Barrington as a Group Village would be contrary to the Council's housing strategy and Policies S/2(e), S/6, S/7 and S/10 of the Local Plan.
- 10.28 Again, it is also pertinent to note that as the outline and reserved matters on the wider Barrington Cement Work site has been implemented, there is a significant material consideration in terms of the fall-back position. As approved, this parcel of the site contained 76no. dwellings, which formed part of the wider 220no. dwellings originally approved. The proposed 113no. dwellings would bring the total number of dwellings on the wider site up from 220no. dwellings (as approved) to 257no. dwellings (as proposed). This may be increased to 260no. dwellings if the application (21/04088/FUL) for an increase of 3no. dwellings on the south-eastern parcel, which has a resolution to approve from Planning Committee (10 August 2022), is permitted once the Section 106 is agreed and then implemented.
- 10.29 As set out in the 'developer contributions' section of this report, it is considered that the impact of a further 37no. dwellings on local services and infrastructure can be compensated by planning obligations where appropriate.

Conclusion

- 10.30 Being a major residential development for 113no. dwellings outside of the development framework boundary of a Group Village, the proposal would conflict with the Council's housing strategy and Policies S/2(e), S/6, S/7 and S/10 of the Local Plan.
- 10.31 However, the degree of conflict with Policy S/7 is lessened in terms of countryside encroachment by virtue of the additional built footprint extending into an area not seen as critical to preventing the perception of significant countryside encroachment and following the adjacent boundaries of approved development within the context of the consented built form of development.
- 10.32 The wider site, and quantum of development of 220no. dwellings, has been previously considered to represent a sustainable form of development, albeit at a time when the Council could not demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The proposal would increase the total number of dwellings on the wider site to 257no. dwellings, although this could increase to 260no. dwellings if the south-eastern parcel application (21/04088/FUL) is permitted and implemented. The proposed increase of 37no. dwellings is a considerable uplift compared to what was approved. Notwithstanding this, for the reasons set out above, this increase in

dwellings is not considered to be so great as to warrant the scale of development becoming unsustainable.

- 10.33 The recent planning history is a material consideration and therefore, having been found to represent a suitable form of development previously, given that the range of services and facilities available has not changed significantly the degree of conflict with the Council's housing strategy is lessened.
- 10.34 The proposal would be contrary to Policies S/2(e), S/6, S/7 and S/10 as a matter of principle, but there are material considerations that suggest the conflict is limited and that the proposal would represent a sustainable form of development, the purpose of the planning system being to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development (NPPF paragraph 7).

Impact on Barrington Chalk Pit

Background of Chalk Pit

- 10.35 The application site previously formed part of the Barrington Cement Works which was in operation until around 2008 before being decommissioned in 2012.
- 10.36 Immediately to the west and north of the site lies the Barrington Chalk Pit. This chalk pit is served by a railway track known as 'The Barrington Light Railway Line'. This is accessed by trains from London 'reverse shunting' into Foxton Exchange Sidings from the mainline.
- 10.37 On 5 August 2011 planning permission (S/01080/10/CW) was granted by Cambridge County Council for the importation, by rail, of suitable restoration material, over a period of 5 years to partially infill an existing quarry void.
- 10.38 On 27 June 2019, planning permission (S/0204/16/CW) was granted by Cambridgeshire County Council for the extension of this importation by rail and deposit of inert restoration material to restore former clay and chalk quarry up to 31 December 2035 (Cemex permission). This permission included a condition (no.38) relating to noise which stated that:

"Noise levels at the boundary of any residential property attributable to train movements on the railway shall not exceed 55dB LAeq, 1 hour free field between 0700 and 2000 hours. Levels may be measured directly or derived from a combination of measurement and calculation using propagation corrections. All measurements shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements of BS7445 'Description and measurement of environmental noise'.

Reason: To protect the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties in accordance with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and

Waste Development Plan Core Strategy DPD (July 2011) policy CS34 and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (September 2018) policy SC/10.”

Policy Context

10.39 The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP) (2021) allocates the Barrington Chalk Pit and the railway line serving this as Consultation Areas (CA) for the Barrington Quarry Waste Management Area (WMA) and the Barrington Cement Works Railhead Transport Infrastructure Area (TIA).

10.40 Policy 16 of the MWLP states that:

“Development within a CA will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that the development will:

(c) not prejudice the existing or future use of the area (i.e. the MAA, MDA, WMA, TIA or WRA) for which the CA has been designated; and

(d) not result in unacceptable amenity issues or adverse impacts to human health for the occupiers or users of such new development, due to the ongoing or future use of the area for which the CA has been designated.”

10.41 The above policy mirrors Paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) whereby the ‘agent of change’ principle is established. Local Plan (2018) Policy SC/10 (Noise Pollution) also reflects this through criteria no.3 where it states that; *“Where a planning application for residential development is near an existing noise source, the applicant will be required to demonstrate that the proposal would not be subject to an unacceptable noise levels both internally and externally.”*

Relevant Planning History on Application Site

10.42 Outline planning permission was granted for 220 dwellings and included a condition requiring details of a noise mitigation scheme to be submitted and agreed to protect the amenity of future residents. An application (S/0306/19/DC) was submitted in January 2019 to discharge this condition. The amended Noise Impact Assessment (uploaded 12 September 2019) submitted with this discharge of condition application summarised the noise impacts as:

The majority of gardens are screened from train noise by the layout of the buildings which form a barrier between the railway line and the gardens. As a result, the noise levels within the majority of gardens are predicted to be below 50 dB LAeq,16hr due to train movements. The target internal noise levels would not be achieved with open windows for ventilation where habitable rooms overlook the railway line. The typical glazing and ventilation specification utilised by Redrow would ensure that the target internal noise levels will be met with windows closed. It is noted that, even in the worst case, train movements would only occur for approximately 2

hours of the day and that during those periods between train movements, the internal noise levels would be readily achieved with open windows for ventilation. Residents would have the choice to open or close their windows according to their preference for the short periods during which train activities are occurring. Therefore, no further ventilation provisions have been recommended.

External Amenity Area Noise Assessment:

The noise levels in external amenity areas associated with the blocks of flats (i.e. Plots 107-115, 135-140 and 153-161) are predicted to exceed the criteria of 55 dB LAeq,1hr and 50 dB LAeq,16hr. Noise mitigation in the form of solid parapet and sound absorbing material on the ceiling and/or rear wall of the balconies, a solid barrier of approximately 1.8 m in height or fully enclosed balconies is predicted to reduce the noise levels to meet the criteria.

- 10.43 It is noted that the external amenity areas of 24 properties would exceed the noise criteria and in consultation with the Environmental Health Team, the condition was discharged on 18 August 2020.

Officer Assessment

- 10.44 Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states; planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Paragraph 187 of the NPPF also states that planning decisions for new development should be integrated effectively with existing businesses and existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development (including changes of use) in its vicinity, the applicant (or 'agent of change') should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed.
- 10.45 The objections from Cemex and the County's Minerals and Waste Planning Team are noted above, as well as the consultation response from Environmental Health. There is some conflict between the applicant's noise assessment and Cemex's review of this noise assessment in terms of the level of exceedance of the noise criteria for external amenity areas (55dB LAeq). The applicant considers the exceedance will be 2-3dB but the report on behalf of Cemex considers it would be up to 10dB. However, Environmental Health have not disputed the assessment in this regard and therefore, officers have no reason to dispute the levels of exceedance within the applicant's report. Nevertheless, the main concern relates to Flat Block B (9 apartments) where the exceedance will occur in relation to external amenity areas.

- 10.46 The elevations to the apartments (plot nos. 251 – 259) in 'Flat Block B' show that at ground-floor level 2.0m high Perspex acoustic screens will be installed and that at the first and second floor levels, 1.8m high Perspex screens will be installed to the balconies. Evidence has been submitted that these mitigation measures would be sufficient to demonstrate that within external living spaces, the 55db noise limit can be met. This includes when measured based on both the Cemex permission noise condition requirements (Two trains modelled over 1 hr period (1 in, 1 out)), as well as the standard planning guidance of a 16 hour day (Six trains modelled over 16 hr day (3 in, 3 out)). As such, the proposal would be acceptable with this mitigation in terms of the external amenity areas for future occupiers.
- 10.47 In terms of internal spaces, the noise assessment demonstrates that the building façade construction, glazing and ventilation system proposed would collectively be sufficient to achieve the target internal noise levels at all plots with windows closed. During the daytimes, with windows open, there will be some plots near to the railway line that experience noise levels above the target internal noise levels. However, due to the relatively limited duration of time that a train movement will occur in the context of a day, as explained in paragraph 10.46 above, it is considered reasonable to allow future occupants to have the option as to whether to keep their windows open or to temporarily close them to mitigate the temporary noise impact. Given the number of train movements are also limited by condition on the Cemex permission (max 6 per day, max of 2 per hour and only between 07:00-20:00), this is not considered to cause material harm to future occupiers.
- 10.48 The condition imposed on the Cemex permission applies a more stringent test as the noise limit relates to "boundaries" (emphasis added) of residential properties. This is an important distinction between the approach typically adopted in planning considerations for residential developments, whereby the noise receptors are limited to the internal noise levels (i.e. within the buildings) and the external amenity spaces (i.e. gardens/ balconies) as these are the habitable living spaces. Nevertheless, it has been accepted that the noise impacts to external amenity areas could not be mitigated to a sufficient degree to satisfy the requirements of the County's condition.
- 10.49 The agent of change principle was first included within the National Planning Policy Framework in July 2018. This was after the outline planning permission for residential development had been granted (October 2016) and therefore, the principle of residential use of the land had already been established. Reserved matters were also subsequently approved which established the location of new residential properties. A planning condition in relation to noise mitigation was also imposed on the outline planning permission and the mitigation strategy has been approved. This is an important material consideration which carries significant weight.

- 10.50 Whilst there are material differences in the layout of the extant permission compared to the proposed development, the extant permission would also result in the 55db noise limit associated with condition no.38 of the Cemex permission being exceeded at residential boundaries. This is experienced on both the north and south sides of the railway line. It would therefore, be down to the County Council to determine whether it was reasonable, expedient and in the public interest to enforce the requirements of the planning condition as set out on the Cemex permission should a breach become evident. It would also be open to Cemex to vary the condition of the original County planning permission to align with any requirements of this development, should planning permission be granted. This would seem an eventual requirement, given it has been identified that the original planning permission would also not be able to meet the requirement of condition 38 on the Cemex permission.
- 10.51 On the basis of the information submitted the Council is satisfied that the amenity of future residents will be appropriately protected through the noise mitigation measures proposed. The demonstration that habitable areas are appropriately protected is acceptable despite the potential conflict with a condition on the Cemex permission regarding noise levels at residential boundaries. The protection of amenity (habitable) areas is considered more specific and appropriate than reference to noise limits at residential boundaries. The fallback position (outline planning permission and reserved matters approval) is a significant material planning consideration.
- 10.52 Overall, the proposed development has adequately demonstrated that internal and external noise levels within the proposed dwellings would provide an acceptable living environment and comply with policies HQ/1 and SC/10. It is however acknowledged that there would be conflict with the 55db limit on residential boundaries on condition no.38 of the Cemex permission. Nevertheless, the material planning consideration of the presence of the extant permission, where this same conflict exists, is considered to hold significant weight as a fallback position. The applicant has submitted sufficient information to demonstrate that the living environment for future occupants would be acceptable in terms of noise. A condition is imposed to ensure the noise mitigation measures set out in the applicant's noise assessment are fully implemented (condition 27).

Housing Provision

Density

- 10.53 Policy H/8 requires housing density in new settlements and urban extensions to achieve a housing density of 40 dwellings per hectare (dph) and in Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centre villages and Group Villages to achieve a density of 30dph. The policy states that density may vary where

justified by the character of the locality, the scale of the development, or other local circumstances.

- 10.54 The site measures approximately 4.38 hectares in area. The provision of 113 dwellings on the site would equate to a density of approximately 29.5 dwellings per hectare.
- 10.55 The density of development is comparable to the other development areas of the wider site and in line with the average requirement. The density is considered to respond to its context and not appear out of scale to the character in which it will sit.
- 10.56 The proposed density accords with Policy H/8 of the Local Plan.

Market Housing Mix

- 10.57 Policy H/9 ‘Housing Mix’ requires a wide choice, type and mix of housing to be provided to meet the needs of different groups in the community. For market housing development of 10 or more homes, H/9 provides targets as set out in the table below. H/9 states the mix of affordable homes is to be set by local housing needs evidence.
- 10.58 Looking at the northern parcel of the site in isolation, the mix of market housing would be more balanced than what was previously approved.

Northern Parcel (approved)

Policy Requirement	Market	Affordable
30% 1 or 2-bedroom homes	4 (9%)	9 (29%)
30% 3-bedroom homes	7 (15.5%)	16 (52%)
30% 4-bedroom homes	34 (75.5%)	6 (19%)
10% flexibility allowance		

Northern Parcel (proposed)

Policy Requirement	Market	Affordable
30% 1 or 2-bedroom homes	12(18%)	41(91%)
30% 3-bedroom homes	15 (22%)	4 (9%)
30% 4-bedroom homes	41(60%)	
10% flexibility allowance		

- 10.59 Therefore, although not strictly in compliance with the requirements of Policy H/9, compared to what was previously approved on this part of the site, the proposal represents a more balanced mix of market housing.

10.60 For context, when considering the contribution of this application to the wider Barrington Cement Works site, the breakdown of housing mix is comparable to what was approved.

Housing Mix Across Wider Site (Approved vs Proposed)

Policy Requirement	Market Approved	Market Proposed	Affordable Approved	Affordable Proposed
30% 1 or 2-bedroom homes	17 (13%)	28 (18%)	43 (49%)	77 (74%)
30% 3-bedroom homes	49 (37%)	47 (30%)	35 (40%)	23 (22%)
30% 4-bedroom homes	66 (50%)	81 (52%)	10 (11%)	4 (4%)
Total	132	156	88	104

10.61 Therefore, in this case, the mix of market housing is considered acceptable.

10.62 The tables above also demonstrate that the mix of affordable housing would be more heavily skewed towards one or two-bedroom homes compared to what was previously approved. However, as explained in paragraph 10.57, the mix of affordable homes is determined by local housing needs evidence, as set out in Policies H/9 and H/10 of the Local Plan. The mix of affordable housing proposed is supported by the Council's Housing Team.

10.63 Policy H/9(4) requires 5% of homes in a development to be built to the accessible and adaptable dwellings M4(2) standard, rounding down to the nearest whole property with the provision split evenly between the affordable and market homes rounding to the nearest whole number.

10.64 Seven of the one-bedroom maisonettes and two of the 'Tavy' two-bedroom houses, which are all affordable dwellings, have been identified as M4(2) units which represents over 8%. The proposal would therefore meet the requirements of Policy H/9(4).

10.65 In terms of self and custom build plots, the policy does not set criteria for how many self or custom build units are to be provided within a development. Although officers would usually seek a proportion of self-build and custom-build on an application of this size, it is pertinent to note that the extant permission did not include either of these housing types on this parcel, nor the wider site. Given that the proposal is effectively a reconfiguration of the south-east parcel of what was previously approved and is extant, officers are of the view that it would not be reasonable to impose either of these requirements in this case.

10.66 Overall, while strictly not in accordance with all aspects of Policy H/9 of the Local Plan, it is considered given the nature of the application and the material consideration of the extant permission on this part of the site, the proposal is acceptable in respect of housing mix.

Affordable Housing

10.67 Policy H/10 of the Local Plan states that all developments of 11 dwellings or more will provide affordable housing (a) to provide that 40% of the homes on site will be affordable, (b) to address evidence of housing need; an agreed mix of affordable house tenures will be determined by local circumstances at the time of granting planning permission and (c) in small groups or clusters distributed through the site.

10.68 The application proposes the development of 45no. affordable properties (40%), comprising 41no. 1 or 2-bed homes and 4no. 3-bedroom homes. These would take the form of 12 x 1-bedroom maisonettes, 9 x 2-bed apartments, 11 x 2-bed houses for affordable rent and 2 x 1-bedroom maisonettes, 7 x 2-bed houses and 4 x 3-bed houses for shared ownership, creating a tenure split of 71/29 in favour of affordable rent.

10.69 The Council's Affordable Housing Team has confirmed their support for the mix, tenure and layout of affordable housing proposed. The Housing Team have noted that the two-bedroom apartment housing type falls 1m² below the minimum space standard for a four-person two-bedroom apartment which would be preferable. However, the housing type is still in excess of the minimum space standards for a three-person two-bedroom apartment.

10.70 The Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy 2019-2023 Annex 10: Clustering and Distribution of Affordable Housing Policy sets out that for medium mixed tenure residential developments of 30 to 200 units, there should be maximum clusters of 15 units (including blocks of flats), which should not abut each other and be dispersed appropriately across the whole development. The Policy also notes that ground floor flats should have their own entrances, if possible, as they are likely to be allocated to older or disabled residents or families with children.

10.71 The layout of the site creates three separate groups of affordable units dispersed within the site:

- Plots 147 – 152 & 231 - 238: a group of 14 affordable units comprising a terraced row of 4no. three-bedroom properties, a terrace of 2no. two-bedroom dwellings and 2no. one-bedroom maisonettes, and a terrace row of 2no. two-bedroom dwellings and 4no. one-bedroom maisonettes. These are situated near to the entrance to the site on the south-eastern frontage.
- Plots 243 – 250: a terraced row of 4no. two-bedroom properties and 4no. one-bedroom maisonettes. These are situated further to the west along the southern frontage.

- Plots 251 – 259: a group of 9no. two-bedroom apartment situated in an apartment block (B) in the western corner of the site.
- Plots 200 – 213: A row of three terraces situated on the western edge of the site, comprising 10no. two-bedroom dwellings and 4no. one-bedroom maisonettes.

10.72 Officers, in consultation with the Council’s Housing Team, are satisfied that the proposed distribution of the affordable units within the site is appropriate and the level of affordable housing is acceptable and accords with Policy H/10 of the Local Plan and the Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy 2019-2023.

Residential Space Standards

10.73 Policy H/12 of the Local Plan states that new residential units will be permitted where their gross internal floor areas meet or exceed the Government’s Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015) or successor document.

10.74 The table below demonstrates that all of the dwellings would meet the nationally described space standards:

Unit Type	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
Private Units						
Bakewell	2	3	2	70	79	+9
Letchworth	2	3	2	70	91	+21
Amberley	3	4	2	84	106	+22
Stratford Q	3	4	2	84	111	+27
Oxford Q	3	4	2	84	122	+38
Leamington Q	3	4	2	84	132	+48
Canterbury 3	3	4	2	84	138	+50
Marlow M4(2)	4	5	2	97	120	+23
Shaftesbury	4	5	2	97	131	+34
Harrogate	4	6	2	106	144	+42
Richmond	4	6	2	106	189	+83
Henley	4	6	2	106	164	+58
Highgate 5	5	6	3	116	181	+65
Hampstead	4	7	2	128	172	+44
Affordable Units						
1B Maisonette (M4(2))	1	2	1	50	50	-
1B Maisonette	1	2	1	50	59	+9

2B Apartment	2	3	1	61	69	+8
Tavy +	2	4		79	79	-
Tavy M4(2)	2	4		79	79	-
Dartford	3	5		99	107	+8

10.75 The proposal would accord with Policy H/12 of the Local Plan.

Character / Visual Amenity

10.76 Policy HQ/1 'Design Principles' provides a comprehensive list of criteria by which development proposals must adhere to, requiring that all new development must be of high-quality design, with a clear vision as to the positive contribution the development will make to its local and wider context.

10.77 Policies NH/2, NH/6 and SC/9 are relevant to the landscape and visual impacts of a proposal. Together they seek to permit development only where it respects and retains or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and its National Character Area.

10.78 The District Design Guide SPD (2010) and Landscape in New Developments SPD (2010) provide additional guidance. The NPPF provides advice on achieving well-designed places and conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

10.79 The impact of the development in terms of countryside encroachment has been considered under the 'Principle of Development' section of this report.

Layout

10.80 As approved, the main vehicular entrance into this northern parcel of the site was sign posted by way of two L-shaped apartment blocks, designed to mirror the same layout as the land to the south of the intersecting railway line to which it would be opposite. The equivalent L-shaped apartment block was however re-located further to the west through a separate permission, meaning the reflective relationship has since been lost. The general arrangement was one of semi-detached and detached properties set back from the main road running through the heart of the parcel, or, orientated around the spur roads within the site to create a somewhat informal layout within the site. Parking spaces, except for the apartment block, were located immediately to the side or front of each dwelling. In the northern corner there was a cluster of large detached properties, designed to mimic that of a cul-de-sac style appearance. Open space was pushed out to edges of the parcel.

10.81 The proposed layout of this re-configured northern parcel would broadly continue the spatial arrangement of built form under the approved scheme, albeit on a denser scale with a mix of terrace, semi-detached and

detached dwellings. The L-shaped apartment block would be re-located away from the main entrance in the heart of the site, and instead moved nearer to the western boundary. Due to the altered layout of the apartment blocks on the southern and northern parcels, the re-location of this block is considered to be acceptable in design terms.

- 10.82 One of the noticeable differences between the approved layout and the proposed layout would be the approach to car parking, particularly for the proposed terraced properties fronting onto the main southern route into the parcel (plot nos. 231 – 150). The proposed scheme would introduce two parking courts at the rear of two rows of the terraces. The concept of car parking courts has however been accepted on the wider site in the southern parcel. Therefore, when viewed cohesively across the entire site, the proposed introduction onto this northern parcel will not appear at odds with the context of the development. Furthermore, the car parking courts would be discreetly sited to the rear of properties rather than being prominent from the main approach into the site. The removal of parking to the front of this boundary edge would naturally offer a more pleasant vista when approaching the site.
- 10.83 In addition, to the above, the row of terraced properties (plot nos. 200 – 213) along the north-western boundary within the proposed development would result in a continuous row of car parking outside the front of these properties, whereas previously there would have been greater levels of separation. This boundary however is in a less prominent location within the wider site and does not form part of the main entry into the site like the southern boundary of this northern parcel for example. Tree planting is still proposed rhythmically through these car parking spaces. Overall, the introduction of car parking in this area is not considered harmful
- 10.84 The layout of the proposed development would naturally, by virtue of the increased density compared to the approved development, result in the extent of the development footprint pushing out nearer the site boundaries, particularly along the western boundary. However, the loss of this open space is compensated for by way of the re-consolidation into a central formalised green. This green would provide a welcome relief to the overdominance of private and hardstanding in the core of the parcel which is a significant benefit of the proposal.
- 10.85 The detached properties (plot nos. 184 – 193) would be presented in a more formal arrangement, whereby gardens back onto one another. However, this back-to-back relationship would not appear alien due to the presence of this layout on the southern parcel.
- 10.86 The spacing between buildings, garden sizes, layout and orientation of buildings on the plot would broadly follow those styles employed on the wider site. Spatially, it is therefore considered that the layout of the built

form would not appear out of character with the wider site and it would read as a part of the comprehensive development of the wider site.

- 10.87 It is acknowledged that the Urban Design Team have made a general comment that the tightly packed series of terraces along the southern edge results in a suburban rather than rural character. Officers do not agree that the character on this site, as approved, was ever rural in character and that naturally, given the scale of development on the entire site of 220no. dwellings, the approved character was already suburban. Notwithstanding this, the density of development would be 29.5dph which is below the 30dph threshold that Policy H/8 sets for developments in this type of location. The layout proposed largely mirrors what has been approved elsewhere on the wider site and is considered acceptable.

Scale

- 10.88 As approved, this parcel of the scheme had almost exclusively two-storey houses/ maisonettes, with the only exception being the three-storey apartment block.
- 10.89 The proposed two-storey houses and two-storey buildings containing the maisonettes are reflective of both the wider site that the proposal would be read within and that of Barrington more generally. The house types reflect those approved on the wider site and the width and length of these buildings would be reflective of its context. The proposed two-storey scale of development is therefore considered acceptable and compatible with its surroundings.

Appearance

- 10.90 The development comprises a range of building types with varying architectural detailing and external finishes that add variety and interest to the proposed development. The house types proposed mirror those approved on the wider site and therefore would not appear alien or contrast harmfully with the wider site it would be read within.
- 10.91 Officers note that the affordable properties within the site are to benefit from the same quality of materials and architectural characteristics of the market housing, further integrating these units within the site.
- 10.92 Officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring the materials to be built in accordance with the materials drawing no. 8502-22-02-02 Revision E. This would ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory and compatible with its surroundings. The Urban Design Team have also requested that details of the perspex acoustic fences for flat block B are provided by way of condition which has been recommended accordingly.
- 10.93 The overall appearance and detailing of the proposed development is considered acceptable and to include a variety of interest within the

development, which draws on the context of the sites rural location. Officers consider that the materials palette and architectural detailing includes variety and interest within a coherent, place-responsive design, which is legible and creates a positive sense of place and identity whilst also responding to the local context and respecting local distinctiveness, although a condition is recommended to ensure appropriate finish.

- 10.94 Overall, the proposed development is a high-quality design that would contribute positively to its surroundings and be appropriately landscaped. The proposal is compliant with South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) policies HQ/1, NH/2, NH/6 and SC/9 and the NPPF (2021).

Landscaping

- 10.95 The application is supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (August 2021) and various landscape plans.
- 10.96 The Assessment includes a methodology and appraisal of development on the site, indicating that in terms of visual amenity, the proposed reconfiguration and densification of development on the parcel would have an overall negligible adverse significance of effect. The northern parcel of development would not be visible from all but one (viewpoint 1) of the key viewpoints at either Winter Year 1 or Summer Year 15 due to the extensive tree belt adjacent. Viewpoint no.1 is the view from the southern entrance to the site looking to the north.
- 10.97 The Landscape Team has requested further information regarding specific concerns in relation to the tree planting strategy, paving materials and how existing and proposed green infrastructure are connected and public available. It is considered that this further information is capable of being agreed in the form of a hard and soft landscaping condition and this has been recommended accordingly. The pedestrian and cycle access, play and amenity provision and green infrastructure connections broadly align with those approved across the masterplan for the wider site. The proposed re-configuration would not result in the severing or loss of any of these functions.
- 10.98 Subject to the recommended condition, officers consider that the proposal would accord with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the Local Plan (2018).

Trees

- 10.99 The application is supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (August 2021).
- 10.100 The Assessment sets out that the removal of trees will be identical to what was approved under the relevant conditions discharge for the wider site.
- 10.101 The group of trees along the Haslingfield Road frontage will be retained and protected to relevant standards.

- 10.102 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Trees Officer who raises no objection.
- 10.103 Officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring the tree protection methodology to be implemented to ensure appropriate protection of retained trees.
- 10.104 Subject to the recommended condition, which would work alongside conditions for boundary treatments and landscaping details as noted above, the proposal would accord with Policy NH/4 of the Local Plan.

Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design

- 10.105 The application is supported by an Energy and Sustainability Statement (August 2021).
- 10.106 The Statement suggests a fabric first approach will be applied to the proposed development, incorporating measures including efficient levels of insulation above those required by Approved Document L1A of the Building Regulations, improved thermal bridging standards, high efficiency combination boilers and solar PV systems to meet 10% carbon reduction.
- 10.107 The Statement also details that basic SAP calculations have been carried out on the proposed specification resulting in a total carbon emission reduction of 11.13%.
- 10.108 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Sustainability Officer who raises no objection to the proposal subject to conditions.
- 10.109 In consultation with the Council's Sustainability Officer, officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition to secure the carbon energy technologies submitted in the Energy Statement and a water efficiency condition to ensure that the dwellings achieve a minimum water efficiency consumption of no more than 110 litres use per person per day, in accordance with Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended 2016).
- 10.110 The applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and subject to conditions the proposal is compliant with Local Plan policies CC/1, CC/3 and CC/4 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

Biodiversity

- 10.111 As part of delivering sustainable development the NPPF identifies an environmental objective which includes amongst other things, improving biodiversity. Paragraph 174 of the NPPF also states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local

environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. The Councils' Biodiversity SPD (2022) require development proposals to deliver a net gain in biodiversity following a mitigation hierarchy which is focused on avoiding ecological harm over minimising, rectifying, reducing and then off-setting. This approach accords with policy NH/14 which outlines a primary objective for biodiversity to be conserved or enhanced and provides for the protection of Protected Species, Priority Species and Priority Habitat.

- 10.112 The application is accompanied by an Ecology Assessment (June 2021) and a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (July 2021) which sets out that there would be an estimated net gain of 11.41%.
- 10.113 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer, who initially requested more information. This was regarding the level of impact from the development on Eversden and Wimpole Special Area of Conservation (SAC), together with any 'functionally linked' habitat, evidence of assessment of recreational impact on the nearby Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and submission of biodiversity net gain matrix. These same requests were also made by Natural England.
- 10.114 The applicant submitted a letter; Barrington – Replan Applications (Southern Ecological Solutions, February 2022) in response to the above request. The letter provides evidence that there will be 14 ha of open space available for residents, which is well above the Strategic Accessible Natural Green Space (SANGS) calculations of 8 ha (based on a 2.4 person per household average) and a further circa 0.8ha for the additional units that this reconfiguration would generate.
- 10.115 The letter also provides analysis of the wider effects of the development on barbastelle bats associated with the Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC. The letter states that the effect of the development is likely to be low and that residual impact should be controlled through sensitive lighting scheme along the plantation woodland. The central area of development had the least bat activity and have now been mostly cleared so further bat surveys were not deemed necessary. A letter was also submitted explaining that it is not considered that an appropriate assessment is not required.
- 10.116 Following receipt of the above, the Ecology Officer no longer raises objection to the application, subject to conditions for a Construction Ecological management Plan (CEcMP), a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Plan and details of ecological enhancements such as bird and bat boxes. The Ecology Officer has confirmed that in their opinion an appropriate assessment is not required.
- 10.117 Natural England requested further information regarding the proposed lighting strategy which has since been provided and found to be

acceptable. A condition to secure this lighting strategy has been recommended accordingly.

- 10.118 In consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer and Natural England, subject to appropriate conditions, officers are satisfied that the proposed development complies with the NPPF, policy NH/4 of the Local Plan (2018), the Biodiversity SPD 2022, and 06/2005 Circular advice.

Water Management and Flood Risk

- 10.119 Policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 of the Local Plan require developments to have appropriate sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems and minimise flood risk. Paras. 159 – 169 of the NPPF are relevant.
- 10.120 The site is in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore considered at low risk of flooding.
- 10.121 The applicants have submitted a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (September 2021) and a Technical Note (August 2022) responding to requests for clarification from the Lead Local Flood Authority.
- 10.122 The application has been subject to formal consultation with Anglian Water, the Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineers. Following the submission of additional information, no objection is raised by any of the technical consultees, subject to conditions.
- 10.123 Officers acknowledge that concerns have been raised by local residents in respect of drainage, several of which have been addressed over the course of the application as further details have been submitted.
- 10.124 The information submitted demonstrates that surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the measures identified in the drainage strategy for the wider site. These measures include the discharge of surface water into the existing storage pond on the southern parcel and connect to the same downstream ditch system provided as part of the approved development. There will be a controlled discharge into the adjacent watercourse network at a limited rate of 5 l/s to ensure the total off site flow does not exceed 18.19 l/s for the 100-year storm including an allowance for climate change (40%) and urban creep (10%). Ditches, French drains and wet swales have been proposed around the perimeter of the site and finished floor levels will also be set a minimum of 150mm above ground levels.
- 10.125 To ensure the development provides a suitable drainage strategy that complies with relevant local and national planning policy a range of conditions are considered necessary, as recommended by the technical consultees.

- 10.126 A condition requiring the submission of a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the submitted Drainage Strategy and SuDS Report and Drainage Strategy Plan, prior to the commencement of development is considered reasonable and necessary as part of any consent to ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage and to prevent the increased risk of flooding.
- 10.127 A condition requiring details of measures indicating how additional surface water run-off from the site will be avoided during construction works is also considered appropriate prior to the commencement of development, to ensure surface water is managed appropriately during the construction phase and does not increase flood risk to adjacent land or properties.
- 10.128 Officers also consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition to require details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage scheme prior to first occupation to ensure satisfactory maintenance of any approved system that are not publicly adopted.
- 10.129 It is important to note that the several of the recommended conditions are pre-commencement conditions. Therefore, no development can take place on the site before a detailed surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with relevant technical consultees).
- 10.130 In terms of foul water drainage, no objection has been raised by Anglian Water or the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer subject to a condition requiring a scheme for foul water drainage works, which is considered reasonable and necessary.
- 10.131 Subject to the recommended conditions, officers are satisfied that the proposal would accord with Policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 of the Local Plan which requires developments to have an appropriate sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems and minimise flood risk.

Highway Safety and Transport Impacts

- 10.132 Policy HQ/1 states that proposals must provide safe and convenient access for all users and abilities to public buildings and spaces, including those with limited mobility or those with impairment such as sight or hearing.
- 10.133 Policy TI/2 requires developers to demonstrate adequate provision will be made to mitigate the likely impacts of the proposed development and, for larger developments, to demonstrate they have maximised opportunities for sustainable travel, and provided a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.
- 10.134 Para. 111 of the NPPF advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an

unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

- 10.135 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment (July 2021) and a Transport Assessment Addendum (March 2022).
- 10.136 Access to the site would utilise the same approved main access into the northern parcel from Haslingfield Road.
- 10.137 The Local Highway Authority has raised no objection to the continuation of this approach subject to conditions relating to the future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development and a traffic management plan, along with an informative relating to works to or within the public highway.
- 10.138 Officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose conditions relating to the future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development and a traffic management plan. Officers also consider it reasonable to include an informative relating to works to or within the public highway for the attention of the applicant.
- 10.139 The Transport Assessment and addendum has been subject to formal consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council's Transport Assessment Team, who raise no objection to the proposed development. The comments note that the development is required to provide off-site improvement works which would also benefit the future occupiers of the proposed site.
- 10.140 In consultation with the Transport Assessment Team, officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring the provision and implementation of a Travel Plan in the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site.
- 10.141 Subject to the recommended conditions and planning obligations secured through an appropriate legal agreement (S106) the proposal is considered acceptable and to accord with Policy TI/2 of the Local Plan and paragraphs 110 and 112 of the NPPF

Cycle and Car Parking Provision

- 10.142 Policies HQ/1 and TI/3 set out that car and cycle parking provision should be provided through a design-led approach in accordance with the indicative standards set out in Figure 11 of the Local Plan. Cycle parking should be provided to at least the minimum standards.

Cycle Parking

- 10.143 TI/3 requires 1 cycle space per bedroom. The supporting text advises that for residential purposes cycle parking should be within a covered, lockable enclosure and that for houses this could be in the form of a shed or

garage, for flats either individual lockers or cycle stands within a lockable, covered enclosure are required. All cycle parking should be designed and located to minimise conflict between cycles, pedestrians and vehicles.

- 10.144 Officers note that bike stores in the form of sheds are provided for the maisonettes, terraced and semi-detached properties within the gardens. The apartment block would have a bicycle store attached to the south-east elevation, although no details as to the type or number of bicycle spaces are provided on the plans. However, no clear plan has been provided to indicate the suitable provision of cycle parking for the detached dwellings. There is however clearly adequate room for cycle parking to be provided in either a shed or potentially within garages. Therefore, officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition to require the submission of appropriate secure and covered cycle parking prior to the occupation of any residential dwelling.

Car Parking

- 10.145 TI/3 requires 2 spaces per dwelling – 1 space to be allocated within the curtilage. The supporting text to the policy advises that the Council will encourage innovative solutions such as shared parking areas, for example where there are a mix of day and night uses, car clubs and provision of electric charging points and that a developer must provide clear justification for the level and type of parking proposed and will need to demonstrate they have addressed highway safety issues.
- 10.146 All dwellings aside from the 14no. one-bedroom maisonettes (Plot nos.147, 148, 151, 152, 200, 201, 208, 208, 231, 232, 243, 244, 249 and 250) and 9no. two-bedroom flats (plot nos. 251 – 259) all have access to two or more off street car parking spaces. The maisonettes are one bedroom properties which have provision for one parking space each. Whilst this is below that stipulated in policy TI/3, these are indicative standards and do not differentiate between provision for one-bedroom properties and larger 4 bedroom dwellings which are more likely to be occupied by a family. Paragraph 2 of policy TI/3 states that provision should take into consideration various factors such as car ownership levels, local services, facilities and public transport. The maisonettes are one-bedroom properties and are therefore least likely to own two vehicles or be inhabited by a family.
- 10.147 The two-bedroom flats are also below the standards stipulated in policy TI/3. However, it is pertinent to note that, as approved, these flats also only had one parking space each. Given that there is an extant permission that had this level of parking for the two-bedroom flats and this was found to be acceptable, it is considered that this level of parking provision is acceptable.
- 10.148 Given the size of the dwellings, the number of potential occupiers and the services within Barrington including shops, services and bus links to the city and the wider South Cambridgeshire area, officers consider that it is

much less likely that occupants of this house type would require two car parking spaces. It is considered that if there were additional cars resulting from more than one car per maisonette or flat, that this would not result in a significant highway or amenity impact. Officers highlight that these are indicative car parking standards which should be responsive to factors such as car ownership levels and access to services and transport links, and policy promotes the use of sustainable travel. Accordingly, officers consider the proposed level of car parking is acceptable.

- 10.149 The Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD outlines the standards for EV charging at one slow charge point for each dwelling with allocated parking, one slow charge point for every two dwellings with communal parking (at least half of all non-allocated parking spaces) and passive provision for all the remaining car parking spaces to provide capability for increasing provision in the future.
- 10.150 The proposed EV plan specifies the precise locations of electric vehicle charging points which are distributed effectively across the site by way of wall mounted, single post and twin posts. The Low Emissions Strategy condition recommended will secure this provision.
- 10.151 Subject to conditions, the proposal is considered to accord with policies HQ/1 and TI/3 of the Local Plan and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.

Amenity

- 10.152 Policy HQ/1 (n), sets out that proposals must protect the health and amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses from development that is overlooking, overbearing or results in a loss of daylight or development which would create unacceptable impacts such as noise, vibration, odour, emissions and dust.
- 10.153 The District Design Guide 2010 advises that to prevent the overlooking of habitable rooms to the rear of residential properties and rear private gardens, it is preferable that a minimum distance of 15m is provided between the windows and the property boundary. For two storey residential properties, a minimum distance of 25m should be provided between rear or side building faces containing habitable rooms, which should be increased to 30m for 3 storey residential properties. It advises that a 12 metre separation is allowed where blank walls are proposed opposite the windows to habitable rooms.

Neighbouring Properties

- 10.154 The proposed development would be over 450m from the nearest properties outside the site which are to the south of the site. Given this extensive separation distance, the proposed residential development would not give rise to any harmful residential amenity impacts such as loss of light, overlooking, visual enclosure, noise or disturbance.

10.155 The proposed development would be sited immediately to the north and east of the other phases of the wider site. However, it would be separated from these phases by the railway line buffer which dissects the site. Consequently, there would be a separation distance of over 35m between this northern parcel and the other phases to the south and west.

10.156 Overall, given the extensive separation distance between this parcel and the neighbouring phases of the wider site, the proposal is not considered to give rise to any harm to the future occupants of the adjacent parcels when occupied.

Future Occupants

10.157 Policy H/12 of the Local Plan states that new residential units will be permitted where their gross internal floor areas meet or exceed the Government's Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015) or successor document.

10.158 The gross internal floor space measurements for units in this application are shown in the table below:

Unit Type	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces (persons)	Number of storeys	Policy Size requirement (m ²)	Proposed size of unit	Difference in size
Private Units						
Bakewell	2	3	2	70	79	+9
Letchworth	2	3	2	70	91	+21
Amberley	3	4	2	84	106	+22
Stratford Q	3	4	2	84	111	+27
Oxford Q	3	4	2	84	122	+38
Leamington Q	3	4	2	84	132	+48
Canterbury 3	3	4	2	84	138	+50
Marlow M4(2)	4	5	2	97	120	+23
Shaftesbury	4	5	2	97	131	+34
Harrogate	4	6	2	106	144	+42
Richmond	4	6	2	106	189	+83
Henley	4	6	2	106	164	+58
Highgate 5	5	6	3	116	181	+65
Hampstead	4	7	2	128	172	+44
Affordable Units						
1B Maisonette (M4(2))	1	2	1	50	50	-
1B Maisonette	1	2	1	50	59	+9

2B Apartment	2	3	1	61	69	+8
Tavy +	2	4		79	79	-
Tavy M4(2)	2	4		79	79	-
Dartford	3	5		99	107	+8

10.159 The Urban Design Team have raised concerns that the front of plot parking proposed for plot nos. 200 – 213 only offers a 2m separation between the windows on the front elevation and the front of plot parking spaces and that this would result in a poor outlook, noise and lighting nuisance for future occupants. However, the space in front of each affected dwelling would be served by its own parking space (i.e. the parking space within 2m of plot no.200 would be the parking space of plot no.200). As a result, the impact would largely be self-contained and therefore the levels of nuisance are not considered to be harmful to the extent of compromising the living environment for future occupiers.

10.160 Paragraph 6.68 of the District Design Guide (2010) SPD states that for two storey residential properties, a minimum distance of 25m should be provided between rear or side building faces containing habitable rooms. The Urban Design Team have identified that the following plots do not comply with this requirement:

- The rear elevations of house nos. 153 - 156 13 are only 23.5m from the rear elevations of house nos. 162 – 163.
- The side elevation of house no 165 is only 7m from side elevation of house no 167.
- The rear elevation of house no 176 is only 23m from rear elevation of house no 177.
- The rear elevation of house no 185 is only 24m from rear elevation of house no 192.
- The rear elevation of house no 186 is only 23.5m from rear elevation of house no 191.
- The rear elevation of house no 195 is only 22.5m from rear elevation of house nos 212/213.
- The rear elevation of house no 196 is only 23m from rear elevation of house nos 209/10.
- The rear elevation of house no 197 is only 23m from rear elevation of house nos 205-6.
- The rear elevation of house no 198 is only 23m from rear elevation of house nos 203/204.

10.161 While officers appreciate that the separation distances are below the guidance recommended in the District Design Guide, the proposed distances between dwellings of over 22m is considered sufficient, taking into account the site layout and context. The 7m side-to-side elevation distance between nos. 165 and 167 is not considered to be problematic given that these elevations do not serve as the main outlooks for habitable rooms. Future occupants would have a high-quality living environment and

acceptable level of amenity. Furthermore, it is pertinent to note that the approved layout on this parcel of the wider site had separation distances equal and less than separation distances proposed on this parcel.

- 10.162 The matter of noise levels for future occupants has been addressed in the Barrington Chalk Pit section of this report.

Garden Sizes

- 10.163 The District Design Guide 2010 advises that each one or two-bedroom house should have private garden space of 40m² in urban settings and 50m² in rural settings; whilst each house with 3 bedrooms or more should have private garden space of 50m² in urban settings and 80m² in rural settings. Ground floor apartments should have a minimum of 10m² private amenity space immediately outside their living accommodation, or use of a communal garden, where 25m² is allowed for each apartment. Upper floor apartments should have use of a private balcony, of a minimum of 3m², plus use of a communal garden, where 25m² is allowed for each apartment.
- 10.164 Each property would benefit from a private garden area or balcony which would meet or exceed the recommendations of the Council's District Design Guide.
- 10.165 One exception to this is the three-bedroom house on plot no.225 which would have a garden of 70m², 10m² less than the 80m² standards in the District Design Guide. It is not considered that this deficit is so significant as to result in the future occupants of this dwelling having a poor-quality living environment. There is also a greater quantum of public open space present on site than required by Local Plan policy.
- 10.166 The other exception is the lack of a designated communal garden for the flats. These flats do all have private balconies which far exceed the 3m² minimum standard. It's pertinent to note that there was not any communal space designated on the extent permission as approved. Furthermore, there is a significant quantum of public open space present within walking distance on the wider site.
- 10.167 Overall, each Plot within the development is considered to be provided with a reasonable degree of amenity that is not significantly compromised by the proposed layout or existing development adjacent to the site.

Conclusion

- 10.168 The proposal adequately respects the amenity of its neighbours and of future occupants. Subject to conditions, the proposal is compliant with Local Plan Policy HQ/1 and the District Design Guide SPD (2010).

Third Party Representations

10.169 The remaining third-party representations not addressed in the preceding paragraphs are summarised and responded to in the table below:

Third Party Comment	Officer Response
<p>Highway safety and traffic generation concerns. Additional traffic which will cause significant damage to the character of the village even before environmental considerations are considered;</p>	<p>The Local Highway Authority and County Council Transport Assessment Team has raised no objection to the proposal subject to conditions and S106 contributions. The addition of 37no. dwellings above what was approved on this parcel would not result in an unacceptable increase in traffic movements to and from the site. The additional traffic movements are not considered to pose any harm to the character of the village.</p>
<p>Local cycle paths are poor</p>	<p>The approved application and S106 agreement attached to this requires improvements to cycle paths. This is not affected by the proposed increase of 37no. dwellings on this parcel.</p>
<p>Water supply in area is struggling to meet demand</p>	<p>Anglian Water have been consulted and have raised no objection to the proposed works subject to condition. A condition is also recommended regarding water efficiency measures.</p>
<p>The new build estate does not match the character of either village. The increase of dwellings is of too great a scale and mass. Development too dense near boundaries Permanent long-term harm to the village life and environment will occur.</p>	<p>The development clearly reads distinct from the character of adjacent villages. This in of itself is not considered to cause harm to the character and appearance of the wider area. The scale, massing and density of the proposed development is considered to align with what's been approved previously on the wider site and not harmful to the character and appearance of the area.</p>
<p>The modern housing estate will dominate and change the nature of the conservation area and listed buildings;</p>	<p>The proposed development is a significant distance from the conservation area and any listed buildings. It would not have a harmful impact on either of these heritage assets due to the extensive separation distance.</p>
<p>The village would be doubled in size if the incremental</p>	<p>The additional dwellings would not have an unacceptable impact on local services and facilities. Contributions towards improvements</p>

<p>development on the south-east and northern parcels goes ahead.</p> <p>Pressure on local infrastructure and facilities (e.g. drainage, water supply, sewage, medical provision, school places and village recreation facilities).</p>	<p>to facilitate the extra dwellings towards education, open space and community facilities will be secured through a Section 106 agreement where appropriate. Anglian Water have been consulted and have raised no objection to the proposed works subject to a foul water drainage condition.</p>
<p>Cemex assured local residents there would be a maximum of 220no. houses.</p>	<p>This is not a material planning consideration. Each application will be assessed on its own merits, taking into account the site planning history.</p>
<p>The countryside needs to be preserved and re-wilded, not developed;</p>	<p>The site is brownfield land.</p>
<p>Traffic from this development will be further worsened if the East West railway (Oxford-Cambridge) goes ahead along the southern route, as the road serving the development (Haslingfield via Chapel Hill) will turn into a dead end, as there is no plan to provide either a level crossing or an underpass. As such the Barton route into Cambridge will only be accessible via Orwell and traffic through Barrington along the green will increase.</p>	<p>The East-West Railway is at a very early stage and therefore no significant weight can be attached to this emerging proposal.</p>
<p>If approved, a condition requiring the unused open space to be for necessary communal facilities should be imposed.</p>	<p>These have not been identified as necessary by the Section 106 Team.</p>

<p>The 17.72ha of open space could accommodate more on-site facilities like tennis courts, scout hut, angler provision etc;</p>	
<p>There is no mention of the allotments in para 2.43 of the applicant's statement about the facilities being provided. Why is this? Surely it is germane to the developer's argument.</p>	<p>Allotments are proposed on the wider site.</p>
<p>The emerging Local Plan will restrict development in villages like Barrington in favour of larger agglomerations, so I believe the application should be denied on these grounds alone.</p>	<p>The emerging Local Plan is at a relatively early stage in the plan making process and only limited weight can be attached to this. Regardless, this site has an extant permission for residential development.</p>
<p>The LEAP/NEAP and Trim Trail are only of benefit to the residents of the new development and are of no benefit the existing residents of the village due to their distance away from the rest of potential users and their children</p>	<p>These have been identified as necessary to help connect the development to the village and will be available for all residents to use.</p>
<p>Barrington Parish Council has pointed out forcefully that the centre of the village is a Conservation Area and there are few opportunity to insert new facilities into the area.</p>	<p>The Section 106 Team and Barrington Parish Council have both identified projects/ facilities within the village that the development can contribute to enhancing.</p>
<p>Increased flood risk</p>	<p>The Lead Local Flood Authority and the Council's Drainage Officer have raised no objection to the proposals subject to conditions.</p>

Open Space and Recreation

10.170 Policy SC/7 requires all housing developments to contribute towards outdoor play space (including children's play space, formal outdoor sports facilities) and informal open space in accordance with the following minimum standards.

- Outdoor sports – 1.6 ha per 1,000 people;
- Formal children's play space – 0.4 ha per 1,000 people;
- Informal children's play space – 0.4 ha per 1,000 people; and
- Informal open space – 0.4 ha per 1,000 people.
- Allotments and community orchards – 0.4 ha per 1,000 people.

10.171 Based on the mix of housing provided the following would be required:

- Outdoor sports space: 1,257m² (0.1257ha)
- Formal children's play space: 314m² (0.0314ha)
- Informal children's play space: 314m² (0.0314ha)
- Informal open space: 314m² (0.0314ha)
- Allotments and community orchards: 314m² (0.0314ha)

10.172 The 220 dwelling approved development had the following open space requirements and provision:

Bedrooms	1	2	3	4+	Total Required	Total Provided
No. of dwellings	6	54	84	76	N/A	220
Persons	8.04	94.5	203.28	252.32	N/A	558.14
Outdoor Sports (ha)	0.012	0.151	0.326	0.404	0.893	Contribution
Formal Children's Play Space (ha)	0.003	0.038	0.081	0.101	0.223	0.3278
Informal Children's Play Space (ha)	0.003	0.038	0.081	0.101	0.223	0.619
Informal Open Space (ha)	0.003	0.038	0.081	0.101	0.223	16.64
Allotments (ha)	0.003	0.038	0.081	0.101	0.223	1.02
Total Open Space (ha)	0.026	0.3	0.65	0.81	1.786	18.6

10.173 The total number of dwellings that would be accommodated on the wider site as a result of the proposed application and open space requirements would be as follows:

Bedrooms	1	2	3	4+	Total Required	Total Provided
No. of dwellings	24	81	70	85	N/A	260
Persons	32.16	141.75	169.4	282.2		625.51
Outdoor Sports (ha)	0.051	0.226	0.271	0.451	1.000	Contribution
Formal Children's Play Space (ha)	0.128	0.056	0.677	0.113	0.250	0.3278
Informal Children's Play Space (ha)	0.128	0.056	0.677	0.113	0.250	0.619
Informal Open Space (ha)	0.128	0.056	0.677	0.113	0.250	16.1
Allotments (ha)	0.128	0.056	0.677	0.113	0.250	1.02
Total Open Space (ha)	0.103	0.453	0.543	0.093	2.001	18.07

10.174 As demonstrated in the tables above, despite the provision of 37no. extra dwellings, the future occupants of the proposal, when considered in the context of the wider site, would have access to open space that significantly exceed the required levels.

10.175 A contribution towards formal sports provision in the form of contributions towards a football pitch, sports pavilion, tennis court and associated car parking is sought. Contributions towards formal children's play space on Challis Green play area are also sought.

10.176 The proposal accords with policy SC/7 of the Local Plan.

Planning Obligations (S106)

10.177 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and

- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 10.178 The applicant has indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Local Plan and the NPPF.
- 10.179 Policy TI/8 'Infrastructure and New Developments' states that Planning permission will only be granted for proposals that have made suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms. The nature, scale and phasing of any planning obligations and/or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions sought will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact upon the surrounding area.
- 10.180 The contributions have been based on the provision of the 37no. additional dwellings and the population that this proposed development would generate above what was previously approved on this parcel of the site.
- 10.181 In consultation with the Council's Section 106 Officer a range of contributions are required as part of the proposed development.
- 10.182 For outdoor sports space a contribution of £74,335.96 is required to mitigate the impact of the proposed development, with the funds directed towards football pitch (£20,181.65), sports pavilion (£25,227.34), tennis court (£20,181.65) and the associated car park (£8,745.32).
- 10.183 In terms of formal children's play space, an offsite contribution of £18,500 for the provision of new and maintenance/ replacement of existing play equipment at the Challis Green Play area is required.
- 10.184 Indoor community space is to be addressed through an offsite contribution of £215,272.66 towards the extension to the Barrington Village Hall. An offsite contribution of £8,408.99 towards improvements to pedestrian footpaths and improvements to the river walks within the Parish of Barrington is required.
- 10.185 A community fee of £5,886.33 is sought, as are £1,000 towards monitoring fees and £3,145 towards household waste receptacles.
- 10.186 Contributions are also sought by Cambridgeshire County Council in respect of education who have commented formally on the application.
- 10.187 An early year's education contribution of £73,252 towards new early years place in Barrington is required. A secondary education contribution of £93,651 towards the expansion of Melbourn Village College is required. A library contribution of £1,388 towards the enhancement of facilities in Barrington is required, as well as a monitoring fee of £150.

10.188 Cambridgeshire County Council has also sought contributions in respect of transport mitigation. A contribution of £18,500 is sought towards the implementation of an improved crossing over Haslingfield Road in the vicinity of Barrington Primary School. A contribution of £4,625 towards the implementation of traffic calming on Barrington Road within Foxton is also sought. The Travel Plan (including Travel Welcome Pack) sought has been recommended to be secured by way of condition.

10.189 The planning obligations are necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the required planning obligation(s) passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and are in accordance with Policy TI/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018).

Other Matters

Broadband

10.190 LP policy TI/10 'Broadband' requires new development to contribute towards the provision of infrastructure suitable to enable the delivery of high-speed broadband services across the District. A condition is proposed to ensure this provision.

Air Quality

10.191 The Council's Air Quality Officer has raised no objection to the proposal subject to conditions regarding emissions ratings being met. These conditions have been recommended and are necessary to ensure compliance with Local Plan (2018) Policy SC/12.

Lighting

10.192 Officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring external lighting to be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the submitted information to ensure compliance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the Local Plan.

Refuse/ Waste

10.193 A refuse strategy has been submitted with the application which demonstrates that there is adequate space for bin storage on each plot and that there is a bin collection point or communal bin collection point for all properties.

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue

10.194 The comments of Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue are noted. Officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition to secure the adequate provision of fire hydrants.

Noise

- 10.195 Noting the comments of the Council's Environmental Health Officer, officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring the submission of a Demolition Construction Environment Management Plan, noise mitigation measures as recommended by the Council's Environmental Health Team will be secured by way of condition to ensure compliance with Policy CC/6 of the Local Plan, alongside the informatives for disturbance, air source heat pumps and statutory noise nuisance.

Contaminated Land

- 10.196 The application is supported by a Phase I Geo Environmental Study and Walkover Report (September 2021).
- 10.197 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Contaminated Land Officer and the Environment Agency who raise no objection to the proposed development, subject to conditions regarding land contamination, surface water run off during construction and piling. These are considered necessary and reasonable to ensure compliance with Policy SC/11 of the Local Plan.

Planning Balance

- 10.198 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
- 10.199 The proposal would be contrary to Policy S/7 of the Local Plan insofar as being a major residential development outside of a development framework boundary. However, officers consider there to be limited conflict with Policy S/7 in terms of countryside encroachment given the extant permission that exists on the site for residential development and the lack of visual intrusion from the development of the formerly approved open space.
- 10.200 The provision of 113no. dwellings to a Group Village, which sets an indicative maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings or in exception about 15 dwellings on a brownfield site, would conflict with the aspirations of Policies S/2(e), S/6, S/7 and S/10 which set out and shape the settlement strategy for the district and seek to concentrate development in the most sustainable locations and villages with the greatest range of services and facilities.
- 10.201 However, the 2017 extant permission is a material consideration and it has already been determined that the development of 76no. dwellings, as part of the wider development of 220 dwellings (223 dwellings if 21/04088/FUL

- implemented), would represent a sustainable form of development. There have been no significant changes to the services and facilities available to serve the development. The proposed additional 37no. dwellings to bring this parcel of the site up to 113no. dwellings would not in the view of officers result in the level of development becoming unsustainable.
- 10.202 45no. (40%) of the 113no. dwellings proposed would be affordable dwellings that would contribute to an identified need. There would be a 11% net gain in biodiversity which would be secured by condition. Financial contributions towards the improvement of existing village facilities, education and libraries would be secured by way of a Section 106 Agreement.
- 10.203 Officers acknowledged that there are concerns raised by the Urban Design Team regarding the proposal, including some conflict with guidance within the Council's District Design Guide SPD. However, the conflict must be weighed against the fact that there is an extant permission on this parcel of land which has a similar layout and design and therefore cannot be said to be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
- 10.204 It is accepted that noise experienced at the boundaries of residential properties would likely exceed 55db. This would likely result in the associated condition no.38 on the Cemex permission adjacent from being able to be complied with. However, again, it is pertinent to note that there is an extant permission on this parcel of land which also would have residential boundaries that would experience noise levels in excess of 55db. This applies on both the north and south side of the railway line. The applicant has submitted sufficient information to demonstrate that, subject to noise mitigation measures, the 55db limit can be met within the internal and external living spaces of the proposed dwellings. From a residential planning perspective, the application has demonstrated that future occupants would have an acceptable living environment in terms of noise.
- 10.205 The proposal clearly represents a significant departure from the development plan and has been advertised as such. Given the extant permission on the site, officers consider that the proposed addition of 37no. dwellings above what was previously approved on this parcel would be difficult to be considered to represent an unsustainable form of development. Nonetheless, the development is contrary to the Council's settlement strategy as a matter of principle.
- 10.206 Very limited other harm has been identified that would weigh against the proposal, while the use of planning conditions can secure appropriate detailing and technical information such that the proposal would accord with Local Plan policies in all other regards.
- 10.207 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations including the 2017 extant planning permission, the, the application is

recommended for approval subject to conditions and completion of a legal (s106) agreement.

Recommendation

10.208 Approve subject to;

1. Completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As amended) as set out in the Planning Obligations sections of the report and;
2. Conditions and informatives set out below and;
3. Minor amendments to the conditions and Heads of Terms of the legal agreement as drafted, delegated to officers.

Planning Conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 3 No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The principal areas of concern that should be addressed are:

- a. Movement and control of muck away vehicles (all loading and unloading should be undertaken where possible off the adopted public highway)
- b. Contractor parking, with all such parking to be within the curtilage of the site where possible
- c. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway where possible.)
- d. Control of dust, mud and debris, and the means to prevent mud or debris being deposited onto the adopted public highway.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that before development commences, highway safety will be maintained during the course of development.

- 4 No development, including preparatory works, shall commence until details of measures indicating how additional surface water run-off from the site will be avoided during the construction works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The applicant may be required to provide collection, balancing and/or settlement systems for these flows. The approved measures and systems shall be brought into operation before any works to create buildings or hard surfaces commence.

Reason: To ensure surface water is managed appropriately during the construction phase of the development, so as not to increase the flood risk to adjacent land/properties or occupied properties within the development itself; recognising that initial works to prepare the site could bring about unacceptable impacts in accordance with South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) Policy CC/9.

- 5 No development shall commence until a further scheme for the investigation and recording of contamination and remediation objectives have been determined through risk assessment and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Detailed proposal for the removal, containment or otherwise rendering harmless any contamination (the remediation strategy) for that phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall include the following components:

- a. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
 - i. all previous uses;
 - ii. potential contaminants associated with those uses;
 - iii. a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors; and
 - iv. potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site
- b. A site investigation scheme, based on (a) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off-site.
- c. The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (b) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
- d. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (c) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy SC/11 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2021; paragraphs 174, 183, 184), Water Framework Directive, Anglian River Basin Management Plan and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Position Statements.

- 6 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a monitoring and maintenance plan in respect of contamination, including a timetable of monitoring and submission of reports to the local planning authority, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Reports as specified in the approved plan, including details of any necessary contingency action arising from the monitoring, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy SC/11 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2021; paragraphs 174, 183, 184), Water Framework Directive, Anglian River Basin Management Plan and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Position Statements

- 7 No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (ref: 190436-RGL-ZZ-XX-RP-C-0004 Rev S2-P01) dated 08.09.2021 prepared by Rolton Group and Technical Note (ref 190436-RGL-ZZ-XX-RP-C-0005 Rev S2-P01) and shall include where appropriate:

- a. Full calculations detailing the existing surface water runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events;

- b. Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with an assessment of system performance;
- c. Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers;
- d. Details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;
- e. Site Investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;
- f. Temporary storage facilities if the development is to be phased;
- g. A timetable for implementation if the development is to be phased;
- h. Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants or to third party receptors downstream of the site;
- i. Details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
- j. Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water

The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the implementation programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage and to prevent the increased risk of flooding in accordance with Policies CC/7 and CC/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 8 No development, including demolition, shall commence until a site wide Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The DCEMP shall include the consideration of the following aspects of demolition and construction:

- a. Demolition, construction and phasing programme.
- b. Contractors' access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel including the location of construction traffic routes to, from and within the site, details of their signing, monitoring and enforcement measures.
- c. Construction/Demolition hours which shall be carried out between 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless in accordance with agreed emergency procedures for deviation.
- d. Delivery times and collections / dispatches for construction/demolition purposes shall be carried out between 0800 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 hours on Saturdays and at

no time on Sundays, bank or public holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- e. Soil Management Strategy having particular regard to potential contaminated land and the reuse and recycling of soil on site, the importation and storage of soil and materials including audit trails.
- f. Noise impact assessment methodology, mitigation measures, noise monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites.
- g. Vibration impact assessment methodology, mitigation measures, monitoring and recording statements in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-2:2009+A1:2014 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Details of any piling construction methods / options, as appropriate.
- h. Dust mitigation, management / monitoring and wheel washing measures in accordance with the provisions of Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - Greater Cambridge supplementary planning guidance 2020.
- i. Use of concrete crushers.
- j. Prohibition of the burning of waste on site during demolition/construction.
- k. Site artificial lighting including hours of operation, position and impact on neighbouring properties.
- l. Drainage control measures including the use of settling tanks, oil interceptors and bunds.
- m. Screening and hoarding details.
- n. Access and protection arrangements around the site for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.
- o. Procedures for interference with public highways, including permanent and temporary realignment, diversions and road closures.
- p. External safety and information signing and notices.
- q. Implementation of a Stakeholder Engagement/Residents Communication Plan, Complaints procedures, including complaints response procedures.
- r. Membership of the Considerate Contractors Scheme.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved DCEMP.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties in accordance with Policy CC/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 9 No development shall commence until a site-based Low Emission Strategy (LES) is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LES shall include the following:
- a. Provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Points for all dwellings with on-site parking
 - b. An implementation plan for each of the above measures. The details to be provided shall include location of charging unit, capacity,

charge rate, details of model, location of cabling and electric infrastructure drawings.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved LES and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of reducing impacts of developments on local air quality and encouraging sustainable forms of transport in accordance with Policies SC/12 and TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

- 10 No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until details of a hard and soft landscaping scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:
- a. proposed finished levels or contours; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. Street furniture, artwork, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, CCTV installations and water features); proposed (these need to be coordinated with the landscape plans prior to being installed) and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant;
 - b. planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme;
- If within a period of five years from the date of the planting, or replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place as soon as is reasonably practicable, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.
- c. boundary treatments (including gaps for hedgehogs) indicating the type, positions, design, and materials of boundary treatments to be erected.
 - d. a landscape maintenance and management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas.

Reason: To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 11 No development shall commence (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEcMP shall include the following:
- a. Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
 - b. Identification of biodiversity protection zones.
 - c. Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
 - d. The location and timings of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
 - e. The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
 - f. Responsible persons and lines of communication.
 - g. The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
 - h. Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs if applicable.

The approved CEcMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that before any development commences appropriate construction ecological management plan has been agreed to fully conserve and enhance ecological interests in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 12 No development shall commence until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The LEMP shall include the following:
- a. Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
 - b. Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
 - c. Aims and objectives of management.
 - d. Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
 - e. Prescriptions for management actions.
 - f. Prescription of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).
 - g. Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan.
 - h. Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.

The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that before any development commences an appropriate landscape and ecological management plan has been agreed in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 13 No development shall commence, apart from below ground works and demolition, until a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The BNG Plan shall target how a minimum net gain in biodiversity will be achieved through a combination of on-site, on-the wider site and / or off-site mitigation. The BNG Plan shall include:
- a. A hierarchical approach to BNG focussing first on maximising on-site BNG, second delivering off-site BNG at a site(s) of strategic biodiversity importance, and third delivering off-site BNG locally to the application site;
 - b. Full details of the respective on and off-site BNG requirements and proposals resulting from the loss of habitats on the development site utilising the latest appropriate DEFRA metric;
 - c. Identification of the existing habitats and their condition on-site and within receptor site(s);
 - d. Habitat enhancement and creation proposals on the application site and /or receptor site(s) utilising the latest appropriate DEFRA metric;
 - e. An implementation, management and monitoring plan (including identified responsible bodies) for a period of 30 years for on and off-site proposals as appropriate.

The BNG Plan shall be implemented in full and subsequently managed and monitored in accordance with the approved details. Monitoring data as appropriate to criterion v) shall be submitted to the local planning authority in accordance with the latest DEFRA guidance and the approved monitoring period / intervals.

Reason: To provide ecological enhancements in accordance with the NPPF 2021 para 174, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 policy NH/4 and the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Biodiversity SPD 2022.

- 14 No development of the building labelled 'Flat Block B (plot nos. 251 – 259)' as shown on drawing no. 8502-22-02-01G shall commence until details of the Perspex acoustic screens to be installed on the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 15 Prior to the first occupation of the development details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved details until such time as an Agreement has been entered into unto Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a Private Management and Maintenance Company has been established.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to achieve a permeable development with ease of movement and access for all users and abilities in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 16 Details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the buildings hereby permitted. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publicly adopted, in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

- 17 No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until foul water drainage works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development in accordance with South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) Policies CC/7 and CC/9.

- 18 Prior to each phase of development being occupied, a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy SC/11 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2021; paragraphs 174, 183, 184), Water Framework Directive, Anglian River Basin Management Plan and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Position Statements.

- 19 No dwellings shall be occupied until a water efficiency specification for each dwelling type, based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach set out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that all dwellings are able to achieve a design standard of water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2018 policy CC/4 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020).

- 20 Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve the development to a standard recommended by the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented.

Reason: To ensure an adequate water supply is available for emergency use in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 21 Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling, infrastructure to enable the delivery of broadband services, to industry standards, shall be provided for that dwelling.

Reason: To contribute towards the provision of infrastructure suitable to enable the delivery of high speed broadband across the district, in accordance with policy TI/10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 22 No gas fired combustion appliances shall be installed until details demonstrating the use of low Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) combustion boilers, (i.e., individual gas fired boilers that meet a dry NOx emission rating of $\leq 540\text{mg/kWh}$), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. If the proposals include any gas fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP) System, the details shall demonstrate that the system meets the following emissions standards for various engines types:
- Spark ignition engine: less than or equal to 150 mg NOx/Nm^3
 - Compression ignition engine: less than 400 mg NOx/Nm^3
 - Gas turbine: less than 50 mg NOx/Nm^3

The details shall include a manufacturer's Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) emission test certificate or other evidence to demonstrate that every appliance installed meets the emissions standards above.

The approved appliances shall be fully installed and operational before the development is occupied or the use is commenced and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect local air quality and human health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter are kept to a minimum during the lifetime of the development in accordance with policy SC/12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 23 If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy SC/11 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2021; paragraphs 174, 183, 184), Water Framework Directive, Anglian River Basin Management Plan and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Position Statements.

- 24 Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy SC/11 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2021; paragraphs 174, 183, 184), Water Framework Directive, Anglian River Basin Management Plan and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Position Statements.

- 25 The materials to be used in the external construction of the development hereby permitted shall follow the specifications in accordance with the details specified within drawing no. 8502-22-02-02 Revision E unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the external appearance of the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 26 During demolition or construction there shall be no bonfires or burning of waste on site.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties in accordance with Policy CC/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 27 The development shall be constructed in strict accordance with the noise mitigation measures recommended in the Redrow Homes South Midlands Limited, Former Cemex Cement Works, Barrington, Southern Parcel, Noise Assessment (dated 4 January 2023) prepared by Accon UK Environmental Consultants.

Reason: To provide an acceptable living environment for future occupants in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and SC/10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 28 The external lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the submitted information; drawing no. Q4188-C4188B-1300-001 Revision A (13/10/2022), document titled 'Outdoor Lighting Report' prepared by Balfour Beatty Living Places (12/10/2022) and document titled 'Design Review and Risk Assessment Record' prepared by Balfour Beatty Living Places (05/06/2017) unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To protect the ecological interests of the Special Area of Conservation and Site of Special Scientific Interest known as Eversden and Wimpole Woods in accordance with Policy NH/5 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

- 29 The approved renewable/low carbon energy technologies (as set out in the Energy & Sustainability Statement - August 2021) shall be fully installed and operational prior to the occupation of each dwelling hereby approved.

Where grid capacity issues subsequently arise, written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and a revised Energy Statement to take account of this shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The revised Energy Statement shall be implemented development and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution (South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, policy CC/3 and Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD).

- 30 The approved tree protection methodology (Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement August 2021, SES) shall be implemented throughout the development and the agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with approved tree protection plans, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority. If any tree shown to be retained is damaged, remedial works as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority will be carried out.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that trees to be retained will not be damaged during any construction activity, including demolition, in order to preserve arboricultural amenity in accordance with Policy NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Background Papers:

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework SPDs
- Planning File References: 21/04088/FUL, 21/04524/S73, 20/02528/S73, S/3485/18/RM, S/0057/17/VC, S/2365/14/OL

This page is left blank intentionally.

Agenda Item 7



Planning Committee Date	8th February 2023
Report to	South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee
Lead Officer	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
Reference	22/04018/OUT
Site	Fenny Lane Farm, Fenny Lane, Meldreth
Ward / Parish	Meldreth
Proposal	Outline Application with all matters reserved other than access for the erection of nine self- build dwellings
Applicant	Mrs Philippa and Joanne Hart
Presenting Officer	Katie Christodoulides
Reason Reported to Committee	Called-in by Meldreth Parish Council
Member Site Visit Date	N/A
Key Issues	1. Principle of Development 2. Character and Appearance of Area 3. Landscaping 4. Highway Safety and Parking Provision 5. Flood Risk and Drainage
Recommendation	REFUSE

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The application seeks Outline planning permission for all matters reserved other than access for the erection of nine self-build dwellings.
- 1.2 Officers consider that the proposal would result in development outside of the village development framework and in an unsustainable location in which most journeys would be by car. Whilst the need for self-build dwellings in the district is not in dispute, the contribution to self-build dwellings in the area is not considered to outweigh the material harm the proposal would have to the character of the open rural landscape, village development character and village edge.
- 1.3 Officers consider that the proposal would result in significant encroachment of built form into the open countryside which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the rural countryside and the back land development would be out of character with the linear development form of the area.
- 1.4 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee refuse the application.

2.0 Site Description and Context

None relevant		Tree Preservation Order	
Conservation Area		Local Nature Reserve	
Listed Building		Flood Zone 1, 2 and 3	X
Building of Local Interest		Green Belt	
Historic Park and Garden		Protected Open Space	
Scheduled Ancient Monument		Controlled Parking Zone	
Local Neighbourhood and District Centre		Article 4 Direction	

- 2.1 The application site comprises of paddock land and private allotment land which lies outside of the Meldreth Village Development Framework and within the open countryside. The Village Development Framework boundary lies adjacent to the east and south of the site. The site lies predominately within Flood Zone 1 (low risk), with a small part of the site, adjacent to the eastern boundary, being located within Flood Zones 2 (medium risk) and 3 (high risk). The site forms Grade 2 agricultural land and is relatively flat and level.

3.0 The Proposal

- 3.1 The application seeks Outline planning permission for all matters reserved other than access for the erection of nine self-build dwellings.
- 3.2 The proposal for 9 dwellings would site plots 1 and 2 to the side (east) and rear (north) of No.24 Fenny Lane and plots 3-9 would be sited to the rear (north) of neighbouring properties Nos.20, 18 and 14 Fenny Lane. The proposal would form a cul-de sac development accessed off one vehicular access from Fenny Lane. Each dwelling would have provision of two car parking spaces.
- 3.3 The application has been amended to address representations and further consultations have been carried out as appropriate, in regard to an amended drainage strategy and revised site and layout plans.

4.0 Relevant Site History

On the site: No planning history.

Adjacent to site but within Fenny Lane Farm: Planning history below.

Reference	Description	Outcome
20/04418/CONDB	Submission of details required by condition 6 (Verification Report) of planning permission 20/04418/PRI03Q	Discharge conditions in full.
20/04418/CONDA	Submission of details required by condition 3 (Contaminated Land), 4(Surface Water Design) and 5 (Biodiversity Enhancement) of planning permission 20/04418/PRI03Q-	Discharge conditions in full.
20/04418/PRI03Q	Prior approval of change of use of agricultural building to 1 No. dwellinghouses (Class C3)-	Prior Approval Given.
20/03484/FUL	Conversion of existing Chitting Shed and Barn into 3 No. dwellings	Approved
20/03484/CONDC	Submission of details required by condition 2 (Verification Report)of permission 20/03484/FUL	Discharge Condition in Full.
20/03484/CONDB	Submission of details required by condition 2 (Contaminated Land Verification Report) of planning permission 20/03484/FUL	Discharge Condition in Part.
20/02122/PRI03Q	Prior approval for change of use of agricultural buildings to 3 No. dwellinghouses (Class C3) and for building operations	Prior Approval Required.

	reasonably necessary for the conversion	
S/3600/19/DC	Discharge of condition 2 (Traffic Conditions Management Plan) 3 (Site access) 4 (Refuse bins) 5 (Contamination), 6 Discharged. (Contamination - Remediation), 8 (Roofing samples) 9 (Boundary treatment) 10 (Foul and surface water) 11 (Arboricultural method statement) and 12 (Bat ecology report) of planning permission S/3418/18/PA.	Accepted Not discharged
S/3418/18/PA	Application for prior approval for the conversion of a timber barn into 2no. dwellings the conversion of a brick chitting shed into 1 No. dwelling the conversion of a timber cart shed into 1 no. dwelling and the demolition of one redundant barn and some lean too structures to provide private amenity and car parking space.	Approved
S/2065/15/PB	Prior Approval Application - Proposal to convert two agricultural buildings into three dwellings.	Approved.

5.0 Policy

5.1 National

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2019

Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015)

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Environment Act 2021

ODPM Circular 06/2005 – Protected Species

Equalities Act 2010

5.2 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018

S/1 – Vision

S/2 – Objectives of the Local Plan

S/3 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 S/7 – Development Frameworks
 S/10 Group Villages
 CC/1 – Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Change
 CC/3 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments
 CC/4 – Water Efficiency
 CC/6 – Construction Methods
 CC/7 – Water Quality
 CC/8 – Sustainable Drainage Systems
 CC/9 – Managing Flood Risk
 HQ/1 – Design Principles
 NH/2 – Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
 NH/3 – Protecting Agricultural Land
 NH/4 – Biodiversity
 NH/14 – Heritage Assets
 H/8 – Housing Density
 H/9 – Housing Mix
 H/12 – Residential Space Standards
 SC/1 Allocation for Open Space
 SC/7 – Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space & New Developments
 SC/9 – Lighting Proposals
 SC/10 – Noise Pollution
 TI/2 – Planning for Sustainable Travel
 TI/3 – Parking Provision
 TI/8 – Infrastructure and New Developments
 TI/9 - Education facilities
 TI/10 – Broadband

5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022
 Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020
 Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

- 5.4 The following SPDs were adopted to provide guidance to support previously adopted Development Plan Documents that have now been superseded by the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. These documents are still material considerations when making planning decisions, with the weight in decision making to be determined on a case-by-case basis:

Landscape in New Developments SPD – Adopted March 2010
 District Design Guide SPD – Adopted March 2010
 Open Space in New Developments SPD – Adopted January 2009
 Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009
 Maintenance of Sustainable Drainage Systems – Adopted 2016

6.0 Consultations

6.1 Parish Council – Object

- 6.2 Further comments received 19.01.2023
- 6.3 Raises objections in regard to the proposal being contrary to policies S/7 and NH/2 of the Local Plan, as the proposal is outside of the framework and would densify a low density village edge. Concern regarding flood risk to the neighbouring property at 14 Fenny Lane.
- 6.4 Original comments received 21.10.2022
- 6.5 Does not support and asks for it to be referred to Planning Committee for the following reasons:
- The proposal would be an inappropriate use of a rural exception site that is not accommodated in the planning policies.
 - There are obvious issues of precedents being consequentially established for other sites in the village and protection of current planning policies and their importance to residents could be severely diluted or lost.
- 6.6 **County Highways Development Management -No objection**
- 6.7 Further comments 15.11.22
- 6.8 The Authority will not seek to adopt any part of this development in its present format as the proposed layout is unacceptable.
- 6.9 If the Planning Authority is minded to approve please add conditions regarding:
- 6.10 Bound material;
Falls and Levels of the access;
Pedestrian visibility splays;
Traffic Management Plan;
Details of future management and maintenance of the streets;
The agricultural access to the proposed site not being used by any demolition or construction vehicles with a gross weight in excess of 3.5 tonnes;
The vehicular crossing of the ditch and watercourse being constructed in accordance with a scheme to be agreed.
- 6.11 Original comments received 21.10.2022
- 6.12 The application has failed to provide a fully dimensioned access drawing as a stand alone plan.
- 6.13 **Sustainable Drainage Officer – No objection**
- 6.14 Recommends conditions in regard to:
- Surface water drainage scheme;

Management and maintenance for the surface water drainage system;
Details for foul water drainage and finished floor levels of plots adjacent to watercourse.

6.15 Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection

6.16 Further Comments 20.1.2023 – The documents demonstrate that surface water from the proposal can be managed through the use of permeable paving and geocellular attenuation, restricting surface water discharge. The principles of how surface water discharges from the site should remain unchanged. The mapping does not show this site as having an increased risk if surface water flooding. Any development within the site is to take place in Flood Zone 1 and the risk of flooding to the properties is minimised and flood water should not be displaced outside of the site.

6.17 Recommends conditions in regard to detailed design of the surface water drainage, details of the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system and details of measures of how additional surface water run-off from the site will be avoided during the construction works.

6.18 Original comments 23.11.2022

6.19 Objects to the application as the outfall from the site will pass through the curtilage of plot 6, passing through third party land, prior to discharging into the existing watercourse. The proposal that the piped network leading to the outfall will be located within the curtilage of an individual property creates access issues for the maintenance and management.

6.20 Environment Agency – No objection

6.21 The receiving Water Recycling Centre has limited capacity and confirmation required with Anglian Water that they can receive the foul drainage without exceeding their permit limits with the Environment Agency or that any necessary infrastructure updates are made ahead of occupation of the development.

6.22 The site is above a Principal Aquifer, but do not consider this proposal to be high risk. The developer should address risks to controlled waters from contamination at the site following the NPPF and EA Guiding Principles for Land Contamination.

6.23 Anglian Water – No comments on the proposal

6.24 The Planning & Capacity Team provide comments on applications for major proposals of 10 dwellings or more if an industrial or commercial development, 500sqm or greater.

6.25 County Archaeology – No objection

- 6.26 Requests a condition in regard to submission of a Written Scheme of Investigation.
- 6.27 **Senior Sustainability Officer – No objection**
- 6.28 Recommends conditions in regard to renewable energy and water efficiency.
- 6.29 **Landscape Officer -Object**
- 6.30 The proposal does not accord with Policies S/7 and NH/2 of the Local Plan.
- 6.31 The provision of 9 dwellings on this constrained piece of land would densify a relatively very low-density village edge and would be out of context with the surrounding area. The illustrative layout shows narrow vegetated edges to the site particularly around the paddock site. These narrow boundaries are not deep enough to provide adequate village edge boundaries and will create a poorly integrated development though we support the use of lower boundary fencing along the Northern edge.
- 6.32 The Design and Access Statement proposes to include hawthorn and Amelanchier which is not supported. Recommend larger native trees such as alder, near to the stream and drain to provide some height diversity along the northern boundary and also to reconsider the tree planting along the access land to allow for some larger trees within the communal areas.
- 6.33 **Ecology Officer – No objection**
- 6.34 Recommends conditions in regard to ecological measures being in accordance with the submitted PEA, details of ecological enhancement and submission of a biodiversity net gain.
- 6.35 **Environmental Health – No objection**
- 6.36 Recommends conditions in regard to hours for site construction and a Construction Management Plan and informatives in regard to an air source heat pump, demolition and minimising disturbance to neighbouring properties.
- 6.37 **Contaminated Land Officer- No objection**
- 6.38 Requests a Phase 1 Desk Study is carried out to assess the potential risks from contamination associated with the proposed redevelopment. Recommends a condition to require a detailed desk study and site walk over is submitted.
- 6.39 **Waste Officer – No comments on the proposal**

6.40 The applicant is advised to view the recycling and waste guide.
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/recycling-and-waste-guide-for-developers>

7.0 Third Party Representations

7.1 42 representations have been received objecting to the proposal.

7.2 Those in objection have raised the following issues:

Principle

- Significant expansion of the village.
- Set a precedent for future development and developing land which is outside the village envelope and outside of the Local Plan.
- Sets a precedent for the expansion of the village on agricultural land.
- Sets a precedent for self-build development.
- Would set a precedent for use of greenfield sites outside the village envelope.
- Houses not needed as there is a five year plan with sufficient supply.
- The development is disproportionate to the location, it would nearly double the number of houses on/off Fenny Lane.
- Fenny Lane already has more than enough buildings.
- Meldreth already has a number of new housing developments, either completed or under construction.
- Outside the village boundary, development plan and Local Plan.
- Loss of allotments which are a valued village amenity and no replacement provision.
- On agricultural land.
- Site was rejected in the call for sites and no significant changes.
- Would lead to uncontrolled growth of the village.
- Self build development and working in the evenings and weekends.
- Proposal detailed enough to not be self build.
- Concern that if the self build plots are not sold they will resubmit.
- Allotments sacrificed and represent an important community asset.
- Loss of allotments which help peoples mental health will be lost.
- Acceptable departure from Policy S/7 is Policy H/11 a Rural Exception Site and the proposal does not provide affordable housing.
- Meldreth is a Group Village.
- Site is not suitable for development as the site was submitted and rejected in the recent Call for Sites process.
- Greater Cambridge HELAA (2021) concludes the site is not suitable for development with issues for flood risk, landscape and townscape and site access.
- Loss of allotments and a valuable community asset in regard to Policy SC/8 of the Local Plan.
- Does not offer low cost housing for first time buyers which is needed.
- Do not have further amenities provided in terms of school places, roads and doctors.
- School is already oversubscribed and cannot accommodate local children already in the village.

- Not appropriate to continue to allow growth without improvement in the infrastructure.
- The school is full and at capacity.
- Strain on doctors.
- Outside the already established Local Plan.
- Land not included in the most recent Local Plan.
- Parish Council have recommended refusal.
- Brownfield development at Eternit was refused due to pressure on local services and road safety.
- Already have had a number of new and in-progress developments in the village.
- Already been six barns completed on the same farm.
- There have been massive developments in neighbouring Melbourn.
- No need for unrestrained development in the area.
- The proposal is not how the village should be expanded.
- Many brownfield sites already identified.

Visual Impact and Character of the area

- The development would probably be visible from the Conservation Area on Fenny Lane and North End.
- Loss of semi-rural nature of the area.
- Loss of agricultural land, loss of UK being more self sufficient with food and energy losing green land.
- Proposed height of the houses at 1.5 storey is out of character with the surrounding area of Fenny Lane.
- Fenny Lane has a beautiful edge of village feel.
- Development introduces development into the countryside than the existing built form.
- The layout is not appropriate within the rural context.
- Cul-de-sac design is not considered to respond to the pattern of development in the area.
- Proposal out of keeping and would compare smaller and cramped.
- Proposal would represent gradual encroachment into the countryside.
- The dominant pattern of development in the vicinity of the site is ribbon development fronting the road.
- The character of the area comprises large single storey dwellings in generous plots, the proposal in comparison is relatively dense.
- The proposals do not preserve or enhance the character of the local rural area or respond to the context in the wider area.
- Proposals contrary to Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan.
- The linear nature of the plot would result in a poor form of development that would have an adverse impact of the setting of the village.
- The proposals do not meet Policy NH/2 of the Local Plan.
- Fills in views through an agricultural scene with housing.
- Diminishes the rural nature of the village.
- With the 6 recently completed barns, this proposal increases the housing density in Fenny Lane considerably.

- With the exception of the barns and the proposed new development, the rest of the housing in Fenny Lane is well spread apart and with large gardens.
- Proposal will compromise character of this part of the village.
- Concern regarding intense densities.

Historical

- Archaeological investigation and recording must be carried out.
- The site may have archaeological interest.

Highway Safety and Parking

- Bus routes are being cut which means residents will travel by car.
- Village infrastructure is at capacity and relies on services such as healthcare from an adjacent village with minimal retail outlets and roads are narrow and subject to congestion.
- The development will add to congestion on the High Street.
- Limited parking at the site which would lead to parking on the road.
- Lack of parking for additional vehicles which would result in vehicles parked in Fenny Lane.
- Traffic congestion in the village and the proposal will make it worse.
- The High Street cannot take anymore traffic.
- The development may lead to nearly 30 cars on this site, creating problems on a narrow country road in the vicinity of the accident hot spot at the junction with Whitecroft Road.
- Generate additional private car journeys.
- Fenny Lane is in need of serious repair.

Biodiversity

- Badger latrines in the area and badgers have been seen foraging in the nearby gardens.
- The plan would mean removal of open spaces and hedgerows reducing habitat for owls, bats, badgers and other species.
- Impact in the loss of flora and fauna in the area.
- Proposal will lead to a net loss of biodiversity.
- Loss of hedgerows will effect wildlife.

Flooding and Drainage

- Lead to potential flooding on Fenny Lane as the ground water and run off could put additional strain on the existing drainage on Fenny Lane.
- Sewerage system in Meldreth already under strain.
- Meldreth suffers from considerable flooding including Fenny Lane.
- Flood risk impacts from the proposed development.
- Historic problems of waterlogging and water lying in fields.
- Flood risk to No.14 Fenny Lane
- Flood risk, foul drainage and contamination.
- Proposal will overload the drainage system. Too much pollution and flooding in the village with unacceptable sewage being discharged by Anglian Water into the River Mel.
- Water table is very high.

- Proposal does not address the pressure on water provision in East Anglia both potable and grey water for sewerage needs.
- Water extraction sewerage problems already in the area.
- Concerns regarding the proposed development increasing the amount of water flowing into the stream and the increase in risk of flooding to No.14 Fenny Lane which borders the stream.
- If ground conditions are such that they cannot deal with the increased water as a consequence of the development, the only option is to increase the water into the stream and this increases flood risk to the neighbour adjoining the river.

Noise and Disturbance

- Result in more noise, cars, traffic and less greenery.
- Concerns regarding amenity in terms of noise, dust, lots of deliveries.

Amenity

- Concerns regarding overlooking and loss of privacy to habitable rooms of 18 Fenny Lane.
- Proposals contrary to the health and amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses from overlooking, overbearing or loss of daylight.
- Lead to years of disruption, traffic, noise and nuisance for those living in Fenny Lane and Manor Road.
- Concern regarding the length of time the development could be on site.

Following amended plans, the following comments were made:

- Proposal does not comply with the Local Plan.
- Set a precedent for more applications on areas outside the village envelope and expansion of the village.
- Pressure on the water provision locally with both potable and grey water for sewerage needs.
- Increasing the pressing environmental and societal issues. Pressure on Melbourn surgery, the school and roads which are at capacity.
- Increase traffic at the Fenny Lane and Whaddon Road junction which is an accident black spot.
- No space for visitor parking and visitors would have to park on Fenny Lane.
- Drainage is currently a problem.
- Concerns over foul and surface water disposal.
- No investigation into the ability of foul drains to cope with the extra load.
- The foul water has suffered a number of blockages, bursts and discharges in the last few years.
- Ditches not designed to carry run-off away.
- Outside village envelope.
- Outside Local Plan.
- Overloading infrastructure including sewerage and surface water.
- Further degradation of existing appalling roads.
- Setting a precedent for further expansion.
- Loss of allotments, a valuable village amenity.

- Self build and disruption to the area for several years.
- If granted would result in years of disruption, traffic, noise and nuisance for those living in Fenny Lane and Manor Road.
- Amendment does not address that the application falls outside of the Meldreth Village Development Framework.
- No clear evidence that a demand for self build homes in Meldreth exists.
- The development site borders an area designated by the Environment Agency as of High Risk.

7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details can be inspected online via the Council's website.

8.0 Assessment

8.1 Principle of Development

8.2 Policy S/7 of the Local Plan states that outside development frameworks, only allocations within Neighbourhood Plans that have come into force and development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside or where supported by other policies in this plan will be permitted.

8.3 The supporting text to policy S/7 sets out the development frameworks define where policies for the built-up areas of settlements give way to policies for the countryside. This is necessary to ensure that the countryside is protected from gradual encroachment on the edges of villages and to help guard against incremental growth in unsustainable locations.

8.4 Policy S/7 also states that frameworks have not been defined around small clusters of houses or areas of scattered development where such buildings are isolated in open countryside or detached from the main concentration of buildings within Cambridge or nearby village. Although it is recognised that such dwellings may be considered locally as 'part' of nearest settlement in communities' terms, it is important to limit the amount of new developments that can take place in rural areas with few services and little or no public transport.

8.5 Policy S/2 of the Local Plan sets out the Plan objectives based on principles of sustainable development. Policy S/3 of the Local Plan provides a presumption in favour of sustainable development as contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

8.6 The application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of nine self-build dwellings with all matters reserved except access. The site is currently used as paddock land and private allotments. The site measures 0.8745 hectares in area and is located outside of the Meldreth Village Development Framework and within the open countryside. The village

development framework boundary lies adjacent to the east and south of the site.

- 8.7 Meldreth is classed as a Group Village as defined under Policy S/10 of the Local Plan. Policy S/10 states that residential development and redevelopment up to an indicative maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings will be permitted within the development frameworks of Group Villages, as defined on the Policies Map. Development may exceptionally consist of up to about 15 dwellings where this would make the best use of a single brownfield site.
- 8.8 Policy TI/2 states that development must be located and designed to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and promote sustainable travel appropriate to its location. Meldreth is a village with a train station, numerous food shops comprising a village shop, farm shop and butchers shop, hairdresser, post office, recreation ground, public house, village hall, primary school and church. Without many employment opportunities within Meldreth, a large food supermarket, secondary school or GP surgery, ultimately most of the journeys made will be by private car. The development is therefore not in accordance with TI/2 of the Local Plan.
- 8.9 The application site is located outside of the development framework of Meldreth and within the open countryside. The development proposes 9 self built dwellings on a green field site. The proposal would result in development outside of the village development framework and in an unsustainable location in which most journeys would be by car. In the absence of satisfying one of the exception categories of development, the site is not a location to which new development should be directed and therefore does not accord with policy S/7 of the Local Plan as a matter of principle.
- 8.10 **Self-Build Need**
- 8.11 Paragraph 62 of the 'National Planning Policy Framework' (2021) highlights the need for different groups in the community to be assessed and reflected in planning policies, including "people wishing to commission or build their own homes".
- 8.12 The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016) provides a legal definition of self-build and custom housebuilding. The Act does not distinguish between self-build and custom housebuilding and provides that both are where an individual, an association of individuals, or persons working with or for individuals or associations of individuals, build or complete houses to be occupied as homes by those individuals.
- 8.13 Whilst the recommendations of the Bacon report are noted and this includes a Custom and Self Build Delivery Unit, these have not yet been agreed and translated into national policy.

- 8.14 South Cambridgeshire District Council is a Right to Build Vanguard Authority with a statutory duty under section 2A of The Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 which requires the Council gives suitable development permission in respect of enough serviced plots of land to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in the Authority's area. Therefore, weight needs to be given to the delivery of self-build dwellings should the Council have a shortfall in delivery.
- 8.15 The table below shows the number of people added to the register for each base period and the number of planning permissions granted within 3 years from the end of each base period. This shows that there is currently a shortfall in the number of permissions granted compared to the number of people added to the register.

Assessment Period	Number of people added to register (within base period)	Permissions Granted (3 years following base period)
Base Period 1: 01/04/16 to 30/10/16	69	69
Base Period 2: 31/10/16 to 30/10/17	89	89
Base Period 3: 31/10/17 to 30/10/18	135	14 (-121)
Base Period 4: 31/10/18 to 30/10/19	204 (339)	64 (-261)
Base Period 5: 31/10/19 to 30/10/20	157	Tbc in Nov 2023
Base Period 6: 31/10/20 to 30/10/21	189	Tbc in Nov 2024
Base Period 7: 31/10/21 to 30/10/22	130	Tbc in Nov 2025

- 8.16 Strategic sites coming forward, on Northstowe and Waterbeach (including Urban Splash on Northstowe) are likely to significantly help meet the registered demand.
- 8.17 The demand for self-build dwellings is measured by the number of new applicants entered on the self-build register in each base period; and that number must be match by new suitable permissions granted within 3 years of the end of each relevant base period.

- 8.18 The above table shows that the number of applicants on the register from 2016 up to the end of base period 3 on 30 October 2018 was 293. To comply with the Act, suitable permissions should have been granted for 293 self-build dwellings by 30 October 2021.
- 8.19 The figures show that 172 self-build dwellings were granted permission. This would result in a shortage of 121 plots. This would result in a significant shortfall in the provision of self-build dwellings.
- 8.20 This application makes reference to a planning appeal (APP/W0530/W/21/3282234) in Caxton which was allowed for up to 9 self-build dwellings. In this instance the provision of self-build plots was given significant material weight in the planning balance by the Inspector.
- 8.21 Numerous other appeals include (APP/W0530/W/19/3230103) in Gamlingay which allowed a proposal for 9 self-build dwellings and the self-build factor was given material weight because the evidence before the Inspector indicated a substantial shortfall of the delivery of self-build dwellings at that time.
- 8.22 However, an appeal (APP/W0530/W/21/3274489) in Willingham was recently dismissed for 4 self building dwelling plots. The Inspector states that 'by reason of the appeal site being located outside of the village framework, the appeal scheme would nevertheless undermine and fail to accord with the identified strategy for growth within the district as required by LP Policies S/6 and S/7'. In addition, the Inspector states that 'the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to LP Policies HQ/1 and NH/2'. The Inspector concluded; 'the planning policies of the development plan are broadly consistent with the Framework and they attract significant weight'..... 'the primary importance of the development plan as regards decision making is clearly set out within section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Act also refers to suitable permissions for development and this does not mean that every self-build proposal will be suitable'.
- 8.23 Appeal (APP/W0530/W/22/3291085) in Cinques Road, Gamlingay for 5 self building and custom dwellings was recently dismissed. The Inspector concluded that the 'proposal would not provide Self Build or Custom Housing within the definition of The Act'.
- 8.24 Whilst the need for self-build dwellings in the district is not in dispute, it is considered that there are material differences between the appeal schemes and the application site. The contribution to the need for self build dwellings in the area is not considered to outweigh the material harm the proposal would have to the character of the open rural landscape, village development character and village edge.
- 8.25 The provision of 9 self-build dwellings would provide a modest impact in meeting the identified need for custom and self-build and is not sufficient

of itself to override the Local Plan policies which seek to direct development to appropriate and sustainable locations, limiting the encroachment of the countryside.

5 Year Housing Land Supply

- 8.26 Paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies³, or against their local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old.
- 8.27 The Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory and Five Year Housing Land Supply Report (1 April 2022) identifies that Greater Cambridge jointly has 6.5 years of housing land supply for the 2022-2027 five-year period.
- 8.28 A five-year housing land supply for Greater Cambridge, can be demonstrated therefore the planning policies in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 will be considered when making decisions on planning applications, unless there are other material factors to take into account.
- 8.29 The proposal therefore does not accord with policies S/2, S/3, S/6, S/7, S10 and T1/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) as a matter of principle and the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of achieving sustainable development and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside.

Housing Provision

Density

- 8.30 Policy H/8 of the Local Plan states that housing development including rural exception sites, will achieve an average net density of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) in Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centre villages, and Group villages; 40 dph in urban extensions to Cambridge and in new settlements. The net density on a site may vary from the above where justified by the character of the locality, the scale of the development, or other local circumstances.
- 8.31 The site has an overall area of 0.8745 hectares. This equates to a housing density of 10 dwellings per hectare.
- 8.32 The development therefore accords with policy H/8 of the Local Plan.

Housing Mix

- 8.33 The application is for an outline application for 9 dwellings. The proposed mix of the dwellings is not currently known. Policy H/9 of the Local Plan states that a mix of market homes to be provided on sites of 9 or fewer homes will take account of local circumstances. 5% of homes in a

development should be built to the accessible and adaptable dwellings M4(2) standard rounding down to the nearest whole property.

- 8.34 Policy H/10 of the Local Plan states that all developments of 11 dwellings or more will be required to provide 40% of homes on site to be affordable. The proposal is for 9 dwellings and therefore no affordable provision is required.
- 8.35 The application is at outline stage currently therefore the housing mix will be decided at Reserved Matters stage, however should permission be granted a condition shall be added to require the mix to comply with Policy H/10 of the Local Plan.

Design, Layout, Scale and Landscaping

- 8.36 Policy HQ/1 'Design Principles' provides a comprehensive list of criteria by which development proposals must adhere to, requiring that all new development must be of high-quality design, with a clear vision as to the positive contribution the development will make to its local and wider context. Development should be appropriate to its context in terms of scale, mass, form, design, siting, landscaping and materials.
- 8.37 Policy NH/2 states that the development will only be permitted where it respects and retains, or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and of the individual National Character Area in which it is located.
- 8.38 The application is at outline stage currently therefore the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale will be detailed and decided at Reserved Matters stage.
- 8.39 The application site is surrounded to the north and part of the east with agricultural fields with residential development to the west and part of the east forming a mix of two, one and single storey dwellings, mainly detached and set in reasonable sized plots. The design of the neighbouring dwellings comprises a mix of architectural styles. The nearby neighbouring properties all form a linear development along Fenny Lane in which they are set back from the road and screened by mature hedgerows. To the west of the site lies nearly built and converted dwellings which form Fenny Lane Farm. Fenny Lane lies to the south with a cemetery lying further south opposite the site and fields and agricultural buildings. The site is relatively flat in its nature.
- 8.40 The proposal will result in the development of new built form on an undeveloped paddock which lies outside of the village development framework. The proposal will extend the built form further beyond the single line of dwellings which lie adjacent to Fenny Lane. As a result, the proposal will result in significant encroachment of built form into the open countryside which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the rural countryside. Fenny Lane and Meldreth is characterised by a

ribbon form of development in which dwellings line the public highway. The proposed development which would form backland development which would be out of character with the linear development form of the area.

- 8.41 Given the site's position and that it is heavily screened from Fenny Lane with hedgerows and trees, the proposal would be subject to a condition restricting the height of the dwellings to being one and a half storey only or lower to ensure the development was in accordance with the height of the dwellings in the area and would not result in significant harm to the visual amenity.
- 8.42 The full details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale will be fully assessed at Reserved Matters stage, however the proposal as detailed above is considered to result in significant harm to the existing character of the open rural landscape, village development character and village edge resulting in harm to the visual amenity of the area and would conflict with Policies S/7, HQ/1 and NH/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

Trees and Landscaping

- 8.43 A Preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted as part of the application.
- 8.44 Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 requires new development to conserve or enhance important natural assets. Policy NH/2 of the Local Plan states that development will only be permitted where it respects and retains, or enhance the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and of the individual National Character Area in which it is located.
- 8.45 The proposal details that the existing hedgerows and trees along the west and southern boundaries of the site will be retained and supplemented. The existing frontage hedgerow along Fenny Lane will be replanted to allow the vehicular access. Boundary treatments around the site would comprise of hedgerows, close boarded fences around garden boundaries and fences to the northern boundary abutting the countryside. Four individual trees are to be removed and the shortening of two hedges to allow for the proposal.
- 8.46 The Landscape Officer has raised an objection to the proposal on the grounds of the proposal densifying a low density village edge and being out of context with the surrounding area.
- 8.47 The application is at outline stage currently therefore landscaping will be detailed and decided at Reserved Matters stage. The proposal is not considered to result in significant harm to trees and hedgerows. However as detailed above, the proposal would result in significant harm to the existing character of the open rural landscape, village development character and village edge, conflicting with policies HQ/1 and NH/2 of the

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, District Design Guide SPD and Landscape SPD.

Archaeology

- 8.48 Policy NH/14 of the Local Plan states that development proposals will be supported where they sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets, including their settings such as archaeological remains.
- 8.49 The site lies in an area of archaeological potential lying to the east of the historic core of Meldreth. Archaeological investigations 250m to the south (Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record reference. ECB5945) revealed a series of Roman to Saxon ditches and pits (CHER ref. MCB29158). To the north of the archaeological investigations, inhumation burials were discovered during construction at Meldreth Manor School (CHER ref. MCB12950), however the burials remain undated. Further archaeological investigations 350m to the west (CHER ref. ECB2273), revealed evidence for medieval to post-medieval cultivation and field boundaries (CHER ref. MCB17491). Medieval cultivation also survives as earthworks to the east, north and west of the development area, representing the remains of furlong boundaries (CHER ref. MCB27308) and ridge and furrow cultivation (CHER ref. MCB27842 and 08556a). Further afield medieval settlement is present, namely to the east where the medieval moated manor Topliffe (CHER ref. 01249) and enclosures identified through cropmarks (CHER ref. 07517) have been identified.
- 8.50 The County Archaeology Officer has commented on the proposal that due to the archaeological potential of the site, a condition will be recommended should permission be granted to require that a further programme of investigation and recording is required to ascertain the presence or absence of archaeological remains.
- 8.51 The proposal would accord with Policy NH/14 and Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design

- 8.52 The Councils' Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020) sets out a framework for proposals to demonstrate they have been designed to minimise their carbon footprint, energy and water consumption and to ensure they are capable of responding to climate change as required by policy CC/1.
- 8.53 Policy CC/3 'Renewable and Low Carbon Energy', requires that Proposals for new dwellings and new non-residential buildings of 1,000m² or more will be required to reduce carbon emissions by a minimum of 10% through the use of on-site renewable energy and low carbon technologies.
- 8.54 Policy CC/4 'Water Efficiency' requires that all new residential developments must achieve as a minimum water efficiency to 110 litres pp

per day and for non-residential buildings to achieve a BREEAM efficiency standard equivalence of 2 credits. Paras 152 – 158 of the NPPF are relevant.

- 8.55 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Sustainability Officer who has commented that little information in regard to sustainability has been submitted as part of the application, and they would recommend conditions in regard to renewable energy and water efficiency should permission be granted..
- 8.56 Subject to conditions the proposal is compliant with Local Plan policies CC/1, CC/3 and CC/4 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020.

Biodiversity

- 8.57 The NPPF (2021) and the Councils' Biodiversity SPD (2022) require development proposals to deliver a net gain in biodiversity following a mitigation hierarchy which is focused on avoiding ecological harm over minimising, rectifying, reducing and then off-setting. This approach accords with policy NH/14 which outlines a primary objective for biodiversity to be conserved or enhanced and provides for the protection of Protected Species, Priority Species and Priority Habitat.
- 8.58 In accordance with policy and circular 06/2005 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation', the application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment.
- 8.59 The site forms paddock land, hedgerows and wooded boundaries, grass land and private allotments. Species data shows barn owl and other breeding birds, white clawed crayfish, flowering plants, fungus, invertebrates, reptiles, bats, badger, otter and water vole have all been recorded locally. The submitted Preliminary Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment details that the site currently has an overall baseline value of 3.21 habitat units and 0.57 hedgerow units. The proposal will result in a decrease in total habitat units to 2.21 and increase in hedgerow units to 0.61. To ensure the development delivers an overall net gain, the application proposes that an area of off-site land (within 420 metres of the application site and within the applicant's ownership) which is currently 1.62 hectares of arable farmland will be used to create a high value habitat which would result in an overall net gain of 9.40 habitat units and +296.3% net gain.
- 8.60 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer, who raises no objection to the proposal and commented that the submitted information found no evidence that a protected species license will be required prior to the commencement of development. A badger latrine was found on site meaning that suitable avoidance measures will need to be in place to remove any risk of harm and other residual risk of harm or disturbance to protected or priority species will be

removed through recommended avoidance and mitigation strategies. The Ecology Officer recommends several conditions to ensure the protection of species and the estimated biodiversity net gain is delivered.

- 8.61 Whilst the applicant has proposed a significant BNG as set out above, the extent of BNG proposed is not required to make the development acceptable. At present, the proposal is required to provide a gain to biodiversity whether on site, or off site. Furthermore, as proposed, it would result in the loss of 1.6 hectares of agricultural land. It has not been demonstrated through an agricultural land classification assessment, the quality of this agricultural land. Without this information, it is not possible to assess whether it would be appropriate to lose this amount of agricultural land, particularly in the context of the overall size of the farm, for the purposes of BNG. Nevertheless, given 10% BNG is not currently a statutory requirement, it is considered a condition could be imposed ensuring the development delivered appropriate BNG.
- 8.62 In consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer, subject to an appropriate condition, officers are satisfied that the proposed development complies with policy NH/14, the Biodiversity SPD 2022, the requirements of the Environment Act 2021 and 06/2005 Circular advice.

Water Management and Flood Risk

- 8.63 Policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 of the Local Plan require developments to have appropriate sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems and minimise flood risk. Paras. 159 – 169 of the NPPF are relevant.
- 8.64 The site lies predominately in Flood Zone 1 (low risk), with a small part of the site, adjacent to the eastern boundary, being located within Flood Zones 2 (medium risk) and 3 (high risk). This small area located within Flood Zone 3 would comprise of the garden of plot 8. Surface water is proposed to either discharge to permeable paving and/or soakaways or to the watercourse to the east of the site. The foul water is proposed to be discharged to the adopted sewer within Fenny Lane.
- 8.65 The applicants have submitted a Flood Risk Assessment. A number of residents have raised concern regarding flood risk from the proposal and the residents have obtained separate advice regarding this matter.
- 8.66 The Environment Agency raise no objection to the application and believe the receiving Water Recycling Centre has limited capacity and confirmation is required with Anglian Water that they can receive the foul drainage without exceeding their permit limits with the Environment Agency or that any necessary infrastructure updates are made ahead of occupation of the development. The site is above a Principal Aquifer, but the Environment Agency do not consider this proposal to be high risk.

- 8.67 The Lead Local Flood Authority following amended plans raise no objections subject to conditions, and comment that the surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the use of permeable paving, and geocellular attenuation, restricting surface water discharge to QBAR rate of 1.2 l/s. The applicant has demonstrated that the rate of runoff into the existing ditch prior to development of the site would be the QBAR rate of 1.2 l/s. Therefore by limiting the discharge rate from the site to this same pre-development rate, the principles of how surface water discharges from the site should remain unchanged. Any development within the site is to take place in Flood Zone 1, and therefore the risk of flooding to the properties is minimised and that flood water should not be displaced outside of the site, therefore minimising any increased risk of flooding to the surrounding area.
- 8.68 The Sustainable Drainage Officer has commented on the proposal and raised no objections subject to conditions.
- 8.69 The applicants have suitably addressed the issues of water management and flood risk, and subject to conditions the proposal is in accordance with Local Plan policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 and NPPF advice.

Highway Safety and Transport Impacts

- 8.70 Policy HQ/1 states that proposals must provide safe and convenient access for all users and abilities to public buildings and spaces, including those with limited mobility or those with impairment such as sight or hearing.
- 8.71 Policy TI/2 requires developers to demonstrate adequate provision will be made to mitigate the likely impacts of the proposed development and, for larger developments, to demonstrate they have maximised opportunities for sustainable travel, and provided a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.
- 8.72 Paragraph 111 of the NPPF advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 8.73 The application is supported by a Transport Note.
- 8.74 The proposal is for one vehicular access which would serve pedestrians and cyclists into the site off Fenny Lane comprising a shared surface.
- 8.75 The Local Highways Authority have commented on the proposal and raise no objections, subject to conditions being added to any permission granted.
- 8.76 The Local Highways Authority commented that they would not seek to adopt any part of this development in its present format as the proposed

layout is not acceptable for adoption. The Local Highway Authority requested consultation with the waste authority regarding the servicing of the site, which has been undertaken. No concerns have been raised by the Council's waste team with regard to servicing the site.

- 8.77 As the site is at Outline stage, parking details are not finalised however two car parking space would be required per dwelling comprising of one space within the curtilage of the dwelling. In addition to these, car parking spaces for visitors, tradesmen and residents is required for the site as a whole.
- 8.78 One cycle parking space is required per bedroom per dwelling for the proposal to accord with policy TI/3. Details on secure cycle parking would be required at the Reserved Matters stage.
- 8.79 The proposal is considered to accord with Policies HQ/1 and TI2 of the Local Plan.

Amenity

- 8.80 Policy HQ/1 (n), sets out that proposals must protect the health and amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses from development that is overlooking, overbearing or results in a loss of daylight or development which would create unacceptable impacts such as noise, vibration, odour, emissions and dust.
- 8.81 The District Design Guide 2010 advises that to prevent the overlooking of habitable rooms to the rear of residential properties and rear private gardens, it is preferable that a minimum distance of 15m is provided between the windows and the property boundary. For two storey residential properties, a minimum distance of 25m should be provided between rear or side building faces containing habitable rooms, which should be increased to 30m for 3 storey residential properties. It advises that a 12 metre separation is allowed where blank walls are proposed opposite the windows to habitable rooms.
- 8.82 Policy H/12 of the Local Plan states that new residential units will be permitted where their gross internal floor areas meet or exceed the Government's Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015) or successor document.
- 8.83 The District Design Guide 2010 advises that each one or two-bedroom house should have private garden space of 40m² in urban settings and 50m² in rural settings; whilst each house with 3 bedrooms or more should have private garden space of 50m² in urban settings and 80m² in rural settings.
- 8.84 The application is for Outline permission with appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved. An Illustrative Site Plan has been submitted as part of the application, in which it illustrates that 9 dwellings could be

positioned on the site without appearing cramped. This is illustrative only and full details will be submitted at the Reserved Matters application stage.

- 8.85 To the west of the site lies No.24 Fenny Lane which is two storey's and a number of new residential dwellings forming Fenny Lane Farm which are one and two storey's. To the east of the proposed access to the site lies No.20 Fenny Lane with the neighbouring properties forming Nos.18 and No.14 Fenny Lane lying to the south of the site. Further east lies the neighbouring property at No.12 Fenny Lane. These neighbouring dwellings are mainly single storey.
- 8.86 Given the application is for outline permission with development for 9 dwellings, the proposed layout, appearance and scale are reserved therefore full details will be submitted and assessed at this stage.
- 8.87 Environmental Health have commented on the application, raising no objections subject to conditions in regard to hours for construction and site machinery and plant to be operated, submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan and informatives in regard to air source heat pumps, demolition and minimising noise and dust.
- 8.88 The proposal adequately respects the amenity of its neighbours and of future occupants. The proposal is compliant with policy HQ/1 and the District Design Guide 2010. The associated construction and environmental impacts would be acceptable in accordance with policies SC/9, SC/10 and SC/12 of the Local Plan.

Contamination

- 8.89 The site forms paddock land and private allotments. The Contaminated Land Officer has recommended that a condition is added to any permission granted if a Phase 1 Desk Study is not submitted prior to determination, requesting that the application site is subject to a detailed desk study, detailed scheme for investigation and recording of contamination and remediation.
- 8.90 The proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy SC/11 of the Local Plan 2018

Third Party Representations

- 8.91 The remaining third-party representations not addressed in the preceding paragraphs are summarised and responded to in the table below:

Third Party Comment	Officer Response
Loss of Allotments	The proposal would involve the loss of allotments. These are allotments on private land which are for private use and not public allotments.

Other Matters

Rural Exception Site

- 8.92 The Parish Council in their comments make reference to the proposal being an inappropriate use of a rural exception site. The proposal is not for a rural exception site.

Bins and Waste

- 8.93 The Waste Officer was consulted on the proposal and commented that the applicant is advised to view the recycling and waste guide.

Broadband:

- 8.94 Policy TI/10 requires that infrastructure be imposed to create access to broadband internet respectively, the application. It is therefore considered reasonable and necessary to impose a broadband condition if the application was recommended for approval.

Planning Balance

- 8.95 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
- 8.96 Officers consider the matter of access to be acceptable and that the development would not result in harm to highway safety.
- 8.97 Officers consider that the proposal would result in development outside of the village development framework and in an unsustainable location in which most journeys would be by car. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with policy S/7 of the Local Plan as a matter of principle.
- 8.98 Officers consider that the proposal would extend the built form beyond the single line of dwellings which lie adjacent to Fenny Lane. The proposal will result in significant encroachment of built form into the open countryside which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the rural countryside.
- 8.99 It is acknowledged that there is a need for self-build plots in the district and that there is currently a significant shortfall, however, the contribution to the provision for self build dwellings in the area is not considered to outweigh the material harm the proposal would have to the character of the open rural landscape, village development character and village edge.
- 8.100 The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies S/2, S/3, S/6, S/7, S/10 and TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

8.101 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

8.102 **Refuse** for the following reasons:

1. The proposal forms residential development outside of a development framework boundary that does not fall within any of the exceptions cited by Policy S/7, nor would the development be supported in principle by other policies in the Local Plan. The development would therefore result in encroachment into the open countryside and a form of unsustainable development that is not compatible with its location.

The fact that the proposed dwellings would be self-build dwellings would not be of sufficient benefit of itself in helping to meet identified need for self and custom build properties to override the presumption against the principle of residential development on the site or to warrant a decision other than in accordance with the adopted development plan policies.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies S/2, S/3, S/6, S/7, S/10 and TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 that seek to prioritise the development of new homes as part of a spatial and sustainable development strategy that protects the countryside from encroachment and to help guard against incremental growth in unsustainable locations.

2. The proposed development would result in significant encroachment of built form into the open countryside which would be harmful to the character of the countryside and the rural transition from the village. The development would form backland development which would be out of character with the linear development form of the immediate built area and Meldreth village. The proposal would therefore result in significant harm to the existing character of the open rural landscape, village development character and village edge and would conflict with Policies S/7, HQ/1 and NH/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

Background Papers:

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework SPDs

Agenda Item 8



Planning Committee Date Report to	18 th January 2023 South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee
Lead Officer	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
Reference	22/04826/HFUL
Site	77 Church Lane
Ward / Parish	Girton
Proposal	Demolition of detached garage and construction of a single storey side extension and rear extension and loft extension with rear facing dormer window
Applicant	Mr. Ammar Al Asaad
Presenting Officer	Charlotte Spencer
Reason Reported to Committee	Application submitted by an officer of the Council
Member Site Visit Date	N/A
Key Issues	1. Design, Layout and Scale 2. Residential Amenity
Recommendation	APPROVE subject to conditions

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The application seeks planning permission to demolish the existing garage and erect a single storey side and rear extension and loft extension with rear facing dormer window.
- 1.2 Officers consider that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, street scene and surrounding area. In addition, it is considered that it would have an acceptable level of impact on the residential amenity neighbouring properties.
- 1.3 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee approve the application.

2.0 Site Description and Context

None relevant	X	Tree Preservation Order	
Conservation Area		Local Nature Reserve	
Listed Building		Flood Zone	1
Building of Local Interest		Green Belt	
Historic Park and Garden		Protected Open Space	
Scheduled Ancient Monument		Controlled Parking Zone	
Local Neighbourhood and District Centre		Article 4 Direction	

- 2.1 The application relates to a detached bungalow located to the east of Church Lane. The brick and tile dwelling is set back from the road by an area of hardstanding and soft landscaping which provides space for off street parking. To the rear lies a long garden which acts as private amenity space.
- 2.2 The application property is attached to No.79 Church Lane to the south and shares a side boundary with No.75 Church Lane to the north. To the rear lies Nos.1 and 3 Gifford Close.
- 2.3 The area is residential in character and appearance and the site lies within the Girton Development Framework.

3.0 The Proposal

- 3.1 The application is seeking planning permission to demolish the existing garage and erect a single storey side and rear extension and loft extension with rear facing dormer window.

3.2 The rear extension would span for a depth of 11.4 metres for a width of 5.1 metres, with a smaller 1.9 metre deep element adjacent to the boundary with No.79 Church Lane. It would be characterised by a hipped roof with a maximum height of 4.3 metres.

3.3 The roof space would be converted to habitable use and a dormer with a width of 1.4 metres, depth of 2.9 metres and height of 1.5 metres would be installed on the rear roof slope. A roof light would be installed to the front.

4.0 Relevant Site History

None relevant.

5.0 Policy

5.1 National

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2019

5.2 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018

S/1 – Vision

S/2 – Objectives of the Local Plan

S/3 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

S/7 – Development Frameworks

HQ/1 – Design Principles

5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020

Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

6.0 Consultations

6.1 Parish Council – No Objection

6.2 Application looks to be straight forward, would match the adjoining semi-detached dwelling and there is no feedback from neighbours.

7.0 Third Party Representations

7.1 No neighbour representations have been received.

8.0 Assessment

Design, Layout and Scale

- 8.1 Policy HQ/1 'Design Principles' provides a comprehensive list of criteria by which development proposals must adhere to, requiring that all new development must be of high-quality design, with a clear vision as to the positive contribution the development will make to its local and wider context.
- 8.2 The rear extension would be large and would have a depth greater than that of the existing property. However, it would be of a similar size and scale to both neighbouring properties. The roof would be set down from the main ridge and so it is considered that it would appear as a subservient addition. It would be located to the rear and so it would not be overly visible from the public realm.
- 8.3 The rear dormer would be limited in size and scale and would appear subordinate within the roof plane. It has been designed to match the existing dormer at the attached property at No.79 Church Lane. It is considered that the front roof light would have a limited visual impact.
- 8.4 Subsequently, it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling house, street scene and surrounding area. The proposal accords with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018).

Amenity

- 8.5 Policy HQ/1 (n), sets out that proposals must protect the health and amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses from development that is overlooking, overbearing or results in a loss of daylight or development which would create unacceptable impacts such as noise, vibration, odour, emissions and dust.
- 8.6 Neighbouring Properties
- Impact on No. 79 Church Lane
- 8.7 The smaller element of the rear extension would be built up to the shared boundary line with No.79. This element would mirror the depth of a similar lean-to extension at the neighbouring property and so would not project beyond it. There are doors from the rear of this extension which lead out to the garden. The larger extension would be located 2.4 metres from the shared boundary and project beyond the depth of no.79, which has also been extended. Given the separation between the properties, it is not considered the proposal would be overbearing or cause an unreasonable sense of enclosure to no.79. The application site is positioned to the north of no.79 and therefore, the proposal would not result in material overshadowing or undue loss of light. There are windows within the side elevation of the extension at no.79 facing the application site which appear to serve a kitchen. The proposal would also seek to install openings

(windows and doors) within the side elevation facing no.79. However, there is an existing fence between the properties which would prevent material overlooking between the properties. On the whole, no concerns are raised with regard to the impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of no.79.

Impact on No.75 Church Lane

- 8.8 The extension would be located 1.1 metres from the shared boundary line with No.75 and 3 metres from this property. No.75 benefits from a large rear extension and so the proposal would not project beyond the rear of this property. It is also set slightly higher than the application site. There are two side windows facing the application property, one of which serves a non-habitable room. The other serves a habitable space to the rear of the property, however, this space also benefits from openings onto a rear conservatory which provides light into this area of the dwelling. In any event, due to the height of the extension and separation from the neighbour's flank wall, it would not lead to undue loss of light. Furthermore it would not be overbearing or cause an undue sense of enclosure to no.75. The extension would contain windows within the flank elevation facing this property however, there is a boundary fence which would prevent material overlooking between the properties.
- 8.9 Subsequently, it is not considered the proposal would materially harm the amenity of the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. The proposal would comply with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018).

Planning Balance

- 8.10 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for approval.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1 **Approve** subject to:

The planning conditions as set out below with minor amendments to the conditions as drafted delegated to officers.

Planning Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Agenda Item 9



**South
Cambridgeshire**
District Council

Report to: Planning Committee

8 February 2023

Lead Officer: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

Appeals against Planning Decisions and Enforcement Action

Executive Summary

1. This report informs Members about appeals against planning decisions and enforcement action, and proposed hearing and inquiry dates, as of 26 January 2023. Summaries of recent decisions of importance are also reported, for information.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Decisions Notified by the Secretary of State

Appendix 2: Appeals received

Appendix 3: Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates scheduled

Appendix 4: Appeals Awaiting Decision from Inspectorate

Appendix 5: Appeals Pending Statement

Report Author:

Ian Papworth

Telephone Number:

Technical Support Officer (Appeals)

01954 713406

This page is left blank intentionally.

Appendix 1

Decisions Notified By The Secretary of State

Reference	Address	Details	Decision	Date	Planning Decision
22/00082/PRIOR	Enterprise Nurseries Ely Road Landbeach	Conversion of existing glasshouse/barn to a 6 bedroom motel	Dismissed	29/12/2022	Refused
20/01779/FUL	Land East And West Of 110 Cinques Road Gamlingay	Erection of 5 dwellings	Dismissed	30/12/2022	Refused
22/00484/FUL	Enterprise Nurseries Ely Road Landbeach	Erection of 1 No. bungalow	Dismissed	30/12/2022	Refused
22/01878/PRIOR	Land At London Road Sawston	Installation of a 15.0m Phase 9 super slimline Monopole and associated ancillary works	Allowed	9/1/2023	Refused
22/01156/FUL	Land Adj 73 High Street Little Shelford	Erection of a single storey bungalow along with associated works	Dismissed	9/1/2023	Refused
22/00199/PRIOR	Land At Station Road Longstanton	Proposed 18.0m Phase 8 Monopole C/W wrapround Cabinet at base and associated ancillary works.	Allowed	9/1/2023	Refused

Appendix 1

20/04431/FUL	The Arches Schole Road Willingham	Removal of existing mobile chalet unit and erection of new single storey dwelling with new 'link' to existing brick and tile 'medical Unit', with temporary provision for the siting of 2 no static caravans for occupation during construction phase.	Allowed	12/1/2023	Refused
21/04742/HFUL	2 Duck End Girton	Demolition of existing garage and store, erection of single storey side and rear extension, and rear dormer and 3 front dormers (Retrospective)	Split	16/1/2023	Refused
21/04745/FUL	41 Back Road Linton	Erection of replacement dwelling and associated garage	Allowed	26/1/2023	Refused

Appeals Received

Reference	Address	Details	Date Appeal lodged
22/00605/HFUL	Manor Farm Barn South Street Comberton	New entry structure, rooflights and roof-mounted photovoltaic arrays	2/1/2023
22/00606/LBC	Manor Farm Barn South Street Comberton CB23 7DZ	New entry structure, rooflights and roof-mounted photovoltaic arrays.	2/1/2023
21/02476/REM	39A And Lion Works Station Road (west) Whittlesford	Approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/0746/15/OL to provide 67 residential units following demolition of 39a Station Road West and the formation of a new access road. (Re-submission of 20/03755/REM)	4/1/2023
22/05031/PRIOR	Moat Farm Park Lane Castle Camps	Creation of 2 No. irrigation reservoirs	5/1/2023
EN/00492/21	Moat Farmhouse Moat Farm Park Lane Castle Camps	Without planning permission, an engineering operation comprising the excavation and formation of two lakes and the creation of earth bunds associated with the excavation of a lakes	5/1/2023

Appendix 2

22/04541/HFUL	7 Princes Close Balsham	Two storey extension and pergola to side	20/1/2023
22/01131/S73	Avalon Eco Farm Meadow Road Willingham	S73 removal of condition 8 (Passing place) of prior approval application 21/01820/PRI03Q (Prior approval for change of use of agricultural building to 2 No. dwellinghouses (Class C3))	23/01/2023

Appendix 3

Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates scheduled

- Local Inquiries

Reference	Name	Address	Planning decision or Enforcement?	Date confirmed/proposed
21/00953/FUL	Mr David Roe	Former Hotel Felix Whitehouse Lane Cambridge	Planning Decision	31/1/2023

- Informal Hearings

Reference	Name	Address	Planning decision or Enforcement?	Date confirmed/proposed
EN/00216/21	Nelson Charles Arthur James O'Conner	Land To The North Of The Old Coal Yard Chesterton Fen Road Milton	Enforcement Notice	TBC
EN/00362/21	Mary Siobhan Howe	Cherry Trees Priest Lane Willingham	Enforcement Notice	TBC
21/00629/S73	Abbey Developments Ltd	Land To The North And South Of Bartlow Road Linton	Planning Decision	TBC

This page is left blank intentionally.

Appeals Awaiting Decision from Inspectorate

Reference	Address	Description	Reason for appeal
EN/00216/21	Land To The North Of The Old Coal Yard Chesterton Fen Road Milton	Mobile homes sited on land without planning permission.	Appeal against enforcement notice
ENF/0214/18	22 Cambridge Road Foxton	Without planning permission: 1. The material change of use of the land hatched in blue on the attached plan to a coach depot including the parking and storage of coaches, and 2. The creation of an area of hardstanding for use as a coach depot on the land hatched in blue on the attached plan.	Appeal against enforcement notice
20/05079/FUL	17 Heydon Road Great And Little Chishill	Erection of one and a half storey dwelling.	Against Refusal of Permission
21/01540/CLUED	Poplar Cottage Nosterfield End Shudy Camps	Certificate of lawfulness under Section 191 for an existing single storey rear extension	Against Refusal of Permission
21/04068/FUL	Land North East Of 155 Rampton Road Willingham	Demolition of redundant agricultural building and erection of two dwellings with associated development (amendments to application 21/02578/PR103Q)	Against Refusal of Permission

Appendix 4

EN/00615/21	Byeways Station Road Harston	Breach of condition 2- 21/02100/HFUL (extension being built bigger than approved) (erection of outbuilding in rear garden exceeding PD)	Appeal against enforcement notice
21/00629/S73	Land To The North And South Of Bartlow Road Linton	S73 Variation of condition 11 (Foul water drainage) of outline planning permission S/1963/15/OL (Residential development for up to 55 dwellings with landscape buffer and new vehicular accesses from Bartlow Road) for revised wording to refer to the foul drainage design.	Against Refusal of Permission
22/00455/CLUED	Blackberry Barn 4 Over Mereway Willingham	Certificate of lawfulness under S191 for the continued use of land as domestic garden.	Against Refusal of Permission
21/00298/FUL	Green Fox Farm Fowlmere Road Melbourn	Farmland diversification, ecological enhancements and erection of 1no. residential dwelling with an associated change of use in land from agricultural to residential.	Non-determined within 8 weeks

Appendix 4

EN/00362/21	Cherry Trees Priest Lane Willingham	Without planning permission, the change of use of the land from agricultural use to the use of the land for the running of a dog rescue organisation and the erection of associated kennels	Appeal against enforcement notice
EN/00063/22	The Land And Property Situated And Comprising Willow Grange Farm Ely Road Chittering	Without planning permission: a) The undertaking of works to facilitate a weddings and events venue business at Willow Grange Farm including the erection of a marquee, bell tents, shepherd huts, toilet facilities and safari tents together with hard standings, decking and pathways; b) A Material Change of Use of the land from Agriculture to a weddings and events venue.	Appeal against enforcement notice
EN/00208/22	10 Shirley Close Milton	Without planning permission, the creation of a new dwelling	Appeal against enforcement notice
EN/01566/20	Whines Lane Farm Track Over	Without planning permission, the change of use of the land from agricultural to a mixed use of open-air storage and residential use. To include the siting of a caravan used for residential purposes, the storage of motor vehicles and associated paraphernalia, storage of building materials and the construction of a wooden structure.	Appeal against enforcement notice
21/03211/FUL	Land West Of Casa D Foseta St Neots Road	Erection of 2 No. dwellings and associated garages	Against Refusal of Permission

Appendix 4

21/05101/HFUL	3 Ravensdale Landbeach	Erection of glazed porch	Against Refusal of Permission
21/02117/FUL	The Jolly Millers 73 High Street Cottenham	Change of use of public house (SG) with flat to dwelling (C3), demolition of existing annex/outbuildings, erection of detached dwelling and creation of amenity space, bin storage and parking and manoeuvring for 2 dwellings	Against Refusal of Permission
22/00964/PRIOR	Land And Buildings To The East Of Gage Farm Branch Road Comberton	Change of use of agricultural building to 1 No. dwellinghouse (use class C3) and associated operational development.	Against Refusal of Permission
21/05251/FUL & 21/05252/LBC	46 High Street Balsham	Conversion of existing annexe into 2no 2bed flats and associated works.	Against Refusal of Permission
21/04473/FUL	Warren Lodge Fowlmere Road Fowlmere	Erection of a machinery and store building.	Against Refusal of Permission

Appendix 4

21/05689/OUT	Land To The South Of Banworth Ely Road Landbeach	Outline application for 3 dwellings with some matters reserved except for access.	Non-determined within 8 weeks
21/02795/S73	Land East Of Highfields Road Highfields Caldecote	Variation of condition 18 (scheme for a shared use footway/cycleway along the western side of Highfields Road) and 20 (scheme for the design and materials to be used for access and public rights of way) of planning permission S/3777/19/VC (Variation of condition 23 (water drainage scheme) of planning permission S/2510/15/OL for Outline planning permission for up to 140 residential dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing) removal of existing temporary agricultural structures and debris introduction of structural planting and landscaping informal public open space and children's play area community orchard and allotments surface water flood mitigation and attenuation vehicular access points from Highfields Road and associated ancillary works. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access)	Against Refusal of Permission
21/04971/PRIOR	Mill Lane Histon	Installation of a 16.0m Phase 8 Monopole C/W wrapround Cabinet at base and associated ancillary works	Against Refusal of Permission
EN/00394/21A	Land adjoining 16 Chalky Road Great Abington	Without planning permission, the erection of a building (edged in black on attached plan for identification purposes only).	Appeal against enforcement notice
20/01564/FUL	Land To The South East Of Burton End West Wickham	Mixed use of agricultural and solar farm	Against Refusal of Permission

Appendix 4

20/03845/HFUL	30 Manor Road Gamlingay	Amendment to S/0371/08/F 'Extension to dwelling and erection of double garage / conservatory' to include the installation of a roof light and the removal of a first floor window on the southern elevation	Against condition(s) on permission
21/00953/FUL	Former Hotel Felix Whitehouse Lane Cambridge	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a care home (Use Class C2) with external amenity space, access, parking, landscaping and other associated works	Against Refusal of Permission
22/00664/FUL	25 Station Road Over	Subdivision of existing garden plot and the erection of a detached dwellinghouse including the stopping up of the existing driveway access and creation of new vehicular access to station road.	Against Refusal of Permission
21/05641/OUT	Land To The South Of 86 Chrishall Road Fowlmere	Outline planning application for 15no self-build dwellings, with details pursuant to access and layout, and all other matters including appearance, scale and landscaping reserved for subsequent approval.	Against Refusal of Permission
EN/00184/22	Land At Acre Orwell Road Barrington	Alleged change of use of the land from agricultural to living in a caravan without permission	Appeal against enforcement notice
21/02235/FUL	The Oaks Blacksmiths Lane Shudy Camps	Demolition of existing dwelling and industrial buildings and erection of 2 x 3bed bungalows and associated garages and alteration of access.	Against Refusal of Permission

Appendix 4

21/04955/FUL	Land Adjacent To 55 Hillside Orwell	Erection of a detached dwelling house	Against Refusal of Permission
22/01210/PRIOR	Flittons Farm 78-80 Station Road Steeple Morden Royston	Notification for prior approval for the conversion of two agricultural buildings to 2 no. residential dwellings (Class C3)	Against Refusal of Permission
22/02960/FUL	16 Dowding Avenue Waterbeach	Erection of a 3 bedroom detached dwelling and parking on side garden of existing dwelling.	Against Refusal of Permission

This page is left blank intentionally.

Appeals Pending Statement

Reference	Address	Details	Date Statement due
21/03039/FUL	Bancroft Farm Church Lane Little Abington	Demolition of existing dilapidated agricultural buildings and hardstandings. Erection of five dwellings and the conversion of two redundant barns to form a detached dwelling and an office.	10/2/2023
21/03829/FUL	Land Adjacent To 26 Church Street Little Shelford	Erection of 1 No. dwelling with associated highway access.	28/2/2023
22/01027/FUL	Land To The Rear Of The Rose And Crown 2 Glebe Way Impington	Erection of a single dwelling.	28/2/2023
22/02870/OUT	Land To The South Of 86 Chrishall Road Fowlmere	Outline planning application for 15 No. self-build dwellings, with details pursuant to access and layout, and all other matters including appearance, scale and landscaping reserved for subsequent approval.	1/3/2023

Appendix 5

22/01507/HFUL	215 Wimpole Road Barton	Demolition of conservatory and shed. Erection of two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension, freestanding private gym and interconnecting undercover areas.	1/3/2023
---------------	----------------------------	--	----------