

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

2 August 2017

AUTHOR/S: Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development

Application Number:	S/1144/17/OL
Parish(es):	Highfields Caldecote
Proposal:	Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 58 dwellings, with associated infrastructure, landscaping and public open space. All matters reserved except for access.
Site address:	Land off Grafton Drive Caldecote
Applicant(s):	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP and Mr B. J. Fletcher and Mrs J. S. Fletcher
Recommendation:	Delegated approval (to complete section 106 agreement)
Key material considerations:	Five year supply of housing land Principle of development Density of development and affordable housing Character of the village edge and surrounding landscape Highway safety Residential amenity of neighbouring properties Surface water and foul water drainage Trees Ecology Provision of formal and informal open space Section 106 Contributions
Committee Site Visit:	01 August 2017
Departure Application:	Yes
Presenting Officer:	David Thompson, Principal Planning Officer
Application brought to Committee because:	Approval of the planning application would represent a departure from the Local Plan and is contrary to the recommendation of Caldecote Parish Council.
Date by which decision due:	04 August 2017 (Extension of time agreed)

Executive Summary

1. The proposal represents a significant scale of development on the edge of a group village. However, Highfields Caldecote is in close proximity to one of the most regular

public transport services to Cambridge and is geographically located close to the city, ensuring the journey times on this service are far less than from large parts of the District. The applicant is proposing the provision of a community transport facility as part of the mitigation measures, in addition to cycleway/footway improvements along Highfields Road. This would address the fact that the site is beyond what would be considered a reasonable walking distance from the bus stops on St. Neots Road and would provide an alternative means to making this trip by private car. These measures would enhance the environmental benefits of the proposals and would reduce the weight to be given to the fact that Caldecote itself has a limited range of services and facilities – as the ease of accessing services and employment in other settlements would be improved.

2. Whilst the limited range of service and facilities is recognised, the provision of a community transport vehicle would improve the connectivity between the southern end of the village and the more regular public transport links to Cambridge, from where the journey time is less than 20 minutes. Within the context of a predominantly rural District, the proximity of Highfields Caldecote to Cambridge and the enhancements that this scheme would make to connectivity ensure that the harm in relation to the lack of services and facilities within the village itself could be adequately mitigated. This conclusion is consistent with the Inspector's observations at Over, where access to employment would have required trips beyond the village and there was an acknowledgement that a number of these would have been, at least in part, by private car. That scheme did not propose as extensive mitigation as is proposed here to provide an alternative mode of transport.
3. Following the receipt of additional information, none of the statutory consultees have objected to the proposals. The density of the development is considered to be acceptable, with the possibility of breaking up the massing of the developed areas through the creation of smaller pockets of open space throughout the scheme. This is a design issue which will need to be resolved at the reserved matters stage. It is considered that the number of units proposed could be achieved in a manner that would preserve the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and the character of the surrounding landscape.
4. Overall, it is considered that the significant contribution the proposal would make to the deficit in the Council's five year housing land supply and the social benefits that would result from the development outweigh the harm resulting from the development of agricultural land and the limited landscape harm arising from the scheme. None of these disbenefits are considered to result in significant and demonstrable harm and therefore, it is considered that the proposal achieves the definition of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.
5. As officers are recommending approval for this application, if Members resolve to grant planning permission, Officers are also seeking permission not to defend the appeal against non-determination of application ref. S/2764/16/OL (of which this application is a duplicate) except where any material changes are introduced to the proposal or where the appellant departs from the terms of the Section 106 as detailed in this report and listed in the matrix attached as appendix 1 to this report.

Relevant Planning History

6. S/2764/16/OL - Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 58 dwellings, with associated infrastructure, landscaping and public open space. All matters reserved except for access – this application is currently the subject of an appeal against non-determination and the application being assessed in this report is a duplicate of that

appeal scheme. The appeal ref. is APP/W0530/W/17/3172541.

That application was not determined in the agreed timeframe due to the Council receiving legal advice that determination of the application could undermine the Council's defence of the appeal in relation to the proposal for 140 residential dwellings at land east of Highfields Road, Caldecote (ref. S/1216/16/OL). This advice was given as both that appeal site and the land that is the subject of this planning application are located outside of the village framework. The principle of development in both cases therefore rests on whether the quantum of development represents a sustainable level of growth in Caldecote when assessed against the definition of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF, with the context of the Council's inability to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land.

Now that the appeal relating to the scheme for 140 dwellings has been decided, officers are content that this application can be determined, having full regard to that decision and the cumulative impact of large scale developments affecting the capacity of infrastructure, services and facilities in Highfields Caldecote.

S/2768/16/E1 – Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening opinion in relation to proposed residential development of the site – no EIA required.

Other planning applications that are relevant to the determination of this application:

S/2510/15/OL - land east of Highfields Road, Caldecote - 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 – appeal allowed (the appeal was made on the grounds of non-determination of the application.)

S/2047/16/FL - Demolition of existing buildings, and erection of residential development to provide up to 71 dwellings (including 28 affordable dwellings), with associated vehicle and pedestrian accesses and open space, and a car park for school/community use – Members resolved to grant planning permission, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement, at the May 2017 meeting of the Planning Committee.

National Guidance

7. National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF)
Planning Practice Guidance

Development Plan Policies

The extent to which any of the following policies are out of date and the weight to be attached to them is addressed later in the report.

8. **South Cambridgeshire LDF Core Strategy DPD, 2007**
ST/2 Housing Provision
ST/6 Group Villages
9. **South Cambridgeshire LDF Development Control Policies DPD, 2007:**
DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development

DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments
DP/7 Development Frameworks
HG/1 Housing Density
HG/2 Housing Mix
HG/3 Affordable Housing
NE/1 Energy Efficiency
NE/3 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development
NE/4 Landscape Character Areas
NE/6 Biodiversity
NE/8 Groundwater
NE/9 Water and Drainage Infrastructure
NE/11 Flood Risk
NE/12 Water Conservation
NE/14 Lighting Proposals
NE/15 Noise Pollution
NE/17 Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
CH/2 Archaeological Sites
SF/10 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments
SF/11 Open Space Standards
TR/1 Planning For More Sustainable Travel
TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards
TR/3 Mitigating Travel Impact

10. **South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):**

Open Space in New Developments SPD - Adopted January 2009
Affordable Housing SPD - Adopted March 2010
Trees & Development Sites SPD - Adopted January 2009
Landscape in New Developments SPD - Adopted March 2010
Biodiversity SPD - Adopted July 2009
District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010
Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD – Adopted January 2009

11. **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission - March 2014**

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
HQ/1 Design Principles
H/7 Housing Density
H/8 Housing Mix
H/9 Affordable Housing
NH/2 Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
NH/3 Protecting Agricultural Land
NH/4 Biodiversity
NH/14 Heritage Assets
CC/1 Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change
CC/3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments
CC/4 Sustainable Design and Construction
CC/6 Construction Methods
CC/7 Water Quality
CC/8 Sustainable Drainage Systems

CC/9 Managing Flood Risk
SC/2 Heath Impact Assessment
SC/6 Indoor Community Facilities
SC/7 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments
SC/8 Open Space Standards
SC/10 Lighting Proposals
SC/11 Noise Pollution
TI/2 Planning for Sustainable Travel
TI/3 Parking Provision
TI/8 Infrastructure and New Developments

Consultation

12. **Highfields Caldecote Parish Council** – (comments received in relation to this application are the same as those received in relation to S/2764/26/OL):

Objects to the proposed development for the following reasons (summarised):

- The proposal would represent a departure from the adopted LDF - policy ST/6 states that development in Group Villages should be limited to developments of up to 8 units or a maximum of 15 where that would make the best use of a brownfield site. Clearly this proposal far exceeds those limits.
- Paragraph 14 states of the NPPF states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that where a Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, planning permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The Parish Council consider that the impact of the additional growth of the village resulting from this development would be unsustainable due to the limited nature of the services and facilities serving the village and the capacity of those services.
- The following elements of infrastructure provision are considered to be particularly deficient in capacity terms:

Drainage – there have been 3 ‘1 in 100 year’ level flood events in Caldecote in the last 21 years. During the 2014 floods, the capacity of the foul and surface water drainage network was exceeded and a number of properties flooded. The northern and southern ends of the village regularly flood during periods of heavy rainfall. The scheme proposes to drain surface water from the site into the existing water course. This will make the existing capacity situation worse and add to the problem of surface water entering the foul drainage network, enhancing the risk of raw sewage overflowing from the system. The scheme will add to the capacity problems at the foul water pumping station.

Education – the County Council have stated that the pupil roll for Caldecote Primary School in September 2015 was 197, with a capacity of 210 and a Published Admission Number of 30 – resulting in capacity for 13 additional pupils. On the basis of data from the 2011 Census, the Parish Council consider that this proposal is likely to yield 25 children – exceeding the capacity of the school. The school building is located on a physically constrained site and therefore capacity cannot be increased to mitigate the impact of the development.

Healthcare – There is no medical provision in Caldecote. Bourn surgery has 5,962 patients. Comberton surgery has 10,747 patients. The proposed

development will put increased pressure on these facilities.

Sustainable Public Transport – Caldecote is served by a once-per-day bus service from the two stops on Highfields Road and this service does not operate at peak commuting times. There is a more frequent service which runs along St. Neots Road but that is 3-4km from the application site and therefore beyond a reasonable walking distance for occupants of the proposed development. The 2011 Census indicates that 75% of residents in the village commute to work by car.

Utilities – the water supplies at Bourn reservoir and the water towers that serve Cambourne may not have sufficient capacity to serve the development. Gas pressure may also be insufficient.

Access – there is only one proposed means of access into the development by vehicles and pedestrians – via Grafton Drive, which is a private road. As a result, no roads within the development would be adopted and therefore maintenance will be reliant on a management company funded by contributions paid by occupants of the development. It is unclear how safe access by emergency vehicles would be secured with only one access point being proposed.

- The Parish Council is willing to consider an amended scheme that looks to address the above concerns. The inclusion of a retail unit within the development would also improve the sustainability credentials of the proposals.

Bourn Parish Council – no comments to make on the application.

13. **Cambridgeshire Police (Designing Out Crime Officer)** – no objection. Crime statistics in the locality do not give rise to concerns in relation to the principle of development. Designing out crime will be a key consideration at the reserved matters stage.
14. **District Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO)** – The Public Health Specialist has commented that the Health Impact Assessment has been assessed as meeting the required standard of the SPD Policy. The scheme is therefore acceptable in this regard.

An assessment of the potential noise generated by traffic accessing and egressing the development and the impact that this may have on the residential amenity of the occupants of the properties adjacent to the proposed main vehicular access off Grafton Drive has been submitted. Mitigation measures are suggested in the report i.e. the use of insulation to reduce the impact of noise, but more detail is required in relation to the means of ventilation in properties where the windows are likely to be shut at night time. These details can be secured by condition at this outline stage as the impact will only become clearer at the reserved matters stage when the layout is to be fixed.

Noise, vibration and dust minimisation plans will be required to ensure that the construction phase of the scheme would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents. These details shall be secured by condition, along with a restriction on the hours during which power operated machinery should be used during the construction phase of the development and details of the phasing of the development.

The applicant will be required to complete a Waste Design Toolkit at the reserved

matters stage in order to show how it is intended to address the waste management infrastructure, and technical requirements within the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide. In addition conditions should secure the submission of a Site Waste Management Plan. Provision of domestic waste receptacles by the developer will be secured via the Section 106 agreement.

15. **District Council Contaminated Land Officer** – No objection. The phase I report submitted with the application highlights the previous use of the land as a pig farm and for waste storage. Given the sensitive nature of the proposed end use, a phase II survey will be required to ensure that the impact of any potential contaminants of the site is fully mitigated. This can be secured by condition at this outline stage.
16. **Air Quality Officer** – No objection. To ensure that sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the development are not affected by the negative impact of construction work such as dust and noise, as well as ensuring that the applicant complies with the Council's low emission strategy for a development of this scale, conditions should be included that require the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan/Dust Management Plan, and an electronic vehicle charging infrastructure strategy.
17. **District Council Urban Design Officer** – no objection to the principle of development on the site. Development of the land would extend the village edge westwards of the existing envelope but the site is visually well contained with a wooded area to the west, existing housing to the east, the recreation ground to the south and fields divided by hedgerows to the north. Although Caldecote originated from a strong linear form, this character has been significantly diluted by more recent development to the rear of the main ribbon of buildings along Main Street and Highfields Road. The creation of public access to the woodland to the west of the site is welcomed. Opportunities to connect to the recreation ground to the south should be considered at the reserved matters stage. Additional landscaping on the site boundaries could be secured to further reduce the wider landscape impact of the proposed development. The density of the developable area is relatively high at 32 dwellings per hectare however this would be offset by the inclusion of 1.4 hectares of open space, which could be positioned so as to break up the mass and concentration of buildings across the site. This is a design issue to be dealt with at the reserved matters stage, as is the fixing of the location of any 2.5 storey development, which should be positioned in the central core as opposed to at the more sensitive edges of the scheme.
18. **District Council Landscape Design Officer** – No objections to the proposals The site lies in the Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Landscape Claylands National Character Area and within the Western Claylands character area at the local level. The applicant has provided a photographic assessment of views of the site and concludes that the existing woodland and boundary hedgerows on the edge of the site provide a sense of containment which would reduce the wider landscape impact of the development. This assessment is supported. Details of landscaping to be planted as part of the development and the treatment/management of public open space and sustainable drainage can be secured by condition or within the Section 106 Agreement.
19. **Cambridgeshire County Council Local Highway Authority** – no objection to the proposals from a highway safety perspective. Further details of the potential impact on the capacity of nearby junctions and the wider highway network has been completed by the applicant. The Local Highway Authority has no objections to the proposals on the basis of this additional information, subject to securing footway improvements and the community transport scheme.

20. **Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team (Archaeology)** – No objection raised. No further investigations are considered necessary and no mitigation measures required.
21. **Cambridgeshire County Council Flood & Water Team** – no objection to the proposals. Sustainable drainage measures should be incorporated within the development and this principle should form the basis of a detailed surface water drainage strategy, which can be secured by condition at this outline stage.
22. **NHS England** - state that Bourn surgery and the satellite surgery at Little Eversden (associated with Comberton surgery) do not currently have capacity to accommodate the projected additional demand that will result from this development. On the basis of their calculation, NHS England have requested a sum of £21,919 to provide an additional 9.53 square metres of floorspace to accommodate the additional approximately 139 anticipated population increase (nb. Different projection to the County Council figure in this regard).
23. **Environment Agency** – no objections to the proposals on the basis that a condition is attached to the planning permission requiring final details of the surface water drainage strategy to be agreed and that a condition requiring investigation into and the remediation of any sources of contamination on the site be attached to any permission granted.
24. **Anglian Water** - No objections received, and advised –
Wastewater treatment – The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Bourn Water Recycling Centre, which currently has capacity to treat the flows from the proposed development
Foul Sewage Network – The foul drainage network has capacity to take the additional flows that will arise from this development.
Surface Water Disposal – The preferred means of draining surface water from the site would be via Sustainable Drainage System, with connection to the mains sewer being a last resort. The Lead Local Flood Risk Authority (LLFRA) should be consulted on this aspect of the proposals.
25. **Affordable Housing Officer** – The site is located outside of the development framework of Highfields Caldecote and should therefore be considered as an exception site for the provision of 100% affordable housing to meet the local housing need in line with Policy H/10 of the proposed Local Plan. However, should this application not be determined as an exception site, then the Council will seek to secure at least 40% affordable housing. The developer is proposing 58 dwellings, 23 of these would have to be affordable.

There are currently 13 people on the Housing Register who live in or have a local connection to Highfields Caldecote.

The mix and tenure split for the 23 affordable dwellings should be as follows:

Affordable rent – 16 units:

6 x 1 bed
8 x 2 bed
2 x 3 bed

Shared ownership – 7 units:

4 x 2 bed
3 x 3 bed

8 properties should be allocated to those with a local connection to Highfields Caldecote and the remaining 15 should be allocated on a 50/50 split basis between applicants with a local connection to Highfields Caldecote and those with a District wide connection.

Properties should be built to DCLG technical housing standards.

26. **Section 106 Officer** – details of the specific policy compliant contributions are discussed in detail in the main body of the report. A detailed matrix is attached to this report as appendix 1.
27. **Cambridgeshire County Council Growth Team** – This proposal would result in an anticipated 18 children in the early years age bracket, 9 of which would qualify for free provision. Two options have been identified as potential mitigation, with the final option to be pursued dependent upon a decision by the County Council relating to the future of the Children’s Centre in the village.

If the Children’s Centre is to be retained, this could be converted to provide capacity for an additional 52 children. That project would cost £60,000 in total, with the proportionate contribution from this development being £10,386. If the Children’s Centre is closed, a new classroom would be provided through an extension to the school building. The total cost of that project would be £500,000 and the proportionate contribution from this development would be £173,079.

In relation to primary school provision, this development would give rise to 21 additional pupils within this age bracket. There is currently insufficient capacity at the primary school to accommodate the additional children. The County Council have identified a project which would mitigate the impact of this development, the scheme for 140 dwellings on land east of Highfields Road and the 71 dwellings on land rear of 18-28 Highfields Road (committee resolved to grant that application, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement at the May 2017 meeting). The project is an extension to the primary school comprising 4 classrooms to provide an additional 120 places. The total cost of the extension would be £2,590,000 and the proportionate contribution from this development would be approximately £453,243 (final figure dependent upon housing mix which is to be determined at the reserved matters stage).

No contributions are considered necessary in relation to secondary school provision as the County Council’s forecast data indicate that Comberton Village College has available capacity to accommodate the additional population arising from this development (anticipated 15 children in that age bracket.)

In relation to lifelong learning, a figure of £4.08 per the additional residents (approx. 145 in the Council’s calculation) is based on the standard charge approach adopted by the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council and is considered to be CIL compliant to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms, to increase the stock of books at the existing mobile library. The total contribution from this scheme is approximately £591.60 (depending upon final housing mix to be determined at the reserved matters stage.)

28. **District Council Sustainable Drainage Engineer** – no objection to the proposals subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the details of surface water drainage

to be agreed.

29. **District Council Ecology Officer** – No objections to the proposals, following the receipt of additional information from the applicant in terms of the precautionary measures to be put in place to mitigate the potential impact of the development on Great Crested Newts.

No objection to the application in principle and the thorough ecological survey information is welcomed. There are substantial opportunities to enhance habitats at the site including native planting, woodland management and the creation of attenuation ponds/drainage basins which also have ecological value. The indicative site layout is acceptable, although hedgerows should be retained and protected outside of garden boundaries.

A condition should be attached requiring compliance with the mitigation measures listed in the ecology survey submitted with the application and the mitigation measures detailed in the additional information relating to Great Crested Newts. A mitigation strategy relating to the potential impact on badgers and biodiversity enhancements to be secured as part of the development should also be secured by condition.

30. **District Council Tree Officer** – no objections to the principle of development. There will be a need to submit a comprehensive arboricultural assessment and tree protection plan with the reserved matters application. There is a need to ensure that the proposals would not adversely impact the woodland immediately to the west of the site (which is the subject of a group Tree Preservation Order.) Details of tree protection measures and additional landscaping should be secured by condition at this outline stage.
31. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** – No objection to the proposals subject to adequate provision being made within the development for fire hydrants which could be secured by a condition or through a Section 106 agreement.
32. **County Council Definitive Map Officer** – no objections to the proposals. It is unlikely that the County Council would adopt any of the pedestrian routes to the adjacent recreation ground and also the woodland to the west of the site.

Representations

33. 17 letters (including representations received via the website) of objection have been submitted in relation to this application alongside the 33 representations received in objection to the application which is now the subject of an appeal. The responses in objection to both schemes raise the following issues (summarised):
- The proposal would significantly increase the volume of traffic on Grafton Drive and this will detrimentally affect the capacity of the junction with Highfields Road, causing a highway safety hazard along a route used by parents and children to walk to the primary school.
 - The proposal will result in increased traffic congestion and is likely to cause more parking on Grafton Drive as traffic builds up outside the primary school in the mornings and afternoons.
 - Large vehicles accessing the site during the construction phase of the development would result in a highway safety hazard given the narrow width of Grafton Drive.
 - There are significant concerns about the ability of the drainage network within the

village to be able to accommodate both the foul and surface water flows resulting from the proposed development.

- The proposal will result in the development of a site that has high biodiversity value – including habitats that support Brown Hares and foraging bats. The erection of buildings on the site and the associated impacts would have an adverse impact on this biodiversity value.
- The proposals will have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties through unreasonable overlooking.
- The site is located outside of the village framework and therefore the proposals are contrary to the provisions of the Core Strategy.
- The proposal will result in ribbon development between Cambourne, Bourn Airfield and Highfields Caldecote, resulting in a cumulatively harmful impact on the character of the landscape.
- The public transport service in the village is insufficient to provide a realistic alternative to making journeys by private car ensuring that the scheme would be environmentally unsustainable.
- Previous residential developments in the village have been refused due to the adverse impact upon the capacity of the drainage network. This proposal would result in additional flows that could not be accommodated and therefore should also be refused.
- The applicant's proposed 18 month construction management plan would restrict the ability of existing residents on Grafton Drive to park in front of and access their property. This is an unacceptable proposal.
- The adverse impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring properties could not be adequately mitigated and the applicant's own assessment concludes that there would be a 'significant adverse' visual and privacy impact on the amenity of the adjacent properties as a result of the development.
- The application site includes Grafton Drive which is a private road, which the applicant does not own and does not have the right to occupy or develop.
- The number of trips generated by the proposed development is considered to have been underestimated by the developer, given the heavy reliance on the private car by residents to access essential services and facilities.
- The proposal itself would result in a 10% increase in the population of Highfields Caldecote. Taken alongside the schemes proposed by Gladman and Cala in the village, this increase in population would be 25%. This proposed level of growth is considered to be unsustainable.
- The proposal would represent the development of a greenfield site, as opposed to brownfield land and therefore does not constitute sustainable development.
- The lack of sustainability of Caldecote as a village, due to the limited nature of the services and facilities within the settlement, were the reason behind the refusal of the 140 dwellings proposed on land east of Highfields Road. The same principle applies here and therefore this application should also be refused.
- The applicant claims that the pre-school capacity shortfall can be accommodated by a financial contribution towards an extension of the facility at the primary school. However, the site is physically constrained and therefore, even if funding was raised, a suitable extension to offset the impact of the development could not actually be provided.
- There is some doubt in relation to the applicant's claim that there is capacity within the primary school to accommodate the additional pupils generated by the proposed development. The developer's case appears to rely on forecasts showing a decline in the number of children within the catchment area of the school in future years and the evidence base for this is not clear.
- The noise and pollution caused by the construction phase of the development would result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the existing properties on Grafton Drive.

- Given the existing problems of surface water infiltrating into the foul sewage network in the village, it is considered inappropriate to drain surface water from the development by the network of ditches adjacent to the site.
- The existing road surfacing on Grafton Drive is considered of insufficient quality to withstand the impact of the additional traffic, including heavy traffic during the construction phase that will be generated by this development.
- The site was assessed as part of the SHLAA process which provided the evidence base behind the emerging Local Plan and was rejected on the basis of having a detrimental landscape and townscape impact. This assessment still applies and the application should therefore be refused.
- There are capacity problems at the GP surgeries in the locality as well as dental services – these will not be able to accommodate the additional population of the proposed development.

Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) – Object to the application. The Council's five year housing land supply deficit has been addressed by the submission of the draft Local Plan. The emerging Local Plan makes provision for an increase in the number of houses to be developed in the District. The scheme would significantly exceed the 15 dwelling limit on new residential development in group villages and should therefore be refused. The housing need within the District for the next 2 years could be met in Northstowe and there are plans to develop Bourn Airfield proposed in the emerging Local Plan. The proposal would result in encroachment into the countryside and the loss of agricultural land.

Site and Surroundings

34. The application site is land to the west of Grafton Drive, a residential street located on the western edge of Highfields Caldecote. There is a large agricultural building and areas of hardstanding on the site associated with the former use of the land as a piggery. A dense area of woodland abuts the western boundary of the site (the subject of a group Tree Preservation Order - TPO), access is gained from the eastern boundary which borders the existing properties on Grafton Drive. The southern boundary of the site, adjacent to the recreation ground, is demarcated by hedge and tree planting.

Proposal

35. Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 58 dwellings, with associated infrastructure, landscaping and public open space. All matters reserved except for access.

Planning Assessment

36. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application in terms of the principle of development are the implications of the five year supply of housing land deficit on the proposals and whether Caldecote generally and this site specifically allow a scheme of the scale proposed to meet the definition of sustainable development. An assessment is required in relation to the impact of the proposals on the character of the village edge and the surrounding landscape, highway safety, the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, environmental health, surface water and foul water drainage capacity, the provision of formal and informal open space and other section 106 contributions.

Principle of Development

Five year housing land supply and sustainability of the proposed development:

37. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires councils to boost significantly the supply of housing and to identify and maintain a five-year housing land supply with an additional buffer as set out in paragraph 47.
38. The Council accepts that it cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply in the district as required by the NPPF, having a 4.1 year supply using the methodology identified by the Inspector in the Waterbeach appeals in 2014. This shortfall is based on an objectively assessed housing need of 19,500 homes for the period 2011 to 2031 (as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 and updated by the latest update undertaken for the Council in November 2015 as part of the evidence responding to the Local Plan Inspectors' preliminary conclusions) and latest assessment of housing delivery (in the housing trajectory March 2017). In these circumstances any adopted or emerging policy which can be considered to restrict the supply of housing land is considered 'out of date' in respect of paragraph 49 of the NPPF.
39. Unless circumstances change, those conclusions should inform, in particular, the Council's approach to paragraph 49 of the NPPF, which states that adopted policies "for the supply of housing" cannot be considered up to date where there is not a five year housing land supply. The affected policies which, on the basis of the legal interpretation of "policies for the supply of housing" which applied at the time of the Waterbeach decision were: Core Strategy DPD policies ST/2 and ST/5 and Development Control Policies DPD policy DP/7 (relating to village frameworks and indicative limits on the scale of development in villages). The Inspector did not have to consider policies ST/6 and ST/7 but as a logical consequence of the decision these should also be considered policies "for the supply of housing".
40. Further guidance as to which policies should be considered as 'relevant policies for the supply of housing' emerged from a recent Court of Appeal decision (Richborough v Cheshire East and Suffolk Coastal DC v Hopkins Homes). The Court defined 'relevant policies for the supply of housing' widely and held that the term was not to be restricted 'merely policies in the Development Plan that provide positively for the delivery of new housing in terms of numbers and distribution or the allocation of sites,' but also to include, 'plan policies whose effect is to influence the supply of housing by restricting the locations where new housing may be developed.' Therefore all policies in the adopted Development Plan which have the potential to restrict or affect housing supply may be considered out of date in respect of the NPPF.
41. The decision of the Court of Appeal tended to confirm the approach taken by the inspector who determined the Waterbeach appeal. As such, as a result of the decision of the Court of Appeal, policies including policy ST/6 of the Core Strategy and policies DP/1 (a) and DP/7 of the Development Control Policies DPD fell to be considered as "relevant policies for the supply of housing" for the purposes of the NPPF para 49 and therefore out of date.
42. However, the decision of the Court of Appeal has since been overturned by the Supreme Court in its judgement dated 10 May 2017. The principal consequence of the decision of the Supreme Court is to narrow the range of policies which fall to be considered as "relevant policies for the supply of housing" for the purposes of the NPPF. The term "relevant policies for the supply of housing" has been held by the Supreme Court to be limited to "housing supply policies" rather than more being interpreted more broadly so as to include any policies which "affect" the supply of

housing, as was held in substance by the Court of Appeal.

43. The effect of the Supreme Court's judgement is that policies ST/6, DP/1(a) and DP/7 are no longer to be considered as "relevant policies for the supply of housing". They are therefore not "out of date" by reason of paragraph 49 of the NPPF. None of these adopted policies are "housing supply policies" nor are they policies by which "acceptable housing sites are to be identified". Rather, together, these policies seek to direct development to sustainable locations. The various dimensions of sustainable development are set out in the NPPF at para 7. It is considered that policies ST/6, DP/1(a) and DP/7 and their objectives, both individually and collectively, of securing locational sustainability, accord with and furthers the social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and therefore accord with the Framework.
44. However, given the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, its policies remain out of date "albeit housing supply policies" do not now include policies ST/6, DP/1(a) and DP/7. As such, and in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court, para 14 of the NPPF is engaged and planning permission for housing should be granted, inter alia "unless any adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole ..."
45. This means that even if policies are considered to be up to date, the absence of a demonstrable five year housing land supply cannot simply be put to one side. Any conflict with adopted policies ST/6, DP/1(a) and, DP/7 is still capable of giving rise to an adverse effect which significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefit in terms of housing delivery of the proposed development in terms of a residential-led development cannot simply be put to one side. The NPPF places very considerable weight on the need to boost the supply of housing, particularly affordable housing, particularly in the absence of a five year housing land supply. As such, although any conflict with adopted policies ST/6, DP/1(a) and, DP/7 is still capable, in principle, of giving rise to an adverse effect which significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefit of the proposed development, any such conflict needs to be weighed against the importance of increasing the delivery of housing, particularly in the absence currently of a five year housing land supply.
46. A balancing exercise therefore needs to be carried out. As part of that balance in the absence of a five year housing land supply, considerable weight and importance should be attached to the benefits a proposal brings in terms of the delivery of new homes (including affordable homes). It is only when the conflict with other development plan policies – including where engaged policies ST/6, DP/1(a) and DP/7 which seek to direct development to the most sustainable locations – is so great in the context of a particular application such as to significantly and demonstrably outweigh" the benefit in terms of the delivery of new homes that planning permission should be refused.
47. This approach reflects the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Hopkins Homes* appeal.
48. As part of the case of the applicant rests on the current five year housing land supply deficit, the developer is required to demonstrate that the dwellings would be delivered within a 5 year period. Officers are of the view that the applicant has demonstrated that the site can be delivered within a timescale whereby weight can be given to the contribution the proposal could make to the 5 year housing land supply.
49. The site is located outside the Highfields Caldecote village framework, in the open countryside, where policy DP/7 of the LDF and Policy S/7 of the Draft Local Plan state

that only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted. The erection of a residential development of up to 58 dwellings would therefore not under normal circumstances be considered acceptable in principle since it is contrary to this adopted and emerging policy.

50. Development in Group Villages (the current and emerging status of Highfields Caldecote) is normally limited under policy ST/6 to schemes of up to an indicative maximum of 8 dwellings, or in exceptional cases 15, where development would lead to the sustainable recycling of a brownfield site bringing positive overall benefit to the village. This planning objective remains important and is consistent with the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development, by limiting the scale of development in less sustainable rural settlements with a limited range of services to meet the needs of new residents in a sustainable manner.
51. By proposing 58 dwellings, the scheme would significantly exceed the indicative maximum of 8 on a greenfield site. The principal consideration is that the NPPF requires development to be assessed against the definition of sustainable development. Specifically in relation to the size of development in or on the edge of Group Villages, the Inspector in the recent Over appeal decision (18 January 2017) stated that '...the strict application of the existing settlement hierarchy and blanket restriction on development outside those areas would significantly restrain housing delivery.....this would frustrate the aim of boosting the supply of housing.'
52. In light of the above, it is not appropriate, in the case of all Group Villages, to attach the same weight to policy DP/7 and DP/1(a) in the 'blanket' way. It is necessary to consider the circumstances of each Group Village to establish whether that village can accommodate sustainably (as defined in the NPPF) the development proposed, having regard in particular to the level of services and facilities available to meet the needs of that development. Similarly, each planning application must be assessed on its own merits and the wider benefit of the community transport and pedestrian/cycleway links to improve the sustainability of the village as well as the development in this case must be considered in assessing the weight to be given to the harm resulting from development on land outside of the village framework.
53. The environmental issues, including impact on the open countryside, are assessed in the following sections of the report. In relation to the loss of higher grade agricultural land, policy NE/17 states that the District Council will not grant planning permission for development which would lead to the irreversible loss of grades 1, 2 or 3a. This site is classified as grade 3 agricultural land.
54. The site is not allocated for development in the existing or the emerging Local Plan. However, given that the development is considered to meet the definition of sustainable development (once the mitigation measures are taken into account) as set out in the NPPF and the fact that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, it could be argued that the need for housing overrides the need to retain the agricultural land when conducting the planning balance. Given the extent of the housing supply deficit, it is considered that compliance with criteria b of NE/17 should be afforded more weight than the conflict with criterion a.
55. The proposals are assessed below against the social and economic criteria of the definition of sustainable development.

Social Sustainability:

56. Paragraph 55 of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas advising 'housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities', and recognises that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.
57. The development would provide a clear benefit in helping to meet the current housing shortfall in South Cambridgeshire through delivering up to an additional 58 residential dwellings, 40% of which would be affordable (23 units). Ensuring that the housing mix in the market element of the scheme would accord with emerging policy H/8 (discussed in detail later in this report) is a matter to be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.
58. The affordable housing can be secured through a Section 106 Agreement. Officers are of the view the provision of up to 58 additional houses, including the affordable dwellings, is a social benefit and significant weight should be attributed this in the decision making process, particularly in light of the Housing Officer's confirmation that there is a demonstrable need for affordable housing in Highfields Caldecote.
59. The adopted Open Space SPD requires the provision of approximately 1750 metres squared of public open space for a development on the scale proposed, depending on the final mix, which is to be determined at the reserved matters stage (this figure represents an approximate amount based on a policy compliant mix). The scheme exceeds this amount by a significant margin (approximately 14000 square metres is shown on the indicative masterplan, excluding the woodland at the southern end of the site) and would include sufficient space for the inclusion of informal areas of play as well as an equipped area of play, as required by the SPD. Equipped play space is not indicated on the proposed plans but this requirement can be secured through the Section 106 and there is considered to be sufficient space within the layout to include this provision at the density proposed, with the exact position to be secured at the reserved matters stage. An alternative would be to meet the requirement through offsite provision.
60. Given that Highfields Caldecote has an identified short fall in play space, the fact that this amount of space can be provided at the density of development indicated is considered to be a significant social benefit of the proposals. Details of the management of the open space and woodland area can be secured in the Section 106 Agreement at this outline stage.
61. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF states that the social dimension of sustainable development includes the creation of a high quality built environment with accessible local services. The indicative layout plan demonstrates that the site can be developed for the number of dwellings proposed, although there are aspects which require further consideration at the reserved matters stage.

Impact on services and facilities:

62. The proposal would significantly exceed the policy complaint number of dwellings in a group village and would not be within the existing framework boundary. Therefore an assessment needs to be made in relation to the impact of the development on facilities in Highfields Caldecote and whether this impact is considered to meet the definition of sustainable development.
63. Paragraph 204 of the NPPF relates to the tests that local planning authorities should apply to assess whether planning obligations should be sought to mitigate the impacts of development. In the line with the CIL regulations 2010, the contributions must be:

- necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms
 - directly related to the development
 - fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed.
64. The existing bus service serving the main part of Highfields Caldecote is irregular, with only one morning service to Cambridge and one back in the evening. The service would not be a realistic alternative to the private car for most journeys from the village to settlements with a greater range of services and facilities throughout the rest of the day during the week or at weekends (when there is no service), a point that has been made by a number of the objections received to the application. The morning and evening buses would allow commuting to and from Cambridge however, arriving at Cambridge at 8 am and back to Highfields Caldecote at 18.30 (the no. 2 service).
65. However, the Citi 4 service operates along St. Neots Road, to the north of the village and provides a regular service to and from Cambridge at commuting times and throughout the day during the week and at weekends. At 1.6 km from the site, it is acknowledged that the closest bus stops are beyond what would be considered a reasonable walking distance from the proposed development. However, in deciding a scheme for a similar number of dwellings (55) in Over, the Inspector gave weight to the presence of a regular form of public transport (the Guided Busway in that case) within a similar distance of the site as St. Neots Road is to this site, on the basis that the majority of a journey to Cambridge could be undertaken by a more sustainable mode than the private car.
66. In assessing the issue of addressing a housing shortage and accounting for the rural character of the majority of the District, the Inspector deciding the Over appeal concluded that 'the level of approvals (of new dwellings across the district) are not at such a scale or rate that they are making significant in-roads into the shortfall.' In relating that situation to the merits of the Over scheme, the Inspector stated 'a concern that the location of this development would lead to journeys for shopping trips is therefore something that is potentially to be repeated in other such locations and therefore does not make this site significantly less sustainable than any other site....'
67. Over as a village has more facilities (e.g. a GP surgery, a central village shop and a mobile part time post office) than Highfields Caldecote. However, it does not have significant sources of employment or services that would go beyond meeting basic day to day needs and access to these would therefore generate trips out of the village.
68. In determining the appeal for the 140 dwellings on land east of Highfields Road, Caldecote, the Inspector accepted that the relatively limited nature of facilities in the village in terms of shopping and employment would result in reliance of car travel to larger settlements. However, due to the fact that the location of that development was within reasonable walking distance of St. Neots Road, weight was given to the alternative provided by a regular public transport service on the edge of the village, to which access would be improved through footway upgrade works.
69. This site is outside of reasonable walking distance to that regular service and therefore, without further mitigation measures to enhance more sustainable means of transport, it is considered that less weight could be afforded to the sustainability benefit of the alternative means of transport. To address this point, the applicant is proposing the provision of a community transport facility as part of the package of measures to mitigate the impact of the development. Caldecote Parish Council have been involved in discussions about the proposal and management arrangements can be secured through the Section 106 Agreement. The £30,000 contribution to be secured would also include a contribution towards annual maintenance of such a vehicle for a five year

period. This facility would provide an alternative to single occupancy car journeys for residents of the development as well as the wider village, enhancing the environmental sustainability of the scheme.

70. The community transport facility would add to the opportunities for sustainable travel options for residents to access services and facilities as well as employment in larger settlements. Given that this facility would provide a more regular sustainable means of transport to occupants of the development and the wider village, it is considered that the conclusion reached in the Over appeal in relation to the significant weight to be applied to the provision of additional housing in the District also applies in this case. It should be noted that a community transport contribution was not secured as part of the Over appeal.
71. In addition to a contribution to fund this facility, the applicant is also proposing to provide an upgraded cycleway/footway for a length of 250 metres along the section of Highfields Road between 115 b and the St. Neots Road roundabout. This would tie in with the mitigation to be secured in relation to the proposals for 140 and 71 dwellings respectively, referred to previously in this report and would allow residents to make use of the cycle stands adjacent to the east bound bus stop on St. Neots Road (to be secured by the other two proposals, with this scheme making a community transport contribution instead.) These measures would provide a greater incentive to cycle for occupants of the development, as well as existing resident in the village, making the journey to the more regular bus service by a sustainable mode of transport.
72. Cambridgeshire County Council is the Education Authority. This proposal would result in an anticipated 18 children in the early years age bracket, 9 of which would qualify for free provision. Two options have been identified as potential mitigation, with the final option to be pursued dependent upon a decision by the County Council relating to the future of the Children's Centre in the village.
73. If the Children's Centre is to be retained, this could be converted to provide capacity for an additional 52 children. That project would cost £60,000 in total, with the proportionate contribution from this development being £10,386. If the Children's Centre is closed, a new classroom would be provided through an extension to the school building. The total cost of that project would be £500,000 and the proportionate contribution from this development would be £173,079.
74. In relation to primary school provision, this development would give rise to 21 additional pupils within this age bracket. There is currently insufficient capacity at the primary school to accommodate the additional children. The County Council have identified a project which would mitigate the impact of this development, the scheme for 140 dwellings on land east of Highfields Road and the 71 dwellings on land rear of 18-28 Highfields Road (committee resolved to grant that application, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement). The project is an extension to the primary school comprising 4 classrooms to provide an additional 120 places. The total cost of the extension would be £2,590,000 and the proportionate contribution from this development would be approximately £453,243 (final figure dependent upon housing mix which is to be determined at the reserved matters stage).
75. No contributions are considered necessary in relation to secondary school provision as the County Council's forecast data indicate that Comberton Village College has available capacity to accommodate the additional population arising from this development (anticipated 15 children in that age bracket.)
76. In relation to lifelong learning, a figure of £4.08 per the additional residents (approx. 145

in the Council's calculation) is based on the standard charge approach adopted by the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council and is considered to be CIL compliant to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms, to increase the stock of books at the existing mobile library. The total contribution from this scheme is approximately £591.60 (depending upon final housing mix.)

77. In terms of health impact, the applicant has submitted an Impact Assessment in this regard. The nearest doctor's surgeries are located in Comberton, the satellite premises of that practice in Little Eversden and in Bourn. NHS England have commented on the planning application and their response indicates that there is currently insufficient space available for doctors within the Comberton Practice and the satellite surgery in Little Eversden, or at Bourn to accommodate the demands of the additional population that would result from this development. As a result, NHS England are requesting a sum of £21,919 to provide an additional 9.53 square metres of floorspace to accommodate the additional 139 anticipated population increase (nb. Different projection to the County Council figures above).
78. Whilst there is limited physical capacity to extend the surgery at Bourn, or the surgery in Comberton, there would be scope to physically extend the satellite facility in Little Eversden. Given the modest nature of the amount of additional floorspace required however, it is considered that this could be achieved through a relatively minor alteration to the internal layout at Bourn as opposed to requiring an increase in the footprint of the building. If, once a specific project is identified by the NHS, it is identified that an external extension is required to provide additional capacity in the area, this could be achieved through an extension to the satellite facility at Little Eversden (approximately 1.5 miles further away from the site). NHS England have indicated in their response that they consider the requested sum to meet the tests for seeking contributions as set out in the NPPF, quoted above.
79. The fact that the developer has agreed to the principle of paying the contributions to fund the additional infrastructure required to offset the impact of the development in this regard ensures that the impact of the scheme on the capacity of these facilities could be adequately mitigated, weighing in favour of the social sustainability of the scheme.
80. In addition to the primary school and mobile library service, Caldecote has a social club, a garage with a Spar selling some convenience items, a sports pavilion and a village Hall. Facilities at the recreation ground include an equipped area of play space, a pavilion, 3 adult football pitches, 3 junior football pitches, a cricket pitch, 2 tennis courts and a Multi-use games area.
81. It is acknowledged that the facilities in Highfields Caldecote are relatively limited and the occupants of the proposed development would be required to travel outside of the village to meet basic day to day needs. However, given that the proposal includes the provision of a community transport facility and enhanced cycleway access to the regular bus service to Cambridge along St. Neots Road, it considered that the harm arising from the lack of facilities within walking distance would be mitigated through the enhancement of alternative modes of transport to the private car.
82. As such, the level of social and environmental harm arising from the development would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme within the context of the shortage of housing, including affordable housing, in the District.

Economic sustainability:

83. It is accepted that there are limited opportunities for employment within Highfields

Caldecote and this does weigh against the sustainability of the village. However, the regular public transport service along St. Neots Road and the improved connectivity to that service that would be provided by the community transport facility to be secured as part of the Section 106 Agreement, would enhance connectivity to sources of employment in Cambridge. The mitigation proposed is therefore considered to reduce to a significant extent the weight which should be attached to the limited employment opportunities in the village, as an element of harm arising from this proposal.

84. The provision of up to 58 new dwellings will give rise to employment during the construction phase of the development, and has the potential to result in an increase in the use of local services and facilities, both of which will be of benefit to the local economy and would enhance the economic sustainability of the scheme.
85. Overall, it is acknowledged that the proposals do not accord with policies DP/7 and ST/6 in that the site is outside of the village framework. However, given that the adverse impacts on the capacity of services and facilities of the development can be mitigated and access to alternative means of transport to the private car are to be secured, it is considered that harm arising from the scheme in social sustainability terms would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. It is considered that compliance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF should be afforded greater weight than the conflict with Local Plan policy given the inability of the Council to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land.

Density of development and housing mix

86. The scheme would be of a lower density than required by policy HG/1 of the LDF and emerging Local Plan policy H/7 (30 dwellings per hectare) when taking the site as whole (approx. 3.5 hectares in area). The density equates to approximately 17 dwellings per hectare. However, both policies include the caveat that a lower density may be acceptable if this can be justified in relation to the character of the surrounding locality. Given that the application site is located on the edge of the settlement and the need to incorporate significant landscape 'buffers' to northern, southern and western edges, it is considered that this proposal meets the exception tests of the current and emerging policy with regard to the density of development.
87. The density of the developed area in the indicative layout would be higher than this figure, approximately 32 dwellings per hectare due to the retention of a significant amount of undeveloped space along the southern and western boundaries of the site. Whilst this layout is not fixed, the illustrative masterplan is considered to demonstrate that 58 units could be accommodated on the site without resulting in a density of development that would be out of character with the edge of village location. This assessment is based on the consideration that the public open space could be dispersed across the developable area (as opposed to being located in one place, as shown on the indicative masterplan), which would reduce the overall massing of the development. Matters of design and landscape impact are discussed in detail in the following section of the report.
88. Under the provisions of policy HG/2, the market housing element of proposed schemes is required to include a minimum of 40% 1 or 2 bed properties. The detail of the housing mix proposed within the market element of the scheme (35 units) has not been specified.
89. Policy H/8 of the emerging Local Plan is less prescriptive and states that the mix of properties within developments of 10 or more dwellings should achieve at least 30% for each of the 3 categories (1 and 2 bed, 3 bed and 4 or more bed properties), with the

10% margin to be applied flexibly across the scheme. This policy is being given considerable weight in the determination of planning applications due to the nature of the unresolved objections, in accordance with the guidance within paragraph 216 of the NPPF.

90. As the application is outline only, a condition requiring this mix is recommended to ensure that the scheme is policy compliant and would deliver a high proportion of smaller units, in a District where there is a need to increase the stock of this type of housing.

Character of the village edge and surrounding landscape

Landscape Impact

91. The application site was assessed as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which formed part of the evidence supporting the emerging Local Plan (site 010 which proposed a development of 10 or more dwellings.) The SHLAA report highlights the fact that the South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study describes the landscape setting of Caldecote as comprising a mix of enclosed farmland, large open arable fields and an airfield. On the western edge of the village, a substantial tree belt and the Bucket Hill Plantation provide visual enclosure from the open fields and disused airfield beyond, and the well treed roads create a soft edge to the village. The report comments that the village has a semi-rural character and is a low density, linear settlement. The report concludes that 'development of this site would have an adverse impact on the townscape and landscape of this area. All nearby development has been built over recent years and is of a suburban nature. The land falls away to the south so development of this site would be visible from views from this orientation.'
92. The Landscape Design Officer (LDO) has not objected to the proposals. The indicative plans demonstrate that the number of units proposed can be accommodated on the site whilst retaining the boundary hedgerows and all tree planting within the site that is considered to be of landscape importance. The LDO concurs with the conclusion of the applicant's visual impact assessment that the effects of the development would be limited to the site and would not adversely affect the character of the village edge or the wider landscape. The LDO considers that the site is relatively contained in visual terms by the existing woodland and hedgerows. There are however views into the site from Grafton Drive to the east and from the recreation ground to the south. From these viewpoints, the open views of undeveloped land which the Capacity Study refers to as being characteristic of the edge of Caldecote, can be appreciated.
93. The LDO is however of the view that any adverse impact can be mitigated, given the low density of the scheme, through careful consideration of the design and layout of the development at the reserved matter stage. Appropriate mitigation measures include the creation of a landscaped entrance to the site which defines the edge of the development with the existing properties on Grafton Drive and ensuring that there are gaps between the plots which allow views through the site to the woodland on the western edge when viewing the development from the eastern edge. These design features would result in a permeability to the development which would retain a sense of long distance views to the landscaped edge provided by the woodland. There should also be a buffer area on the southern edge of the development to soften views of the dwellings from the recreation ground, with the arrangement of plots also allowing views through the site in a north-south direction. It is considered that each of these issues can be addressed at the reserved matters stage.

94. The management of the open space is considered to be important in ensuring the effectiveness of woodland area on the western edge of the development landscape character point of view. The retention of these trees and those on the southern boundary of the site can be secured by condition, as can supplementary landscaping (particularly of the northern boundary) this outline stage. At the density proposed, substantial separation distances can be retained between buildings within the development and the boundaries of the site with adjacent land which has a more open and less developed character.
95. Within the context of a lack of five year housing land supply, the Inspector for the New Road, Melbourn appeal (199 dwellings and a care home) provided guidance in a case where landscape harm is identified and balancing this against the need to address the lack of housing land supply. In that case the Inspector concluded in relation to landscape harm that 'while the development of this site would cause very limited harm to the wider landscape, there would be a greater localised harm to the character of the village and its countryside setting, in conflict with development control policies. This carries fairly significant weight (in the planning balance).' In weighing this harm against the benefit of housing provision in that location, the Inspector concluded that '...while there would be some notable adverse impacts, they would not be sufficient to outweigh the very significant benefits of the proposal (i.e. the provision of additional housing in the District).'
96. The SHLAA report did conclude that development of the site would have an adverse impact on the character of the village edge. However, the report does also make reference to the suburban development to the east and north east of the site which already contrasts with the historic linear form of the settlement, a characteristic which must be acknowledged when assessing the extent of any harm arising from this proposed development. Officers consider that, at the density proposed, an adverse impact on the character of the landscape, both in localised and more distant views, could be mitigated. This mitigation would be achieved through the retention of the wooded area in the western portion of the site, the inclusion of landscape buffers to the northern and southern edges, which could be achieved at the density of development proposed and the grading of the density out from the centre, towards the boundaries of the site.
97. Given the context of a lack of five year housing land supply (a situation which has arisen since the completion of the SHLAA process), the test to be applied to any harm arising from a development has become more stringent as this harm must significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, in accordance with the guidance in the NPPF. Given the lack of objection on landscape grounds to this proposal and the guidance in relation to the weight to be given to the housing shortage where harm is identified by the Inspector in the Melbourn appeal, it is considered that refusal of this scheme on the basis of landscape impact could not be substantiated at appeal.
98. In light of the above assessment, it is considered that any harm to the landscape arising from this proposal would not itself outweigh the benefits of providing additional housing (including 40% affordable) and additional community benefits on the edge of a village, including the provision of a community transport facility to improve access to the regular bus service from St. Neots Road into Cambridge.
99. The Design Officer has commented the development would extend significantly west of the existing village envelope. However, no objection is raised to the proposals due to the contained nature of the site and the fact that the low density would allow for a layout that would result in a permeable development, with views through the site retained. There is no objection to the inclusion of 2.5 storey development but this should be

restricted to the core of the development, with the height and density of buildings reduced at the edges of the scheme. These matters can be addressed at the reserved matter stage.

Trees

100. The District Council Tree Officer has raised no objections to the proposals. The application is supported by a comprehensive arboricultural impact assessment and the recommended tree protection measures are considered to be acceptable. There is a need to ensure that the proposals would not adversely impact the woodland immediately to the west of the site, which is the subject of a group Tree Preservation Order. Given the low density of development, it is considered that these trees and all of the planting on the boundaries of the site which are of amenity value could be retained at the point where the layout is to be fixed at the reserved matter stage. Details of tree protection measures should be secured by condition at this outline stage.

Ecology

101. The Ecology Officer has raised no objections to the application, following the receipt of additional information from the applicant in terms of the precautionary measures to be put in place to mitigate the potential impact of the development on Great Crested Newts. The Ecological Assessment submitted with the planning application assesses the impact of the development on protected species.
102. There are no objections to the application in principle and the thorough ecological survey information is welcomed. There are substantial opportunities to enhance habitats at the site including native planting, woodland management and creation of attenuation ponds/drainage basins which also have ecological value. The indicative site layout is acceptable, although hedgerows should be retained and protected outside of garden boundaries in the fixed layout to be determined at the reserved matters stage.
103. A condition can be attached requiring compliance with the mitigation measures listed in the ecology survey submitted with the application and the mitigation measures detailed in the additional information relating to Great Crested Newts. A mitigation strategy relating to the potential impact on badgers and biodiversity enhancements to be secured as part of the development can also be secured by condition at this outline stage.

Highway safety and parking

104. The Local Highway Authority has no objection to the proposed means of access. A condition can be imposed at this outline stage relating to the detailed design of the means of access. A management plan can also be secured by condition, detailing how access to the site by traffic during the construction phase of the development and requiring such vehicles to park and any materials to be stored within the confines of the site, to minimise disruption to neighbouring properties.
105. Further details of the potential impact on the capacity of nearby junctions and the wider highway network has been completed by the applicant. The Local Highway Authority has no objections to the proposals on the basis of this additional information, subject to securing appropriate mitigation.
106. The applicant is also proposing a number of mitigation measures. These include the provision of an upgraded cycleway/footway for a length of 250 metres along the section of Highfields Road, connecting to the site to the St. Neots Road roundabout. This would

tie in with the mitigation to be secured in relation to the proposals for 140 and 71 dwellings respectively, referred to previously in this report.

107. These measures would provide a greater incentive for occupants of the development to make journeys by bicycle and would be in addition to the community transport contribution to be secured to provide a more sustainable means of accessing services and facilities in neighbouring villages, as well as the regular public transport service on St. Neots Road.
108. Given the low density of the scheme, it is considered that there would be sufficient space to locate 2 car parking spaces on each plot, meeting the requirements of the LDF standards of 1.5 spaces per dwelling across developments with additional room for visitor parking.

Residential amenity

109. The application seeks outline planning permission and therefore the layout plan submitted is for illustrative purposes only. However, officers need to be satisfied at this stage that the site is capable of accommodating the amount of development proposed, without having a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of occupiers of adjacent properties.
110. There are a number of properties on Grafton Drive which face the eastern boundary of the site, with their rear gardens immediately adjacent to the common boundary. However, at the density proposed, it would be possible to retain 25 metres between the rear elevations of those properties where the arrangement involved elevations with habitable rooms facing each other. In addition, there would be sufficient space to ensure that the rear gardens of the plots closes to the common boundary achieved the 15 metre depth recommended in the adopted Design Guide
111. At approximately 32 dwellings per hectare within the developed area, the average plot size of would be approximately 300 square metres in size (although space for the internal roads would need to be deducted from this). This is considered sufficient to achieve a dwelling size greater than the minimum residential space standards proposed in policy H/11 of the emerging Local Plan (85 square metres for a 3 bed house with 5 occupants) and allow sufficient space for 80 square metres of garden space (the upper limit of the standards within the adopted Design Guide) along with the required space for driveways etc to the front of the plots.
112. Due to the oblique relationship and substantial separation distance between the application site and any of the neighbouring properties to the north east of Grafton Drive, it is considered that there would be no adverse impact on the residential amenity of any of those neighbouring properties. It is considered that the indicative layout demonstrates that 58 units could be located on the site, with sufficient separation distances retained between properties to preserve the residential amenity of the occupants of the development.
113. Standard conditions relating to the construction phase of the development have been recommended by the EHO and these can be attached to the decision notice. It is considered that the proposed number of units can be accommodated on the site without having any adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of each of the plots within the development.

Surface water and foul water drainage

Surface water drainage

114. The site is located within flood zone 1 (lowest risk of flooding). The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFRA) has not raised an objection to the revised proposal.
115. The capacity of the surface water attenuation measures on site would ensure that the proposals meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework by not increasing the surface water run off rate beyond the existing greenfield level once the scheme has been developed. Specific details on site levels, existing surface water run off rates, full details of the capacity of attenuation measures, flow control mechanisms and maintenance will be required at the reserved matters stage and can be secured by condition at the outline stage.
116. The details of the surface water drainage strategy can be secured by condition at the outline stage and the means of management and maintenance can be included as clauses in the Section 106 Agreement. The Environment Agency has also raised no objection on the basis that this condition is attached to the decision notice.

Waste and Foul water drainage

117. In relation to Wastewater treatment, Anglian Water has confirmed that the foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Bourn Water Recycling Centre and that the facility does currently have capacity to treat the additional flows resulting from the development.
118. Anglian Water state in their consultation response that the foul drainage network has capacity to take the additional flows that will arise from this development. Officers have had detailed discussions with Anglian Water regarding the drainage situation in Caldecote, in light of the concerns raised by residents and the Parish Council. Anglian Water officers explained that during periods of wet weather the receiving flow often increases, and a storm chamber is used to relieve the pump's workload. A typical storm downpour is handled without any impact to customers or the environment, however, prolonged wet weather periods have proved harder to manage.
119. Bourn pumping station has recently received fresh pumps and Anglian Water confirmed they are working as expected. The station also has a pumping flow meter which allows their teams to monitor performance. Anglian Water officers confirmed that recent concerns and customer complaints in the area have been due to tanker movements and hired diesel pumps through the village. These actions were required because of blockage caused by non-flushable waste in the systems rather than the pump/assets failure.
120. This is an on going issue and is the responsibility of Anglian Water as the owners or the public system, riparian owners and the local community to fully address. It is not for the planning system to duplicate controls or place the onus onto developers to address a wider matter. On the issue of foul water drainage capacity, the Inspector determining the appeal for 140 dwellings east of Highfields Road stated that 'incidents of flooding and breakdown have occurred at the pumping station, leading to smells and noise, but Anglian Water has indicated that the pumping station has the capacity to pump the additional outflow from the proposed development. On the face of the evidence, there is no reason to consider that foul drainage is a reason to dismiss the appeal.'
121. Whilst the issues relating to drainage are noted, given that there is capacity within the network and the issues are connected to maintenance of the network, there are no grounds to refuse the application in this regard that could be successfully defended at

appeal.

122. Anglian Water raises no objection in relation to the drainage of surface water from the site, subject to the details of these measures being secured by condition.

Section 106 contributions

123. In addition to the County Council requirements in terms of pre-school capacity and the NHS already identified in this report, the Section 106 Officer has confirmed that the site has the capacity to achieve the 58 units proposed and also meet the required provision for formal and informal space on site. As none of the details are to be fixed at this stage, a legal agreement should make provision for an eventuality where equipped open space would need to be provided off site should the proposal at the reserved matters stage involve a scheme which would not meet the Open Space SPD requirement in full through on site provision.
124. In addition to the community transport contribution and highways mitigation measures quoted previously, policy compliant contributions towards off site play space and indoor community facilities are to be secured. A contribution of approximately £62,000 would be secured towards a project encompassing the extension of Caldecote sports pavilion, along with the re-surfacing of the pavilion car park, installation of additional lighting to serve this car park and the installation of outdoor gym equipment at the recreation ground. A contribution of approximately £50,000 towards the provision of older children play equipment offsite in addition to the onsite provision is to be secured through the Section 106 Agreement.
125. These schemes would enhance the quality of recreation space within the village, in compliance with policy SF/11 of the LDF and are considered to be CIL compliant given the additional demand on the recreation ground facilities as a result of the increased population of the village. As there have been less than 5 pooled contributions made towards these projects previously, these contributions are considered to be compliant with the CIL regulations.
126. In relation to indoor community meeting space, a contribution of approximately £28,000 is to be secured towards the extension of Caldecote Village Hall. The final sum will be dependent upon the housing mix of the development, which is to be determined at the reserved matters stage. This contribution would enhance the standard of community meeting space within the village, accommodating the additional population of the development. The scheme is considered to be CIL compliant as necessary to mitigate the impact of the development and would comply with policy DP/4 (Infrastructure and New Development) of the LDF. As there have been less than 5 pooled contributions made towards this project from previous developments, the contribution is considered to be compliant with the CIL regulations.
127. A sum of £73.50 per dwelling and £150 per flat would be required in relation to household waste receptacles. A summary of all of the contributions and monitoring fees is attached as appendix 1 to this report.

Other matters

Archaeology and Heritage:

128. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to pay "special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which (they)

possesses.”

129. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF, in the section dealing with the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, states 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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification”.
130. Paragraph 133 of the NPPF states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm or to a total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.
131. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF says that “(where) a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use”.
132. Recent planning case law has confirmed that having “special regard” to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building under section 66 involves more than merely giving weight to those matters in the planning balance. In particular, case law has confirmed that “preserving” in the context of Listed Buildings means doing no harm.
133. The County Council Archaeologist has considered the report submitted by the applicant and considers the findings are thorough, concluding that the risk caused by development in this regard is low. As such, no further investigation is considered to be necessary and no specific mitigation is required.
134. There are no listed buildings within close proximity of the site, the closest being in excess of 1 km to the west of the site, with any views to or from the application site substantially obscured by the intervening woodland. There is also a substantial separation distance (in excess of 2km) between the application site and Bourn conservation area to the south west. Given the substantial separation distances to be retained, it is considered that there would be no adverse harm to the setting of these designated heritage assets arising from the proposed development.

Environmental Health:

135. The Public Health Specialist has reviewed the Health Impact Assessment and considers that it meets the required standard of the SPD Policy. The scheme is therefore acceptable in this regard.
136. There is no objection to the proposal in respect of air quality. However, to ensure that sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the development are not affected by the negative impact of construction work such as dust and noise, as well as ensuring that the applicant complies with the Council’s low emission strategy for a development of this scale, conditions should be included that require the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan/Dust Management Plan, and an electronic vehicle charging infrastructure strategy.
137. An assessment of the potential noise generated by traffic accessing and egressing the development and the impact that this may have on the residential amenity of the

occupants of the properties adjacent to the proposed main vehicular access off Grafton Drive has been submitted. Mitigation measures are suggested in the report i.e. the use of insulation to reduce the impact of noise, but more detail is required in relation to the means of ventilation in properties where the windows are likely to be shut at night time. These details can be secured by condition at this outline stage as the impact will only become clearer at the reserved matters stage when the layout is to be fixed.

138. The phase I report submitted with the application highlights the previous use of the land as a pig farm and for waste storage. Given the sensitive nature of the proposed end use, a phase II survey will be required to ensure that the impact of any potential contaminants of the site is fully mitigated. This requirement can be secured by condition at this outline stage.
139. Noise, vibration and dust minimisation plans will be required to ensure that the construction phase of the scheme would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents. These details shall be secured by condition, along with a restriction on the hours during which power operated machinery should be used during the construction phase of the development and details of the phasing of the development.
140. The applicant will be required to complete a Waste Design Toolkit at the reserved matters stage in order to show how it is intended to address the waste management infrastructure, and technical requirements within the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide. In addition conditions should secure the submission of a Site Waste Management Plan. Provision of domestic waste receptacles by the developer will be secured via the Section 106 agreement. The developer should ensure that the highway design allows for the use of waste collection vehicles and this is a detailed matter relating to the layout of the scheme at the reserved matters stage.
141. The applicant has committed to 10% of the energy requirements generated by the development being produced by renewable sources. A condition will be required to ensure that the noise impact of any plant or equipment for any renewable energy provision such as air source heat pumps is fully assessed and any impact mitigated. It is considered that each of these issues could be dealt with through the imposition of conditions at this outline stage.

Cumulative Impact:

142. Officers have considered this proposal alongside the other large scale applications for residential development in Highfields Caldecote where the principle of development relies on the District Council's deficit in five year housing land supply. Those schemes are, land east of Highfields Road (140 units) and land rear of 18-28 Highfields Road (71 units.) Whilst the latter is a site located within the village framework, the number of units clearly far exceeds those permitted under adopted policy.
143. Each planning application has to be assessed in its own merits. Whilst officers realise that all development has the potential to contribute to a cumulative impact, the CIL regulations require that each applicant must only be responsible for mitigating the impact of that specific scheme.
144. Therefore, officers are of the view that only schemes of a size that would attract contributions to increasing education and health provision can be reasonably included in the assessment of cumulative impact. Officers have considered the cumulative impact of the three schemes on the capacity of services and facilities in Caldecote and have worked with consultees to ensure that they have done the same, including in

relation to education provision.

145. The County Council as Education Authority have identified a project to accommodate the additional population of all three developments in relation to pre-school and primary school capacity. This is evidenced by the scale of the identified projects and the proportionate nature of the contributions to be sought from each of the three schemes. Education officers have also confirmed that there is a capacity to accommodate the cumulative population of all three developments at Comberton Village College.
146. In relation to the capacity of health services, whilst a specific scheme is not identified, the amount of space required to mitigate the population increase arising from this proposal amounts to a relatively small proportion of the space required per GP according to the NHS England guidelines. The size of the additional floorspace required suggests that this could be achieved through internal modification. If it was the case that a physical extension to a practice was required, there is space to achieve this at the Little Eversden branch of the Comberton surgery which is not significantly further away (approximately 1.5 miles) from the site than the Bourn surgery.
147. Given this information, it is considered that there is insufficient evidence to substantiate a refusal of this application as part of a cumulative effect on the capacity of social infrastructure that serves Highfields Caldecote.
148. In relation to drainage, it is considered that the information submitted with this application would achieve the requirement not to result in additional surface water on the site once the development has been constructed. This is evidenced by the removal of the LLFRA's initial objection and the lack of objection from Anglian Water to the proposed scheme.
149. In relation to landscape impact, it is considered that this development would be sufficiently separated from the other schemes to avoid cumulative impact in this regard.
150. Following this assessment, officers are content that the sustainability credentials of this proposal have been demonstrated satisfactorily when assessed alongside the other two large scale developments in the village. It is therefore considered that approval of this application is not prejudiced by the outcome of those applications.

Conclusion

151. Given the fact that the Council cannot currently identify a five year supply of housing land, in accordance with the guidance in paragraph 14 of the NPPF, in balancing all of the material considerations, planning permission should be granted unless the harm arising from the proposal would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits.
152. The proposed development would provide a significant number of dwellings, 40% of which would be affordable. This is a benefit which should be given significant weight in the determination of the planning application. The provision of a community transport contribution is considered to be a significant benefit of the proposals. This facility would ensure that this development along with other parts of the village that are beyond a reasonable walking distance from St. Neots Road would have a more sustainable means of accessing the regular bus service to the north of the village, as opposed to being reliant on the private car. This would be supplemented by an upgraded cycle/footway along Highfields Road to enhance the ability to cycle that distance. The community transport facility would also provide an alternative to the use of the private car for journeys to settlements with greater services, facilities and sources of employment.

153. It is considered that the proposal would not result in a significant adverse impact on the character of the landscape. The proposal would retain a substantial belt of trees along the western boundary and at the density of development proposed, landscape buffers could be retained between the edge of the development and the northern and southern boundaries, thereby softening the transition from the extension to the developed part of the village and the open countryside beyond.
154. The density of the development is considered to be acceptable, with the possibility of breaking up the massing of the developed areas through the creation of smaller areas of open space throughout the scheme. This is a design issue which will need to be resolved at the reserved matters stage. It is considered that the number of units proposed could be achieved in a manner that would preserve the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, through the sensitive positioning of plots adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site, which forms the common boundaries with the properties at the western end of Grafton Drive.
155. It is acknowledged that this proposal would significantly exceed the indicative maximum number of dwellings suggested as an appropriate scale of development in Group Villages by the policies of the LDF. However, in the absence of a five year housing land supply, the key issue is the extent of the services and facilities available in and accessible from Highfields Caldecote and whether these have the capacity to accommodate the additional population growth. The relevant consultees consider that the impact on the capacity of education and health services can be accommodated subject to appropriate mitigation, which the applicant has agreed to provide through the Section 106 Agreement.
156. Whilst the limited range of service and facilities is recognised, the provision of a community transport vehicle would improve the connectivity between the southern end of the village and the more regular public transport links to Cambridge, from where the journey time is less than 20 minutes. Within the context of a predominantly rural District, the proximity of Highfields Caldecote to Cambridge and the enhancements that this scheme would make to connectivity ensure that the harm in relation to the lack of services and facilities within the village itself could be adequately mitigated. This conclusion is consistent with the Inspector's observations at Over, where access to employment would have required trips beyond the village and an acknowledgement that a number of these would have been, at least in part, by private car. That scheme did not propose as extensive mitigation as is proposed here to provide an alternative mode of transport.
157. As such, although located outside the development framework of a group village, accessibility to services and to public transport is considered adequate and can be improved. The weight that can therefore be attached to the conflict with policies DP/1(a) and DP/7, which are intended to ensure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations in the district, is limited. This is consistent with the position taken by the Inspector determining the appeal for the 140 unit scheme on land east of Highfields Road. The decision letter for that case states that, even though the proposals conflicted with LDF policies ST/6, DP/1(a) and DP/7, 'the weight to be attached to the conflict with these policies is reduced because of the ongoing shortfall (in housing numbers.)'
158. It is considered that the scheme includes positive elements which enhance social sustainability. These include:
- the positive contribution of up to 58 dwellings towards the housing land supply in the district based on the objectively assessed need for 19,500 dwellings and the method of calculation and buffer identified by the Waterbeach Inspector

- the provision of 23 affordable dwellings on site, making a significant contribution to the identified need in Caldecote (currently 13 people within the village currently on the Housing Register) and the wider District
- significant public open space, including a Local Equipped Area of Play (either provision on site or a financial contribution to enhancing facilities offsite) , in a village which currently has an under provision in this regard.
- The provision of a community transport facility to improve connectivity of the southern end of the village to the more regular bus service to and from Cambridge along St. Neots Road to the north of the village.
- The provision of contributions towards the expansion and improvement of recreation and indoor community space facilities within Caldecote
- Improvements to the footpath/cycleway connection to St. Neots Road. These improvements would all enhance the environmental sustainability of the scheme.

159. As such, although a conflict with policies DP/1(a) and DP/7 arises, given the particular circumstances of the development and the opportunity to encourage and improve the use of local services and public transport, the weight to be given to this conflict is limited. In terms of the balance required by para 14 of the NPPF, the absence of a five year housing land supply means the conflict with these policies is not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal particularly in terms of the contribution which it would make to housing supply. It is therefore considered that there is no basis to seek the withholding of planning permission for the proposed development, subject to the imposition of necessary planning conditions and the securing of a planning obligation, as set out below.

Recommendation

160. Officers recommend that the Committee grants planning permission, subject to Section 106 obligations, conditions and informatives as detailed in the main body of the report.

161. As stated in the executive summary, if Members resolve to grant planning permission, the Committee is requested to confirm that the Council will choose not to defend the appeal against non-determination of application ref. S2764/16/OL (of which this application is a duplicate) except where any material changes are introduced to the proposal or where the appellant departs from the terms of the Section 106 as detailed in this report and listed in the matrix at appendix 1 b.

162. If this application is refused, the Committee will need to confirm the reasons for the Council's case in respect of the ongoing appeal.

Section 106 agreement

163. To secure provision of onsite affordable housing, the provision of public open space, the management of the public open space and surface water drainage within the development and the community benefits and education contributions listed in Appendix 1.

Draft conditions

- 164.
- (a) Outline planning permission
 - (b) Time limit for submission of reserved matters
 - (c) Time limit for implementation (within 2 years of approval of reserved matters)
 - (d) Approved plans
 - (e) Landscaping details

- (f) Contaminated land assessment
- (g) Dust, noise, vibration mitigation strategy
- (h) Details of renewable energy generation (including water efficiency/conservation measures) within the development and associated noise assessment and mitigation measures – 10% renewables and compliance.
- (j) Details of scheme for improving footway/cycleway along Highfields Road
- (k) Details of noise mitigation measures to be incorporated on plots to be positioned adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site
- (l) Foul water drainage scheme
- (m) Surface water drainage scheme (management and maintenance to be secured through Section 106)
- (n) Sustainable drainage strategy
- (o) Tree Protection measures
- (p) Retention of existing planting on site boundaries
- (q) Compliance with flood risk assessment
- (r) Detailed plans of the construction of the accesses
- (s) Pedestrian visibility splays
- (t) Ecological enhancement and habitat management plan
- (u) Site waste management plan
- (v) Restriction on the hours of power operated machinery and deliveries during construction
- (w) Phasing of construction
- (x) Badger survey to be undertaken and mitigation measures agreed
- (y) Compliance with ecological survey submitted
- (z) External lighting to be agreed
- (aa) Cycle storage
- (bb) Housing mix within market element to be policy compliant
- (cc) Boundary treatments
- (dd) Waste water management plan
- (ee) Construction environment management plan
- (ff) Details of piled foundations
- (gg) Fire hydrant locations
- (hh) Screened storage for refuse
- (ii) Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Strategy

Informatives

- (a) Environmental health informatives
- (b) Exclusion of indicative plans from approval – indicative layout plan not to be approved at this outline stage

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 Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission 2014
- Planning File Reference: S/1144/17/OL

Report Author:

David Thompson

Principal Planning Officer

Telephone Number: 01954 713250