

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee 1 November 2017
AUTHOR/S: Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development

Application Number: S/3052/16/FL

Parish(es): Shepreth

Proposal: Full planning permission for the erection of 25 dwellings (including 40% affordable) along with access, car and cycle parking and associated landscaping.

Site address: Land to the east of Collins Close, Shepreth

Applicant(s): Greater Cambridgeshire Housing Development Agency

Recommendation: Delegated approval (to complete section 106 agreement)

Key material considerations: Five year supply of housing land
Principle of development
Sustainability of the location
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
Provision of formal and informal open space
Section 106 Contributions

Committee Site Visit: 31 October 2017

Departure Application: Yes (advertised 22 March 2017)

Presenting Officer: John Koch, Team Leader

Application brought to Committee because: The officer recommendation of approval conflicts with the recommendation of Shepreth Parish Council and would represent a departure from the Development Plan

Date by which decision due: 14 February 2017

Executive Summary

1. The application site is located outside, but adjoining the Shepreth village framework. Shepreth is designated as an Infill village. Full planning permission is sought for the erection of 25 dwellings (including 40% affordable). A revised layout plan submitted with the application demonstrates that 25 units could be provided on the site, within adequately sized plots along with the required access routes, level of formal and informal open space and surface water attenuation measures.

2. Following the receipt of additional information, none of the Council's internal consultees have recommended refusal. Neither are there objections to the proposals from the Highway Authority, the Flood Risk Authority or the Environment Agency. All of the matters raised can be secured by appropriately worded conditions.
3. The proposal would involve the loss of grade 2 Agricultural land, but is not considered to have an adverse impact on the character of the village edge, given the proximity of the existing residential development on Collins Close to the west, the commercial uses to the east and the relatively dense landscaping along the northern boundary of the site. The proposals are considered to demonstrate that the residential amenity of neighbouring properties would be preserved and the density of development would allow sufficient space to be retained between the buildings to preserve the residential amenity of the future occupants of the development.
4. Whilst Shepreth itself does have limited facilities, the site is within walking distance of a train service which gives regular access to Cambridge and Royston in a relatively short time both at commuting times and throughout the day. This represents a social and environmental benefit through providing a viable alternative to the private car for access to a wider range of services and facilities.
5. Overall, it is considered that the small amount of harm arising from the loss of agricultural land and the location on the edge of an Infill Village where development of individual sites is otherwise restricted to no more than 2 dwellings is outweighed by the significant contribution the proposal would make to the deficit in the Council's five year housing land supply, including the provision of affordable housing, and the social benefits that would result from the development. None of the 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.

Planning History

6. There is no relevant planning history on the application site. Application S/0506/10/F for the erection of 12 affordable houses and associated open space was approved in July 2010 for the development on Collins Close immediately to the south west of the site. A number of planning applications have been approved associated with the commercial development to the north east of the site which contains light industrial and office uses.

National Guidance

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

Development Plan Policies

8. 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.

South Cambridgeshire LDF Core Strategy DPD, 2007

ST/2 Housing Provision
ST/7 Infill Villages

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
- CH/4 Listed Buildings
- CH/5 Conservation Areas
- SC/9 Protection of existing Recreation Areas, Allotments and Community Orchards
- 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

9. **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
- Health Impact Assessment SPD– Adopted March 2011

10. **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/11 Infill 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

11/1. **Shepreth Parish Council** – the Parish Council recommended refusal of the original submission for the following reasons:

- The site is of nature conservation value. Trees have been planted which has created a tree belt which screens the occupants of the existing development on Collins Close from the railway line and the industrial development which area adjacent to the site. The loss of a large part of this tree belt would harm the biodiversity of the site and may harm the amenity of existing residents and occupants of the proposed development through noise pollution.
- Access to the development would be via Collins Close which is a small cul-de-sac primarily occupied by families and small children. The Parish Council question the wisdom of funnelling cars through this route and consider that this will result in a highway safety hazard, particularly during peak times. A safer access point would be between 9 Collins Close and 26 Meldreth Road in the south eastern corner of the site.
- Concerns regarding surface water drainage. The Parish Council has previously informed Anglian Water about concerns relating to the capacity of the surface water and foul sewer drainage network. The pumping station at Barrows Green regularly breaks down and this results in the flooding of an adjacent property with raw sewage. Anglian Water has agreed to undertake hydraulic modelling but, until this issue is resolved, no further development within the village will be supported by the Parish Council.
- Anglian Water has confirmed that the Foxton Waste Water Recycling Centre does not have capacity to accept the flows from the development, which highlights the problem with regard to drainage infrastructure.
- There are concerns regarding surface water drainage due to the chalk consistency of the ground below the surface. This will result in infiltration problems and surface water will gather on the site, presenting a flooding hazard.
- The proposal development is considered to be too dense given that there is a need to remove landscaping to fit the number of dwellings proposed on to the site.
- The Parish Council does recognise the need for additional affordable housing in

the village and there is some logic to developing this site – which lies adjacent to existing affordable residential development on Collins Close and John Breay Close. A greater proportion of affordable housing should be incorporated as well as a larger number of 3 bedroomed properties to meet identified local need.

- The village has a very limited bus service and the primary school is close to capacity.
 - If permission is granted, S106 money would be spent on the following projects: additional play equipment for Collins Close playground (specifically to include older children); play facilities at the Old School Field; a MUGA on the recreation ground; start-up costs for a Senior Citizens Coffee Club to include provision of a small kitchen area in the Village Hall Meeting Room; start up costs for a Cinema Club; and refurbishment of the changing/shower room at the Village Hall.
- 11/2. **District Council Urban Design Officer** – The density of the proposed development (21 dwellings per hectare - dph) is considered to be low and is below the policy requirement for 30 dph. However, the existing and emerging policies in this regard do include a caveat that justification may exist for a different density. Given the edge of village location and the need to preserve comprehensive screening on the northern boundary, it is considered that the caveat should be applied to this case. Concerns raised in relation to the parking arrangements in the original submission, the proximity of properties to the north eastern boundary and the extent of tree removal adjacent to the north western boundary with the railway line have been addressed to some degree by the revised proposals. A Local Area of Play is required as part of the proposals.
- 11/3. **District Council Landscape Design Officer** – No objection to the proposals following the revision to increase the amount of landscape planting to be retained on the northern boundary of the site. It would be preferable to include the landscaping on the north eastern boundary of the site within an area of open space so that the landscaping on that boundary can also be maintained. The landscaping within the 'woodland' area will need to be managed to ensure that the pedestrian connection to the existing play area on Collins Close would be legible for users.
12. **Cambridgeshire County Council (Local Highway Authority)** – No objections to the application, subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the provision of pedestrian visibility splays at the entrance to the development, the construction of the access road in a bound material and at levels which prevent displacement of water/debris onto the highway and the submission of a construction management plan. Question the size of some of the car parking spaces and the use of shared surfaces to serve some of the plots within the development.
13. **Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team (Archaeology)** – no objections to the proposals. It is considered not necessary to undertake any investigation work in relation to this site following the investigations undertaken during the application for the development on Collins Close (immediately west of this site). Those investigations indicated that the site is of low archaeological potential.
14. **Cambridgeshire County Council Flood & Water Team** – no objection subject to the imposition of conditions requiring compliance with the amended Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) submitted with the planning application and details of a surface water drainage strategy (including details of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems) being secured by condition.

15. **Environment Agency** - The site lies in Flood Zone 1. The Environment Agency has no objection to the scheme, highlighting the need for the LLFRA to be consulted on the contents of the drainage strategy submitted with the application. Precautionary condition relating to the actions required if sources of contamination are encountered during the construction process and conditions requiring the submission of the final surface and foul water drainage proposals.
16. **Anglian Water** - Anglian Water (AW) has confirmed that the site is within the catchment of Foxton Water Recycling Centre, which currently does not have capacity to deal with the flows from the development. AW acknowledge that they are legally obliged to accept these flows and would be required to undertake any work required to meet these demands. AW confirm that there is available capacity within the drainage network to deal with the foul sewage flows from the development. The details of the surface water drainage from the site can be secured by condition.
17. **Contaminated Land Officer** - low risk in relation to land contamination. It is considered that adherence with the recommended mitigation measures in the Phase II Geo Environmental Assessment produced by EPS would be sufficient to offset any detrimental impact in this regard. A Verification Report should be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.
18. **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.
19. **Affordable Housing Officer** - The proposed site is located outside the development framework and should therefore be considered on the basis of an exception site for the provision of 100% affordable housing only to meet the local housing need. This would be in accordance with Policy H/10 of the emerging 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, which is in line with policy H/9 of the emerging Local Plan.

The developer is proposing 25 dwellings, which consists of 15 market dwellings and 10 affordable dwellings which meets the 40% requirement. There are approximately 1,700 applicants on the housing register and our greatest demand is for 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings. The district wide tenure split is 70% rented and 30% shared ownership.

The mix across the 10 affordable units would be:

Affordable Rented

4 x 2BH
3 X 1BH

Shared Ownership

3 x 2BH

We are happy with the mix proposed as it is reflective of the needs in the district, and

the tenure split is in accordance with policy. Whilst these properties should be available to all applicants registered on homelink in South Cambridgeshire, we would have no objection to 50% of the properties being available to applicants with a local connection to Shepreth.

Properties should be built in accordance with the guidance from the DCLG on Technical Housing Standards.

A registered provider should be appointed to manage the affordable housing; we would like to be informed when an RP has been appointed so that we can discuss the delivery of the affordable housing with them. The rented properties should be advertised through homelink and be open to all applicants registered in South Cambs. The shared ownership properties should be advertised through BPHA (Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association) who are currently the governments appointed home buy agent in this region.

20. **Section 106 Officer** – details of the summary of section 106 requirements are appended to this report and discussed in detail later in this report. Specific policy compliant contributions amounting to £57,939.59 are requested towards the formal sports provision and children’s play space (to help fund a MUGA at the village recreation ground) and £11,149.08 towards indoor community space by way of renovation and refurbishment works at Shepreth Village Hall.
21. **Cambridgeshire County Council Growth Team** – There is currently insufficient capacity in the early years provision at Barrington Primary School (this site being within the catchment area for that school) to accommodate the anticipated 5 children within the relevant age bracket (3 of whom will qualify for free provision) that would result from this development. Barrington Primary School also does not have capacity to accommodate the anticipated 4 children within that age bracket. The County Council identified the need for a 4 classroom extension to Barrington school in 2016/17 which was planned for in order to accommodate additional development within the catchment area. The cost of the overall project, once non-CIL compliant elements are removed is £2,225,202. The overall project would accommodate 116 additional pupils, resulting in a cost per pupil of £19,183. On that basis, the contributions to be sought from this development are £57,549 in relation to pre-school provision and £76,732 in relation to primary school provision.

The development would be within the catchment area of Melbourn Village College and the County Council consider that this school has capacity to accommodate the additional pupils projected to be generated by the development (anticipated to be 3).

22. A contribution of £1,533.00 is requested to improve the provision of library services. The County Council have calculated this figure based on 53 new residents resulting from the scheme multiplied by a sum of £28.92 as a per person as a pooled contribution towards the replacement of the existing mobile library on the route that serves Shepreth. Given that the impact on the capacity of the library can be mitigated through this relatively small scheme in relation to the overall anticipated population increase, it is considered that securing this sum via a section 106 agreement would offset any negative impacts on social sustainability in this regard.

A contribution of £209.75 is to be secured towards the Thriplow recycling centre for household waste, as there have not yet been five contributions towards that project.

A monitoring fee would also be applied (£650).

23. **District Council Sustainability Officer** – no objection to the proposals. The inclusion of the specified solar PV systems appear to ensure that the development is brought up to the appropriate Distributed Energy Resources (DER) standards and confirm that a minimum of an additional 10% carbon emissions reduction can be achieved across the development. The proposal therefore meets the LDF policy requirement although further specific details are required by condition.
24. **District Council Conservation Officer** – no objections raised
25. **District Council Ecology Officer** – No objections subject to conditions preventing demolition or vegetation clearance works take place during the bird breeding season and mitigation measures re the proposed inclusion of wildflower planting and the installation of bat and bird boxes would be biodiversity enhancements which are considered to be a positive element of the scheme.
26. **District Council Tree Officer** – no objections to the proposals. The application is supported by a comprehensive arboricultural report with recommendations including a tree protection plan. Compliance with the recommendations contained within the report should be secured by condition.
27. **District Council Environmental Health Officer** – The Health Impact Assessment has been assessed as meeting the required standard of the SPD Policy. The scheme is therefore acceptable in this regard.

The amended noise impact assessment submitted is considered sufficient in relation to addressing the impact of noise generated by the adjacent commercial use and the railway line on the living conditions of the occupants of the proposed development. The report indicates that upgraded acoustic glazing will need to be installed in the rear elevations of the properties adjacent to the north western boundary of the site (adjacent to the railway). A plan showing the affected elevations has been submitted and is considered adequate, alongside the specification of the glazing, to ensure that the impact of this noise source can be adequately mitigated. Compliance with these details shall be secured by condition.

- 28.. 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 in order to show how it is intended to address the waste management infrastructure, and technical requirements within the RECAP Waste Design Management Design Guide. This detail can be secured by condition. 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.

29. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue** – 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.
30. **District Council Drainage Officer** – no objection to the proposals following the submission of a revised Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy. Details of

the management and maintenance of the system will need to be provided.

Representations

31. A notice was displayed at the entrance to the site and adjacent to the existing properties on Collins Close. Two letters of objection (no representations made via the Council's website) has been received which raise the following concerns:
- The proposal would result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring properties, particularly to the rear of the dwellings on The Bramleys (to the east of the site).
 - The proposal will result in an increased risk of flooding to neighbouring properties.
 - Shepreth has limited facilities and the doctors surgeries in Harston and Melbourn are close to capacity.
 - The proposal will result in additional traffic in the locality which would be detrimental to highway safety.
 - The proposal would result in a significant level of tree loss on the boundaries of the site. The removal of trees on the boundary adjacent to the railway line would result in increased noise levels that will detrimentally affect the amenity of neighbouring residents.
 - The bus service serving the village is limited and would not offer regular connectivity from the site to the services and facilities within the village and in neighbouring settlements. Travel would therefore be reliant on the private car.
 - The density of the development is considered to be too high and out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area.
 - The proposed replacement tree planting/landscaping is considered to be inadequate to compensate for the amount of trees it is proposed to remove.

Site and Surroundings

32. The application site is located on the western edge of Shepreth. The land lies outside of the existing development framework which runs parallel with the southern boundary of the site. The site is currently paddock land to the east of the residential development on Collins Close. There is a dense area of tree planting on the north western boundary, which screens the site from the railway line beyond. Less dense landscaping is located along the north eastern boundary of the site, which is the common boundary between the field and the adjacent commercial uses.

Proposal

33. The applicant seeks full planning permission for the erection of 25 dwellings, including 40% affordable housing, along with access, car and cycle parking and associated landscaping.

Planning Assessment

34. 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 Willingham generally and this site specifically allow the proposal 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 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:

35. 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.
36. 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.
37. 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".
38. Further guidance as to which policies should be considered as 'relevant policies for the supply of housing' have emerged from the decision of 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.
39. 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 (and the other settlement hierarchy policies by extension), 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.
40. 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/7, 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 ...”

41. 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/7, 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/7, 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.
42. 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/7, 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.
43. This approach reflects the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Hopkins Homes* appeal.
44. 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 as this is a full application, 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.
45. The site is located outside the Shepreth 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 permitted. The erection of a residential development of 25 dwellings would therefore not under normal circumstances be considered acceptable in principle since it is contrary to this adopted and emerging policy.
46. Development in Infill Villages (the current and emerging status of Shepreth) is normally limited under policy ST/7 to schemes of up to an indicative maximum of 2 dwellings, or in exceptional cases 8, 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.

47. By proposing 25 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 an appeal decision in Over (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.' Clearly this principle applies to all levels of the settlement hierarchy, as the deficit in relation to the five year housing land supply applies to the District as a whole.
48. In light of the above, it is not appropriate 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 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. Because of the train station serving the Cambridge to London King's Cross line, Shepreth is served by a public transport service that far exceeds that available in the majority of other infill villages in the District. This needs to be given due weight in the decision making process.
49. The proposals are assessed below against the social, economic and environmental criteria of the definition of sustainable development.

Social sustainability

50. 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.
51. The development would provide a clear benefit in helping to meet the current housing shortfall in South Cambridgeshire through delivering up to an additional 25 residential dwellings. 40% of these units will be affordable (10 units). The affordable housing will be secured through a Section 106 Agreement.
52. Policy HG/2 of the current LDF requires the mix of market dwellings within developments to be split 40% 1 or 2 bed and approximately 25% 3 bed and the same for 4 or more bed properties. Policy H/8 of the emerging Local Plan is being given significant weight in the determination of planning applications however, due to the limited nature of the unresolved objections to the policy, in accordance with the guidance contained within paragraph 216 of the NPPF. This policy requires a minimum of 30% of each of the three size thresholds to be provided, with the remaining 10% allocated flexibly across developments.
53. This proposal would allocate the following mix to the market housing within the scheme: 23% 2 bedrooms (4), 57% 3 bedrooms (8) and 20% 4 bedrooms (3). Clearly this equates to an under provision of 2 and 4 bed properties when assessed against either the emerging policy on housing mix. However, Shepreth has a significantly larger proportion of detached properties than the South Cambridgeshire District average (51% compared to 41%). Whilst semi-detached properties are 4% higher as a proportion of the total housing stock in Shepreth than the District average, there are 9% fewer terraced properties than the District average. This data was taken from the 2011 census.

54. Whilst this data is not broken down to property sizes, this evidence appears to corroborate the supporting text of emerging policy H/8 which states that 'housing stock (in the District) has traditionally been dominated by larger detached and semi-detached houses. Whilst recent developments have helped to increase the stock of smaller properties available, the overall imbalance of larger properties remains. The 2011 census for example identifies that 75% of the housing stock' are detached or semi-detached houses and bungalows, with 18% terraced homes and 6% flats or maisonettes.'
55. Within the context of sustainable development, it is considered that there is clear evidence of an oversupply of detached properties in Shepreth. Paragraph 50 of the NPPF also requires planning authorities to 'plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs for different groups in the community' and to 'identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand.'
56. Whilst there is a partial conflict with the emerging Local Plan policy therefore, the evidence provided by the 2011 Census data and the guidance contained within the NPPF are considered to ensure that the proposal would still achieve the social element of sustainable development by responding to the size of properties required in the locality.
57. Officers are of the view the provision of 25 additional houses, including the affordable dwellings, is a 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 significant need for affordable housing in Shepreth.
58. The adopted Open Space SPD requires the provision of just over 600 square metres of informal and formal public on site open space for a development on the scale proposed. Whilst the area proposed would remain relatively densely covered by trees, there would be a new woodland footpath linked to an existing play area to the west of Collins Close.
59. The proposed plans indicate that alongside the required amount of public open space the development would allow for plots that meet the minimum standards for garden sizes in this location, which the design guide suggest should be a minimum of 50 square metres for 2 bed properties and 80 square metres for larger dwellings (the 'rural' size guidance has been applied in this instance given the edge of village location of the site.)
60. 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 proposed plans are considered to demonstrate that 25 dwellings can be erected on the site in a manner which would respect the transition between the built environment and the open countryside through relatively low density of development and the overall scale and massing of the dwellings is considered to be acceptable.
61. Given that this proposal is required to meet all three elements of the definition of sustainability as set out in the NPPF, there is a need to consider the range of facilities in Shepreth available to the occupants of the proposed scheme and the impact of the scheme on the capacity of public services that serve the village.
62. 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:

- 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.

63. Whilst it is possible to commute to and from Cambridge from Shepreth, the bus service is limited and does not provide a regular alternative to the private car as there is no service during the rest of the day, with no service at the weekends. The service to and from Royston would not allow commuting and is limited to 2 services to and from Royston Monday to Saturday. It is acknowledged that if occupants of the development were reliant on the bus service as a more sustainable means of transport, the infrequency of the service in Shepreth would significantly weaken the environmental sustainability of the proposal.
64. However, Shepreth railway station is within walking distance of the site and the connection can be made via existing footpaths. There are 3 trains at commuting times to and from Royston (total journey time from the site to Royston train station is 15 minutes). There are 2 trains to and 3 from Cambridge at commuting times (total journey time to Cambridge station is 20 minutes). There is a frequent service throughout the day Monday to Saturday and an hourly service to and from both Cambridge and Royston on Sundays. Given the ease of access to this mode of transport from the site and the speed and frequency of the respective services, it is considered that connection by rail offers a viable alternative to the use of the private car to access a wide range of employment, services and facilities. This factor is considered to be a benefit which should be afforded significant weight in the determination of the application.
65. The County Council as the relevant Authority for providing education services have indicated that there is currently insufficient capacity in the early years provision at Barrington Primary School (this site being within the catchment area for that school) to accommodate the anticipated 5 children within the relevant age bracket (3 of whom will qualify for free provision) that would result from this development. Barrington Primary School also does not have capacity to accommodate the anticipated 4 children within that age bracket. The County Council identified the need for a 4 classroom extension to Barrington school in 2016/17 which was planned for in order to accommodate additional development within the catchment area. The cost of the overall project, once non-CIL compliant elements are removed is £2,225,202. The overall project would accommodate 116 additional pupils, resulting in a cost per pupil of £19,183. On that basis, the contributions to be sought from this development are £57,549 in relation to pre-school provision and £76,732 in relation to primary school provision.
66. The development would be within the catchment area of Melbourn Village College and the County Council consider that this school has capacity to accommodate the additional pupils projected to be generated by the development (anticipated to be 3).
67. A contribution of £1,533.00 is requested to improve the provision of library services. The County Council have calculated this figure based on 53 new residents resulting from the scheme multiplied by a sum of £28.92 as a per person as a pooled contribution towards the replacement of the existing mobile library on the route that serves Shepreth. Given that the impact on the capacity of the library can be mitigated through this relatively small scheme in relation to the overall anticipated population increase, it is considered that securing this sum via a section 106 agreement would offset any negative impacts on social sustainability in this regard.

68. No contribution is to be secured towards the Thriplow recycling centre for household waste, as there have now been five contributions towards that project.
69. In terms of health impact, the applicant has submitted an Impact Assessment in this regard. This Assessment acknowledges that there may need to be an upgrade in public service facilities to accommodate the needs of the occupants of the development to ensure that the high standards of public health in locality are maintained.
70. Whilst NHS England have not provided a response to the planning application, (as it their protocol in relation to proposals for less than 50 dwellings) Officers have contacted the GP surgery in Melbourn to ascertain whether the anticipated population of the development (approximately 53 using the Open Space SPD estimates) could be accommodated at the surgery given that the Royal College of General Practitioners has a guideline of 1,800 patients per GP.
71. The surgery has confirmed that the practice is still taking on new patients. There is an issue regarding the future expansion of the practice due to the physically constrained nature of the site. However, a contribution has been sought in relation to the development at New Road in Melbourn (199 units and a care home) and is proposed to be sought from other developments of a larger scale on sites in Melbourn and the surrounding villages, which will contribute to a suitable project once this has been identified. NHS England confirmed in relation to the Melbourn site that a number of options are being explored and this justification was accepted by the Inspector. Given the relatively smaller scale of this scheme in comparison with those other developments, and considering the limit of 5 contributions being pooled to the same project, it is considered that there is no evidence to justify a contribution in this case.
72. Shepreth has a village hall, equipped recreation ground, allotments and 2 pubs but doe not have a primary school, or any shops. Whilst a mobile library service does serve the village, it is clear that even basic day to day needs are not met by facilities within the village and therefore travel outside of the village would be an essential and regular requirement of occupants of the proposed development. However, given the regular and convenient nature of public transport links to settlements with a wide range of services and facilities, it is considered that the lack of facilities within the village is not, when seen in isolation, to be sufficient to outweigh the benefits of the provision of housing, including affordable units, within the context of a lack of a five year supply of housing land.
73. The fact that the developer has agreed to the principle of paying the contribution 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. In light of this and the close proximity of a sustainable means of transport to access a broad range of sources of employment, services and facilities, it is considered that the proposal would achieve the definition of sustainability in terms of connectivity.

Economic sustainability

74. The provision of 25 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.

Environmental sustainability

Density of development

75. The proposed density of the development would be 21 dwellings per hectare. Policies HG/1 of the current LDF and H/7 of the emerging Local Plan require new residential development to achieve a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare within Minor Rural Centres and other villages within the settlement hierarchy. Policy HG/1 states that higher densities should be achieved in more sustainable locations. 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 that development to the west (also beyond framework boundary) is of low density, it is considered that this proposal meets the exception tests of the current and emerging policy with regard to the density of development.

Agricultural land, character of the village edge and surrounding landscape

76. 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 grade 2 (in this case) agricultural land unless :
- a. Land is allocated for development in the Local Development Framework
 - b. Sustainability considerations and the need for the development are sufficient to override the need to protect the agricultural value of the land.
77. While there would be conflict with policy NE/17, given the sustainable location of the site for residential development and the fact that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, the need for housing overrides the need to retain this relatively small area of agricultural land.

Landscape Impact

78. The site is considered to be visually contained in landscape terms due to the screening provided on the north eastern boundary with the commercial uses and there is dense screening on the north western boundary with the railway line. The site is visible from Meldreth Road although properties along the frontage of Meldreth Road provide the foreground and the existing development on Collins Close forms the backdrop on the approach to the site from the north east.
79. The proposals have been revised to pull the properties at plots 23 and 24 further away from the north western boundary, allowing the retention of a greater proportion of the tree planting along that boundary. This would ensure that the sense of containment provided by this landscaping would be retained. Whilst the Landscape Design Officer's (LDO) comments regarding the potential loss of trees on the north eastern boundary are noted (as these trees would be within private gardens), the boundary is considered to be less sensitive due to the fact that commercial units form the backdrop to that boundary of the site.
80. The tree survey identifies the trees on the north eastern boundary as being of average or poor in terms of form and condition and the Tree Officer has raised no objection to the loss of these trees. Following the revisions to increase the length of the rear gardens of the plots adjacent to that boundary, it is considered that there would be adequate space to plant better quality specimens as part of a landscape strategy that can be secured by condition.

81. The LDO also makes the point that there would need to be some tree removal to create a safe environment for the pedestrian link to the play space on Collins Close. It is considered that there is space within this part of the site to remove a small number of trees to widen the route as part of a wider management plan. These details can also be secured by condition.

Design

82. The Urban Design Officer (UDO) expressed concerns in relation to the proximity of properties to the north eastern boundary and the extent of tree removal adjacent to the north western boundary with the railway in the original submission. These concerns have been addressed in the revised submission by increasing the depth of the gardens of plots 19-22 and pulling plots 23-25 further in from the respective boundaries of the site. The depth of the gardens of plots 19-22 has been increased and plots 23-25 have been pulled further in from the respective boundaries of the site.
83. Concerns were raised by the Design Officer in relation to the parking arrangements in the original submission. Comments that the parking court between plots 1-3 and 4 and 5 is not ideal. Parking to the front of plots 15 and 16 has been rationalised and the spaces associated with plots 6-8 have been relocated so that they would no longer be prominent from the entrance to the development.
84. Whilst it is acknowledged that the properties adjacent to the north eastern boundary would not have 15 metre long rear gardens, as considered 'preferable' in the Design Guide, each of the gardens exceed the minimum size of garden in the Design Guide and therefore the revised scheme is considered to be acceptable. This assessment is made within the context of the limited landscape sensitivity of that boundary of the site given the relatively close proximity of the extensive commercial area to the north east.

Trees

85. The applicant has provided a Tree Survey in support of the planning application. The proposals have been revised to retain a greater depth of the planting along the north western edge of the site. The trees to be removed on the north eastern boundary would be limited to specimens classified as category C i.e. not of sufficient amenity value or condition to be worthy of retention. These trees are considered to be of limited amenity value due to their lack of prominence in wider public views of the site. The District Council Tree Officer has raised no objection to the revised proposals.
86. A condition can be added to the permission requiring tree protection measures to be agreed. Details of the species mix, number and location of new landscaping to be implemented can also be secured by condition.

Ecology

87. The application is supported by an ecological assessment and the site is generally considered to be of low biodiversity value. No suitable habitat was recorded to support reptile species and no activity/evidence of badgers was observed. None of the trees present on site were considered as potential roosts but bats would be likely to use hedgerows for feeding.
88. The survey indicated that there is evidence of previous nesting birds within the buildings and potential evidence of nesting activity in the hedgerows on the

boundaries of the site. To mitigate the impact of this, no demolition or vegetation clearance works take place during the bird breeding season. No nesting activity by barn owls was encountered on the site and the installation of bird boxes within the development is considered to be adequate mitigation.

89. Similar mitigation is considered necessary for bats as the report concluded that no evidence of bats nesting within the site were encountered during the survey period. Mitigation measures are recommended to ensure that any potential impact on badgers is mitigated during the construction of the development. In relation to Great Crested Newts, there are two ponds 140 metres to the north of the site which are considered to have some potential to support this protected species. A survey was undertaken during the breeding season and the no newts were recorded during the four visits to the two ponds. The suitability of the habitat was also considered poor in terms of the ability to support Great Crested Newts. No specific mitigation measures were recommended in the report.
90. The District Council Ecology Officer has no objection to the proposals following the receipt of additional information relating to the mitigation measures to be implemented. The proposed inclusion of wildflower planting and the installation of bat and bird boxes would be biodiversity enhancements which are considered to be a positive element of the scheme, according with paragraph 118 of the NPPF. Details of the specifications and management of these features can be secured by condition.

Highway safety and parking

91. The County Council as Local Highway Authority have raised no objections to the proposals. Access to the development would be gained via Collins Close, in the location of the existing field gate which is located at the end of turning head between 2 of the existing dwellings on that street.
92. The Highway Authority have requested conditions be imposed in relation to the provision of 2 metre x 2 metre pedestrian visibility splays on either side of the driveways serving each of the properties and internal access roads and details of the construction material and finished levels of the driveways. The amended plans show driveways across the development would be a minimum of 5 metres in length, which is considered to be acceptable and would avoid reliance on parking within the road. A construction environment management plan can also be secured by condition to ensure that the construction phase does not result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties or highway safety.
93. The proposal makes provision for 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. Given that 2 bedroomed properties have also been allocated 2 parking spaces, it is considered that the overall scheme would not result in reliance for on street parking either within the development or on the wider highway network.

Residential amenity

94. In terms of the amenity of the future occupiers of the development, the amended layout ensures that the 25 metre guideline separation between elevations containing habitable room windows and 12 metres between blank elevations and those with habitable room windows would be adhered to. The amount of private amenity space associated with each property is considered to meet the minimum requirements of the Design Guide.

95. The amended noise impact assessment submitted is considered sufficient in relation to addressing the impact of noise generated by the adjacent commercial use and the railway line on the living conditions of the occupants of the proposed development. The report indicates that upgraded acoustic glazing will need to be installed in the rear elevations of the properties adjacent to the north western boundary of the site (adjacent to the railway). A plan showing the affected elevations has been submitted and is considered adequate, alongside the specification of the glazing, to ensure that the impact of this noise source can be adequately mitigated. Compliance with these details shall be secured by condition.
96. It is considered that further assessment of the potential noise generated by traffic and vehicle movements on Meldreth Road is required and the implications of this in terms of sound insulation measures which may need to be incorporated into the buildings that would front onto the highway. This assessment can be secured by condition.
97. An assessment of the impact of artificial lighting resulting from the development can also be secured by condition in order to ensure that the strength of such light does not have any adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties or the surrounding area.
98. Standard conditions relating to the construction phase of the development have been recommended by the EHO in relation to managing the impact on the environment and amenity of neighbouring properties during construction process and the management of waste during construction and on occupation of the development. These can all be added to the decision notice

Surface water and foul water drainage

Surface water drainage

99. The site lies in Flood Zone 1. The Lead Local Flood Authority has not raised an objection following the submission of revised surface water drainage strategy and is of the view that surface water drainage would achieve the requirement of not exceeding the existing run off rate on the site, subject to suitable conditions being included in any consent. The Environment Agency has not objected to the proposals and has not recommended any specific conditions.

Foul water drainage

100. Anglian Water has commented that the site is within the catchment of the Foxton Water Recycling Centre, which does not currently have capacity to treat the flows from the proposed development. However, they acknowledge in their response that they are legally obliged to accommodate the demands of any development and would therefore ensure that there is sufficient capacity to deal with the flows, should planning permission be granted.
101. Officers have held a meeting with Anglian Water, in recognition of the concerns raised regarding the capacity of the treatment works. Anglian Water have explained that it is only at the point that there is certainty a scheme will be built i.e. outline and reserved matters planning permission has been granted, that a specific project will be identified. The required works would be identified and carried out in the time between the granting of planning permission and the occupation of the development. On the applicant's indicative timescale, the development would not be fully occupied until more than 2 years after the discharge of conditions, should planning permission be

granted. This would allow sufficient time for any upgrade works to be completed and as such, the current deficit in capacity would not be a reasonable ground on which to refuse planning permission.

102. In terms of foul water, Anglian Water has confirmed that there will be a need to mitigate the impact of additional foul water entering the drainage network and that a suitable drainage strategy will be required. This can be secured by condition.

Section 106 contributions

103. In addition to the requirements of the County Council as Education Authority, the Section 106 Officer has confirmed that the contributions towards the formal sports provision and children's play space (to help fund a MUGA at the village recreation ground) and indoor community space by way of renovation and refurbishment works at Shepreth Village Hall are CIL compliant and will meet the needs arising from the development.
- 104.. Contributions are also required towards Household Waste Receptacles charged at £73.50 per dwelling and a monitoring fee of £500 (flat fee),

Other matters

Archaeology and Heritage

105. An investigation into the archaeological potential of the site has been undertaken by the applicant and there is evidence of remains of a 13-15th century medieval farm building on the site. As a result of the investigation works already submitted, the County Council Archaeologist is satisfied that no further investigation works are necessary and no conditions are required should planning permission be granted.
106. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to pay "special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses." Given the separation distance between the site and the edge of the Shepreth conservation area and the fact that residential development lies directly between, it is considered that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area. There are no listed buildings within close proximity of the site and therefore the development of the site would not have an adverse affect on the setting of any heritage assets in this regard.

Environmental Health

107. 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.
108. 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.
109. The site is considered to be a low risk in relation to land contamination and as such it

is considered that a scheme of investigation into any potential harm and suitable remediation can be secured by condition at this outline stage, to ensure that the detailed layout does not result in any adverse impact in this regard, acknowledging the sensitive end use proposed for the site.

110. 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.
111. The applicant will be required to complete a Waste Water Design Toolkit in order to show how it is intended to address the waste management infrastructure, and technical requirements within the RECAP Waste Design Management Design Guide. This can be secured by condition. 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.
112. The applicant has indicated that a minimum of 10% of the energy needs generated by the development can be secured through on site 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.

Conclusion

113. Policies ST/5 and DP/7 of the LDF are relevant, but are considered to carry limited weight in the determination of this application. Recent appeal decisions have confirmed that the settlement hierarchy is also to be afforded limit weight, with the main focus being whether the proposed development itself meets the definition of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.
114. Policies HG/1, HG/2 and HG/3 are all housing policies which are considered to carry some weight in the decision making process as these relate to the density of development, housing mix and affordable housing, all of which contribute to sustainable development. In relation to the other relevant policies of the LDF quoted in this report are considered to be consistent with the definition of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF and therefore have been given some weight in the assessment of this application.
115. Shepreth is classified as an Infill Village and has only a limited range of services and facilities. The site is not served by a good bus services but the presence of the rail station close to the site would allow commuting to and from other major service centres. This is both a social and an environmental benefit of the scheme.
116. In addition to the ability to mitigate the harm in relation to the capacity of services and facilities, it is considered that the scheme includes positive elements which enhance social sustainability. These include the provision of 40% affordable housing. The package of contributions to be secured through the Section 106 towards the enhancement of offsite community facilities would be a wider benefit of the proposals, further enhancing the social sustainability of the scheme.
117. Following the receipt of additional information, none of the Council's internal consultees have recommended refusal. Neither are there objections to the proposals

from the Highway Authority, the Flood Risk Authority or the Environment Agency. All of the matters raised can be secured by appropriately worded conditions.

118. Overall, it is considered that the small amount of harm arising from the loss of agricultural land and the location on the edge of an Infill Village where development of individual sites is otherwise restricted to no more than 2 dwellings is outweighed by the significant contribution the proposal would make to the deficit in the Council's five year housing land supply. None of the 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.

Recommendation

119. Officers recommend that the Committee grants planning permission, subject to the following:

Section 106 Agreement

As per the Heads of Terms set out in Appendix 1.

Draft conditions

- (a) Time limit for implementation
- (b) Approved plans
- (c) Landscaping details and implementation
- (d) Contaminated land assessment and remediation
- (e) Dust, noise, vibration mitigation strategy
- (f) Noise assessment relating to impact of road traffic on Meldreth Road
- (g) Provision and retention of acoustic glazing
- (h) Details of renewable energy generation within the development and associated noise assessment and mitigation measures – 10% renewables and compliance.
- (i) Woodland management plan
- (j) Foul water drainage scheme
- (k) Surface water drainage scheme
- (l) Sustainable drainage strategy
- (m) Tree Protection measures
- (n) Compliance with flood risk assessment
- (o) Traffic Management Plan
- (p) Falls levels and bound materials fro the new access road
- (q) Pedestrian visibility splays
- (r) Electric vehicle charging points
- (s) Time restriction on the removal of trees
- (t) Ecological enhancements including bird and bat boxes
- (u) Site waste management plan
- (v) Restriction on the hours of power operated machinery during construction
- (w) Compliance with ecological survey submitted
- (x) External lighting to be agreed
- (y) Cycle storage
- (z) Screened storage refuse
- (aa) Boundary treatments
- (bb) Waste water management plan
- (cc) Construction environment management plan
- (dd) Details of piled foundations
- (ee) Fire hydrant locations

Informative

(a) Environmental health informatives

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/3052/16/FL

Report Author:

David Thompson
Telephone Number:

Principal Planning Officer
01954 713250