

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

7 February 2018

AUTHOR/S: Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development

Application Number: S/4469/17/OL

Parish(es): Castle Camps

Proposal: Proposed Outline Application with All Matters Reserved Residential development of 0.42 hectares to include the erection of up to 5 dwellings and other associated works.

Site address: Land South of Bartlow Road, Castle Camps, CB21 4SY

Applicant(s): Elbourn Carter Trust

Recommendation: Approval

Key material considerations: Housing supply
Principle of development
Density
Housing mix
Affordable Housing
Impact on services and facilities
Impact on landscape, trees local character and heritage
Ecology
Noise
Residential amenity
Highway Safety and Parking
Archaeology
Surface Water Drainage and Foul Water Drainage
Contamination
Developer contributions

Committee Site Visit: No

Departure Application: Yes (advertised on 03 January 2018)

Presenting Officer: Michael Sexton, Senior Planning Officer

Application brought to Committee because: The recommendation of Officers conflicts with that of the Parish Council and approval would represent a departure from the Local Plan

Date by which decision due: 08 February 2018

Executive Summary

1. This is an Outline Application for the erection of up to five dwellings, and other associated works, outside Castle Camps village framework and in the countryside.
2. All matters are reserved at this stage, although formal consultation has taken place with the Local Highways Authority and vehicular access to the site can be achieved.
3. Castle Camps is classified as a Group Village where residential development and redevelopment up to an indicative maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings will be permitted within the village framework. Although the number of dwellings proposed falls below this threshold, the development would not normally be considered acceptable in principle as a result of its out of village framework location. However, the Council acknowledges at present it cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply.
4. Given that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply, its "housing supply policies" remain out of date (albeit "housing supply policies" do not include policies ST/6, DP/1(a) or DP/7). As such, and in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court in the Hopkins Homes appeal, paragraph 14 of the NPPF is engaged and planning permission for housing development 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 ...".
5. Castle Camps is a Group village with limited facilities. Occupants of the development would be required to travel out of the village to access facilities to meet day to day needs and employment opportunities. These factors weigh against the social and environmental sustainability of the scheme.
6. However, the extent of this harm is considered to be reduced by the fact that there is a bus service which would allow commuting to Haverhill, a market town, within a reasonable time and that this service runs within close proximity of the application site. Whilst buses are infrequent throughout the day, occupants of the development would still have an alternative to the use of the private car to access the services and other facilities in Haverhill. Furthermore, as noted above, the number of dwellings proposed falls within the indicative maximum scheme permitted for group villages, albeit the site is located outside of the framework boundary.
7. There are no objections to the proposed development from the Council's internal consultees, with the exception of the Urban Design Officer, or from the Highway Authority, subject to appropriate conditions. In respect of the Council's Urban Design Officers comments, the application is Outline only with all matters reserved; therefore comments relating to layout cannot be afforded significant weight.
8. The benefits from the development include the provision of up to 5 dwellings towards housing land supply, employment during construction to benefit the local economy and greater use of local services and facilities to contribute to the local economy.
9. These benefits must be weighed against adverse impacts of the development. These are identified as the location outside village framework and the objectives of policies DP/1(a) and DP/7, and only limited landscape harm.
10. In this case, it is considered that 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.

Planning History

11. S/3128/17/OL – Proposed Outline Application with All Matters Reserved Residential development of 0.42 hectares to include the erection of 9 dwellings and other associated works – Refused (18 December 2017)

S/1767/78/O – Erection of two dwellings. – Refused

SC/0342/73/O – Residential Development of five dwellings – Refused

Adjacent Sites

S/0415/17/OL – Outline application for the erection of up to 10 dwellings with all matters reserved expect for access – Approved (16 December 2017)

Environmental Impact Assessment

12. The application does not fall under Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and would not exceed the criteria in section 10b of Schedule 2 of the regulations. The application does not therefore require the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment.

National Guidance

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

14. Development Plan Policies

The following paragraphs are a list of documents and policies that may be relevant in the determination of this application. Consideration of whether any of these are considered out of date in light of the Council not currently being able to demonstrate that it has an up to date five year housing land supply, and the weight that might still be given to those policies, is addressed later in the report.

15. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy DPD 2007

ST/2 Housing Provision
ST/6 Group Village

16. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007:

DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/4 Infrastructure in New Developments
DP/7 Development Frameworks
HG/1 Housing Density
HG/3 Affordable Housing
CH/2 Archaeological Sites
HG/1 Housing Density
NE/1 Energy Efficiency
NE/4 Landscape Character Areas
NE/6 Biodiversity
NE/9 Water and Drainage Infrastructure
NE/10 Foul Drainage – Alternative Drainage Systems

NE/11 Flood Risk
NE/12 Water Conservation
NE/14 Light Pollution
NE/15 Noise Pollution
NE/16 Emissions
NE/17 Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
SF/10 Outdoor Play space, 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
TR/4 Travel by Non-Motorised Modes

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

Health Impact Assessment SPD – Adopted March 2011
Affordable Housing SPD - Adopted March 2010
District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010
Landscape in New Developments SPD - Adopted March 2010
Biodiversity SPD - Adopted July 2009
Open Space in New Developments SPD - Adopted January 2009
Trees & Development Sites SPD - Adopted January 2009

18. **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/7 Development Frameworks
S/10 Group Villages
S/12 Phasing, Delivering and Monitoring
CC/1 Mitigation and adoption 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
HQ/1 Design principles
H/7 Housing Density
H/9 Affordable Housing
NH/2 Protecting and enhancing landscape character
NH/3 Protecting Agricultural Land
NH/4 Biodiversity
NH/6 Green infrastructure
H/7 Housing density
SC/8 Open space standards
SC/11 Noise pollution
SC/13 Air quality
TI/2 Planning For Sustainable Travel
TI/3 Parking provision

Consultation

19. **Castle Camps Parish Council** – Castle Camps Parish Council held a meeting on Thursday 11th January 2018 where 5 Councillors and 13 parishioners attended. All Councillors present objected to the above application for proposed outline application with all matters reserved residential development of 0.42 hectares to include the erection of up to 5 dwellings and associate works

The objections are as following:

- **Layout and density.**
There is already an agreed outline planning permission S/415/17/OL for land opposite this site looking to build up to 10 dwellings. If this application were to go ahead for a further 5 dwellings this would mean this gateway to the village would be supporting an additional 15 houses. This is a very localised development area for such a small village and will be significantly changing the characteristics and rural nature and gateway appearance of the area. The application is on land lying within open countryside and outside the developmental framework
- **Noise**
The increase to the number of houses in such a small vicinity will be extremely invasive to the current residents. Castle Camps is a small quite village with a small number of properties adding extensions but this scale of building work will be significant to that currently experienced and very invasive to the people living next to and around this area. Construction machinery, noise, mud and parking during construction will also affect people walking and driving along this road especially if a development of 10 dwellings is being constructed opposite this site.
- **Development framework and impact on local character of village**
This application is outside the framework set out in the South Cambs Local Plan and the South Cambs Strategic Housing Land Availability Report – August 2013 (SHLAA). Had the South Cambs Local Plan still been in place it would carry weight to argue against the position of this application. It is very unfair for a small village to be so unprotected by local policy and be left open and subject to the advances of development such as this.

The SHLAA report showed site assessment conclusion of no development potential and status of site in proposed local plan 2013 was Not allocated for development. Outside developmental framework. It further states “the site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints”. This situation has not changed and the conclusion from the 2013 SHLAA is still valid and appropriate.

- It further states the site listed as “Viability Category 4 Least Viable Sites”. There have been no positive influences or changes to the area to move from this position and the Parish Council would therefore note that this “least viable” position is again equally valid and relevant today.
- The report states that land is Agricultural land grade 2

This site has had 3 previous applications refused SC/0342/73/O, S/1767/78/O and S/3128/17/OL

The refusals were as follows

SC/0342/73 – 5 dwellings

- Development is unrelated to the basic needs of the rural community
- Development is unrelated to the basic needs of the rural community

- This would create an undesirable precedent for further and similar proposals to the detriment of the open and rural character and appearance of the area
- Undesirable extension of ribbon development outside the limits of the village
- There is no main drainage to serve the site

S/1767/78/O – 2 dwellings

- Site lies outside the “stop lines” for the furthest residential development on the Approved Written Policy Statement for Castle Camps
- The proposed development would constitute ribbon development and would increase the danger to road users
- On the Approved and Review Country Development Plan the site is shown to be within the white area where existing uses are expected to remain for most part undisturbed unless related to a proven and justifiable local or rural need
- Development of the type proposed would progressively detract from the open rural appearance and character of the area

S/3128/17/OL – 9 dwellings

- The development is located outside of Castle Camps village framework and in open countryside.
- The Local Planning Authority is of the view that the development would have a significant and adverse impact upon the rural character of the area on the village edge and would lead to encroachment into the countryside. For this reason, the proposal is contrary to the aims of Policy DP/2 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Development Framework, that states all new development must be of high quality design and, as appropriate to the scale and nature of the development, should preserve or enhance the character of the local area and be compatible with its location. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 17 and section 7 of the NPPF

The three refusals above show that the current lack of Local Plan shouldn't count as this area has been classed as unsuitable for development for many years. All three refusals taking into account two of them are small applications for 2 and 5 dwellings, state development of this land would be detrimental and have an adverse impact on the rural character, area and nature of this part of the village. The lack of mains drainage near the site is also used. This application for up to 5 dwellings should be considered exactly the same

- Sustainability

Castle Camps is defined as a Group Village, in the South Cambs District Council Core Strategy. Referring to policy ST/6, development for a small number of dwellings is considered acceptable within the developmental framework and policy DP7 restricts development within open countryside. The approval of outline planning permission S/415/17/OL for land opposite for up to 10 dwellings which was outside the developmental framework and in open countryside shows South Cambs District Council have already permitted a small number of dwellings in this localised area of Castle Camps. Any further development would be detrimental and not considered a small number of dwellings. The village, being a group village, has limited services, facilities and employment opportunities therefore occupants would be required to travel out of the village to access facilities to meet day to day needs. The bus service during the week is regular but not frequent and is extremely limited in

destination so wouldn't support residents looking to commute. There is no bus service at the weekend. This creates an adverse effect against social and environmental sustainability for this application and the necessity for all occupants to drive out of the village for even basic requirements for day to day needs. Thus, resulting in a higher volume of cars and traffic using this road and potentially adding to local highways problems including on the A1307.

- Highway Safety and Traffic

This site is outside of the 30mph zone. The proposed entrance to the site will see pedestrians, cyclists and motorists entering and exiting the development amongst traffic travelling at speeds greater than 30mph. The conclusion from the enclosed speed survey states an average speed of passing traffic travelling between 42mph & 45mph. This speed survey was carried out in Oct 2016 during half term so doesn't reflect the usual higher volume or speed of traffic using this road for the majority of the year. Given the location of the nearby Primary School this could well include children crossing and using this area. If this application were to be approved a condition for the developers to finance and move the 30mph speed limit zone on Bartlow road further out of the village to include this application entrance and Pond Farm is requested. This application could generate an increase of 5 – 10 vehicles. The development S/0415/17/OL will also generate an increase of up to 20 vehicles, this is a huge demand on this area of the village. The Pedestrian safety is not adequate at present.

The Design, Access, Planning and Justification Statement Summary 13.6 states that "Improvements to pedestrian links to the village could be provided by a footway being created to connect the site to the village" There is no commitment to provide this. If this application were to be approved a condition requiring the developer to provide a footway and adequate crossing point with drop kerbs to accommodate wheelchair use, pram use etc must be included before occupation of dwellings.

If no pavement is provided this will create separation from the rest of the village and cause a hazard for all pedestrians in this area.

- Sewer and drainage system

Anglian Water have not been consulted on this application so at present it is unknown what effect this development will have on the system or if it can cope at present with this extra demand.

The sewage system suffered its latest problem earlier last year along Bartlow Road that resulted in a blockage and overflow, flooding a property's garage and garden. This resulted in the Environmental Department being called out as effluent flowed onto the highway. In times of heavy continuous rain several manholes in Bartlow Road and Church Lane overflow with sewage. The Village Pond also overflowed several times, the last, a few years ago resulting in flooding a resident's property, the resident has added additional pipework at his own expense to avoid further damage. It is agreed that these systems barely cope or just about cope at present. The neighbouring houses are not on mains drainage. There is concern that the foul water drainage generally in Castle Camps has a history of being at capacity and overflowing. These are serious issues that exist at present and can only be made worse by further development. If this application is approved conditions to upgrade all existing mains drainage systems and surface water drainage systems that this application will connect to must be included

It was agreed and voted on that this complete outline planning application be considered by the District Council's Planning Committee. This request has the support

of Cllr Richard Turner.

19. **Anglian Water** (comments made to application previous application S/3128/17/OL) – No objections in principle, due to the lack of Anglian Water operated assets no comments have been made with regards to surface water drainage. However, a condition was requested for a foul water drainage strategy.
20. **Cambridgeshire County Council Education** (comments made to application previous application S/3128/17/OL) – The County Council does not seek contributions for 10 or less dwellings unless we are made aware that the development has a combined gross floor space of over 1000sqm.
21. **Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team** (comments made to application previous application S/3128/17/OL) – The site lies in an area of high archaeological potential, situated in the village core, reflected by the series of listed buildings in the vicinity of the application area. Raises no objection in principle but considered that a condition should be added requiring a programme of archaeological investigation to be secured prior to the commencement of development as the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential.
22. **Contaminated Land Officer** – No objection, request condition requiring a Phase 1 Environmental Desk Study.
23. **Ecology Officer** (comments made to application previous application S/3128/17/OL) – No Objections in principle of the development at outline stage. It is agreed with the recommendations in both the Reptile report and Biodiversity report. There is agreement to the reptile translocation scheme and a condition is recommended in order to achieve this. The ecology officer also recommended a biodiversity enhancement condition.
24. **Environmental Health Officer** – No objection, request conditions relating to hours of work, burning of waste and informatives relating to driven pile foundations and minimising the potential for disturbance of neighbouring residents.
25. **Landscape Officer** (comments made to application previous application S/3128/17/OL) – Recommends approval, subject to landscaping conditions. The site is in a rural location and preservation of existing trees is welcomed. Applicant to consider the following within the final detailed design:
 - Permeable paving.
 - Access road to be less urban / engineered and reflect the local village character.
 - Southern boundary to be both post and rail fencing with native mixed hedgerows / trees. This will reflect the existing village boundary treatments.
 - Northern boundary to be infilled with both tree and native hedgerow.
 - Enclose boundaries facing roads by hedgerow or, in appropriate locations, low flint and brick walls.
 - Hedgehog gaps within close boarded boundary fencing to be included.
26. **Local Highways Authority** – No objection. Requests that the access be a minimum width of 5 metres. Requests conditions relating to driveway falls and levels, driveway materials, management and maintenance of the proposed street and the submission of a Traffic Management Plan. An informative relating to works to or within the public highway has also been requested.

The Local Highways Authority have also stated that they will not be seeking to adopt

this development in its present format as the internal roads serve no highway function and all of the proposed dwellings have an existing highway frontage.

27. **Sustainable Drainage Engineer** – No objection, requests surface water and foul water drainage conditions.
28. **Trees Officer** – No objection.

The internal site trees have all been removed, leaving trees on the boundaries. A 'Tree Survey Report' dated July 2017 / Dec 2017 has been submitted, which for the most part is sufficient for the site and proposal. It does not appear to cover the instillation of the road side footpath which appears to be within the RPA of the trees on the frontage. Recommend a condition requiring a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Strategy; approved protection measures to be installed prior to works and remain in place until completion.

29. **Urban Design Officer** – objection.
- Sensitive village edge location, Council's SHLAA consideration was a rejection although does advise that landscape issues could be mitigated in part by possible development within part site with mature hedged rear to site, subject to landscape mitigation and retention of mature hedgelines.
 - Layout – indicative layout tries to address SHLAA issue. Lack of enclosure caused by lack of an end dwelling to provide visual stop point. 5 dwellings positioned close together and there may be a danger of overlooking. Car parking proposed to be on plot at the front of all dwellings. Informal open space to comply with requirements at Reserved Matters Stage.
 - Use and amount – low density but acceptable given edge of village location, housing mix currently undetermined, more detail expected at Reserved Matters stage.

Representations

30. 1 letters of objection has been received from a local resident raising the following concerns: -
- i. S/3128/17/OL reason for refusal is still applicable.
 - ii. Capacity of community services / infrastructure to cope.
 - iii. Highway safety.
 - iv. Surface drainage.
 - v. Sewerage.
 - vi. Heritage consideration – preservation of local history.
 - vii. Outside of the development framework.
 - viii. Property size – 2 or 3 storey properties would result in a loss of privacy and light.

Site and Surroundings

31. The site lies to the south of Bartlow Road and west of the village, just outside, but adjacent to, Castle Camps village framework, in the open countryside.
32. The site has an area of approximately 0.42 hectares. It is bound to the east and west by residential properties, where the boundaries are defined by areas of vegetation providing separation between the site and the adjacent development. The northern boundary of the site runs parallel with Bartlow Road with a drainage ditch running along the northern and southern boundaries of the site. To the south of the site is open countryside.

33. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk)

Planning Assessment

34. The key planning issues relevant with respect to the proposed development are considered to be the following: Housing Supply, Principle of development, Density, Housing mix, Affordable Housing, Impact on services and facilities, Impact on landscape and local character, Ecology, trees and hedging, Residential amenity, Highway Safety and Parking, Surface Water Drainage and Foul Water Drainage, Contamination, and Developer contributions

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 4.5 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 19,000 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 December 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/6 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' has emerged via 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 policy 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.

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/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 ...”
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/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.
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/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. This approach reflects the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Hopkins Homes* appeal.
43. This approach reflects the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Hopkins Homes* appeal.

Principle of Development

44. As the site is located outside the Castle Camps village framework and, in the open countryside, 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 5 dwellings would therefore not under normal circumstances be considered acceptable in principle since it is contrary to this adopted and emerging policy.
45. The development would not therefore comply with Policy DP/7 of the LDF.

46. Development in Group Villages (the current and emerging status of Castle Camps) is normally limited to schemes of up to 8 dwellings, within the village framework boundary. 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 more limited range of services to meet the needs of new residents in a sustainable manner than in Rural Centres.
47. While the development would fall within the accepted threshold of 8 dwellings, it would not strictly accord with Policy ST/6 of the LDF, by virtue of its location outside of the village framework.
48. The principal consideration however is that the NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to boost the supply of housing and to assess development against the definition of sustainable development within that context. Specifically in relation to the size of development in or on the edge of settlements, the Inspector in the 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.'
49. In light of the above, it is not appropriate to attach the same weight to policy DP/7 and DP/1(a) in a 'blanket' way to all settlements. Group Villages such as Castle Camps are generally less sustainable locations for new development than Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, having fewer services and facilities allowing only some of the basic day-to-day requirements of their residents to be met without the need to travel outside the village. Within the context of the lack of a five year housing land supply, Officers are of the view that sites on the edges of these locations generally, can accommodate at least the indicative maximum of 8 units and still achieve the definition of sustainable development due to the level of services and facilities provided in these villages.
50. Whilst the site is outside of the village framework, it is below the indicative maximum number of units considered to be suitable within the defined village boundary and given the close proximity of the framework boundary, it is considered that this factor is worthy of considerable weight in assessing the sustainability credentials of the proposals.
51. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF states there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental, which are mutually dependent. These are assessed below in relation to the proposed development.

Economic

52. The provision of up to 5 new dwellings will give rise to employment during the construction phase of the development and would have 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.

Social

Housing Delivery

53. Chapter 6 of the NPPF relates to 'delivering a wide choice of high quality homes' and seeks to 'boost significantly the supply of housing' placing importance on widening the

choice of high quality homes and ensuring sufficient housing (including affordable housing) is provided to meet the needs of present and future generations.

54. 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.
55. There remains a significant shortage of deliverable housing sites in the district. The development would provide a clear public benefit in helping to meet the current housing shortfall in South Cambridgeshire in the delivery of up to 5 dwellings. Officers are of the view significant weight should be afforded to this benefit in the decision making process.
56. The application is Outline with all matters reserved, therefore the development would require the submission and approval of a Reserved Matters application, along with the discharge of any relevant conditions prior to works commencing on site.

Scale of Development, Cumulative Impact and Services

57. This proposal is for up to 5 dwellings, and along with the approved Outline development on the opposite side of the road (S/0415/17/OL), would result in a total of 15 new dwellings on the western edge of the village.
58. Given the current lack of a 5 year housing land supply and that policy ST/6 is out of date, it therefore needs to be determined whether the scale of the development is acceptable for this location in terms of the size of the village and the sustainability of the location.
59. The site abuts the village framework boundary on its eastern boundary and is located west of the main village. The number of dwellings proposed falls within the indicative maximum scheme permitted for Group Villages, albeit the site is located outside of the framework boundary.
60. The Services and Facilities Study (March 2014) states that in mid-2012 Castle Camps had an estimated population of 660 and a dwelling stock of 280.
61. The Services and Facilities Study (March 2014) identifies that Castle Camps is served by relatively few services and facilities in the village. The study details a Primary School, a mobile library service on the first Tuesday of the month from Sangers Farm (Camps End) and Claydon Close, a temporary Post Office which operates on a Monday from 12.30-14.30 and on Thursday from 13:30-15:30, a Public House and a Village Hall located at the Recreation Ground. The Recreation Ground has a Local Equipped Area of Play and outdoor sports facilities which include a football pitch and multi-use hard court with floodlights and play area, a separate bowls green and allotment.
62. This relative lack of services and employment opportunities is reflected in Castle Camps being designated a 'Group Village'. Whilst the village is served by some community and social facilities, it is deficient in its function to provide significant sources of employment, secondary education and services to fulfil other than the most basic shopping trip. As such, journeys out of the village would be a regular necessity for the majority of residents in order to access many day-to-day services. The nearest settlement that would offer services and social facilities, including sources of employment and secondary education, to possibly meet day-to-day needs would be

the Minor Rural Centre of Linton, located approximately 6 miles to the north west. The market town of Haverhill located in Suffolk is also only approx. 5miles north east which contains a range of services and facilities. It is also acknowledged that the scheme would generate further cars in the village as commented on by residents.

63. There is a bus stop on Bartlow Road near the corner of High Street, approximately 200m from the site. The number 19 bus service connects Castle Camps to Haverhill with one bus from 7.00-9:29, 4 buses from 9:30-16:29 and 1 bus from 16:30-18:59. There are 4 buses from Haverhill between 9:30-16:29 and one bus from 16:30-18:59 Monday-Friday. There is no service on a Saturday or Sunday. The service between the village and Cambridge is extremely limited and would not allow commuting from the proposed development without access to private motor transport.
64. Bartlow Road has a public footpath which commences at 8 Bartlow Road on the opposite side of the road to the site, the footpath on the same side of the road of the site commences at the junction with Church Lane. The proposed development includes the installation of a footway along the north eastern boundary of the site to improve connectivity and this would improve the sustainability of the scheme. The proposed footpath would then link to the footpath proposed under approved application S/0415/17/OL. No development on this site could be occupied until the footpath on both schemes is implemented in order to provide safe access into the village. Details of the extent of the footpath are considered in the highway safety section below.
65. It is acknowledged that occupants of the proposed development would need to make journeys to larger centres, such as Haverhill, to meet day to day needs. However, it is possible to do that journey by public transport and therefore there is an alternative to the use of the private car for these journeys. It is accepted the proposed development would increase car use and congestion, but given there are alternative means of travel other than by car, this is considered to carry only limited weight against the proposal given the existing housing land supply deficit.

Density

66. Housing density Policy HG/1 is applicable in this instance and seeks a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare, unless there are exceptional local circumstances that require different treatment.
67. The site is approximately 0.42 hectares in area. The erection of up to 5 dwellings would equate to a density of 12 dwellings per hectare. Whilst this density would be below the requirement of at least 30 dwellings per hectare, officers consider it is appropriate in this case given the nature of the site on the edge of the village to minimise the visual impact upon the countryside, the character and appearance of the area and the surrounding built environment.

Affordable Housing

68. Planning law requires that planning applications shall be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
69. Policy HG/3 requires that a minimum of 40% (i.e. 3) of the proposed dwellings should be affordable.
70. On 11 December 2017, the Planning Portfolio Holder (PPH) considered a report on Affordable Housing Thresholds. In summary, the PPH has noted that affordable

housing provision will only be required on developments of 11 dwellings or more, or on sites of less than 11 units if the combined gross internal floorspace of the proposed development exceeds 1,000 sqm. This is in accordance with the Government's Written Ministerial Statement 2014 (WMS) and the anticipated findings of the Inspector reporting on the modifications to the emerging Local Plan.

71. The proposed scheme would fall beneath the threshold set out in the report. In the light of the WMS and the anticipated Inspector's report, it would be both inappropriate and unreasonable to secure any affordable housing obligations in this instance.

Developer Contributions

72. With regard to developer contributions development plan policies state that planning permission will only be granted for proposals that have made suitable arrangements towards the provision of infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.
73. Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations states that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development of the obligation is: -
- i) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - ii) Directly related to the development; and,
 - iii) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
74. The Written Ministerial Statement and NPPG dated November 2014 and later reintroduced in May 2016 following a legal challenge seeks to limit Section 106 contributions secured from small scale developments of less than 10 no. dwellings or those where the gross floor space would not exceed 1000 square metres. The proposed development is for up to 5 no. dwellings and would not exceed 1000 square metres and would fall below the threshold. Therefore, no contributions in relation to open space, community facilities, education, libraries and waste could be secured from the development.
75. As the application is Outline with all matters reserved the exact size of the dwelling are unknown, however, it is unlikely that the resulting floor space would exceed 1,000 square metres.

Environmental Aspects

Landscape Impact

76. The site is currently a piece of arable land situated within the South Suffolk and North Essex Clayland East Anglian Plain Landscape Character Area. The landscape character of the site and its immediate surrounding are typical of East Anglian Chalk comprising wooded arable countryside and gently undulating ground level.
77. The application is an Outline application, with all matter reserved at this stage, including the matter of landscaping. However, given the sites location outside of the village framework and open countryside, consideration is given to the open countryside and landscape impact of the proposed development.
78. Following the removal of a large amount of vegetation, the site comprises a small range of trees along the northern and southern boundaries of the site which are unlikely to be affected by the development of houses. There would be the requirement to remove some trees at the point of access. The application is supported by an

arboricultural impact assessment and has been subject to consultation with the Council's Trees Officer who has raised no objection in principle. However it was recommended that the remaining trees should be protected from any development, therefore tree protection conditions have been recommended and it is considered necessary and reasonable for these to be secured by condition.

79. The presence of the surrounding vegetation partially screens the site from the public realm and would compliment the mix between the new urban development and the rural countryside character. Although the current application has not been subject to consultation with the Council's Landscape Officer, the previous application did receive comments (S/3128/17/OL), and no objections were raised, with several guiding points for Reserved Matters stage in respect of landscape details.
80. Officers acknowledge the previous application, S/3128/17/OL, which was refused for the following reason:
- The development is located outside of Castle Camps village framework. The Local Planning Authority is of the view that the development would have a significant and adverse impact upon the rural character of the area on the village edge and would lead to encroachment into the countryside. For this reason the proposal is contrary to the aims of Policy DP/2 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Development Framework, that states all new development must be of high quality design and, as appropriate to the scale and nature of the development, should preserve or enhance the character of the local area and be compatible with its location. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 17 and section 7 of the NPPF.
81. Officers consider however that this proposal has a more limited impact on the rural character of the area and village edge, and does not result in the same level of encroachment into the countryside as the previous scheme.
82. The application is for up to 5 dwellings and, although all matters are reserved at this stage, an indicative layout plan has been submitted which shows a singular linear form of development along the southern side of Bartlow Road. These five dwellings would be located between two existing buildings (Pond Farm and The Lymit) effectively infilling. The development would also form a pattern of development which is typical of development at the edge of a village in its singular linear form.
83. Furthermore, Outline planning permission has recently been granted on the opposite side of Bartlow Road for 10 dwellings (S/0415/17/OL), a site outside of, but abutting the village framework boundary spanning approximately 130 metres from the village edge. The current application site spans approximately 80 metres from the village edge, 40 metres of which is beyond the western boundary of the approved site opposite.
84. Officers consider that the limited impact on the rural character of the area and open countryside is limited and could be further mitigated at reserved matters stage through appropriate landscaping. It is considered that the application site and proposed development will therefore be satisfactorily softened and screened within wider views in the landscape therefore the proposed landscaping is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policies DP/2, DP/3 and NE/4 of the LDF.

Loss of agricultural land

85. 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 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.

86. The site is not allocated for development in the existing or the emerging Local Plan. However, given the considered sustainable location of the site for residential development 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, officers consider that compliance with NE/17 should be afforded limited weight.

Biodiversity

87. Although the current application has not been subject to consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer, the previous application did receive comments (S/3128/17/OL). The same Ecological Appraisal has been submitted in support of the current application.
88. No objection was raised by the Council's Ecology Officer who agreed with the recommendations within the submitted report. The Ecology Officer recommended an ecological mitigation condition in the form of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) in order to prevent any significant adverse environmental impacts during construction. An enhancement condition was also requested in the biodiversity and reptile reports which would include the recommendations of a reptile relocation scheme. These conditions are considered necessary and reasonable to achieve compliance with policy NE/6 of the LDF.

Scale, Layout and Appearance

89. The matters of scale, layout and appearance are all reserved at this stage and would be formally considered at reserved matters stage. The comments of the Urban Design Officer are noted, but cannot be attached significant weight at outline stage.
90. The application is for up to five units only therefore officers do not consider it necessary to impose a condition for a design code. This is no different than any other application of this scale within the district. However, design clues and the general scale of development should be taken into account together with the surrounding area before drawing up a reserved matters application.
91. Officers consider that up to five dwellings could be accommodate on site which are in keeping in terms of scale, layout and appearance with the character of the surrounding area and local built form. The indicative site plan indicates that the units are to be set back from the main road, which will retain a tree/hedgerow frontage to the site, softening the impact of the development. At this stage, officers do not think it's reasonable to restrict the heights of the development given that these matters can be addressed in the reserved matters.

Highway Safety, Parking and Sustainable Travel

92. The matter of access has been reserved at this stage, although formal consultation has taken place with the Highway Authority to establish that in principle, vehicular access to the site can be achieved.

93. Castle Camps Parish Council and a local resident have raised concerns on highway safety, with particular concern over the sites proximity to the change in speed limit.
94. The Highways Authority raise no objection to the proposal, subject to a number of conditions and informatives, including the submission of a traffic management plan. These conditions are considered reasonable and necessary in order to comply with Policy DP/3 of the LDF.
95. A footpath is proposed to be provided from the access to the development, to join up with the existing footpath which currently ends just east of the site along Bartlow Road using the footpath currently proposed under S/0415/17/OL. The proposed footpath for this application can be secured by condition, however if S/0415/17/OL is not implemented, then the applicants for this proposal would be responsible to connect the proposed footpath up to the existing on Bartlow Road.
96. Officers consider that a scheme for up to 5 dwellings on the site would achieve sufficient car parking and cycle space per dwelling to accord with Policy TR/2 of the LDF.

Flood Risk and Drainage

97. The application site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and has therefore passed the sequential and exemption tests as required by the NPPF.
98. The Parish Council and local resident have raised a number of concerns that the current drainage and sewage systems are struggling to cope. However, the Sustainable Drainage Engineer raises no objection in principle to the proposal, subject to the imposition of conditions requiring details of the surface water drainage system and foul water drainage. Subject to condition, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of flood risk and drainage and complies with Policies, NE/9, NE/10 and NE/11 of the LDF.
99. The Parish Council commented that Anglian Water have not been consulted as part of the current application. Anglian Water commented on the previous application on the site and raised no objection in principle, requesting a foul water drainage condition which, as noted above, is recommended as part of any consent.

Neighbour Amenity

100. The application is Outline only with all matter reserved at this stage; therefore formal floor plans and elevations have not been submitted. Officers consider that the development of up to 5 dwellings on the site could be accommodated without significant adverse impacts on neighbouring properties. Full details, consultation and assessment would occur at Reserved Matters stage.

Contamination

101. The Council's Contaminated Land Officer has raised no objection to the proposed development, requesting a condition requiring a Phase 1 Environmental Desk Study. Officers consider such a condition should be imposed on any consent.

Other Matters

Archaeology

102. Adopted Development Control Policy CH/2 states that archaeological sites will be protected in accordance with national policy. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
103. No objection was raised to the previous application Cambridgeshire County Council's Historic Environment Team, subject to a condition requiring a programme of archaeological investigation to be secured prior to the commencement of development is recommended. Officers consider the condition to be reasonable and necessary.
104. Subject to the recommended condition, the proposal is considered comply with Policy CH/2 of the LDF.

Environmental Health Comments

105. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has raised no objection to the proposed development, subject to a number of conditions relating to hours of work, burning of waste and informatives relating to driven pile foundations and minimising the potential for disturbance of neighbouring residents. Officers consider such a condition should be imposed on any consent.

Balance

106. 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.
107. The benefits from the development is the provision of up to 5 dwellings are set out below: -
- i. The provision of up to 5 dwellings towards housing land supply in the district based on the objectively assessed 19,000 dwellings target set out in the SHMA and the method of calculation and buffer identified by the appeal Inspector.
 - ii. Employment during construction to benefit the local economy.
 - iii. Greater use of local services and facilities to contribute to the local economy.
108. Significant weight can be attached to the provision of up to 5 dwellings to meet the lack of housing supply in the district in accordance with the guidance in the NPPF.
109. Moderate weight can be attached to the provision of employment during construction and the impact upon local services from the development.
110. This report sets out a number of adverse impacts that would result from the development. These are the location outside the village framework and the objectives of policies DP/1(a) and DP/7.
111. Limited weight can be attached to the location of the development given the absence of a five year housing land supply.
112. The potential adverse impact in terms of landscape character harm and impact on the open countryside can be addressed in more detail at Reserved Matters stage and

landscape conditions.

Conclusion

113. In this case, the limited adverse impacts of this development are not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole, which aim to boost significantly the supply of housing and establish a presumption in favour of sustainable development in the context of the lack of a 5-year housing land supply. Therefore, it is considered that, on balance, planning permission should, be granted.

Recommendation

114. Approval subject to:

Conditions and Informatives

Planning conditions and Informatives as set out below, with the final wording of any amendments to these to be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair prior to the issuing of planning permission:

- A) Approval of the details of the layout of the site, the scale and appearance of buildings (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.
(Reason - The application is in outline only.)
- B) Application for the approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission.
(Reason - The application is in outline only.)
- C) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than the expiration of three years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
(Reason - The application is in outline only.)
- D) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan (1:1250).
(Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)
- E) No development shall commence until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted, an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in The National Planning Policy Framework, associated Planning Policy Guidance and the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems. The results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:
 - i. Provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharge rate

and volume from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters.

- ii. Provide a plan indicating flood exceedance routes, both on and off site in the event of a blockage or rainfall event that exceeds the designed capacity of the system.
- iii. Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime. Including: details of land ownership; maintenance responsibilities; a description of system; the identification of individual assets, services and access requirements; details of routine and periodic maintenance activities.
- iv. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

(Reason - To ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage and to prevent the increased risk of flooding in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- F) Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the implementation programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

(Reason - To reduce the risk of pollution to the water environment and to ensure a satisfactory method of foul water drainage in accordance with Policy NE/10 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- G) No development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI which shall include:

- i. The statement of significance and research objectives;
- ii. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;
- iii. The programme for post-excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material.

(Reason - To secure the provision of archaeological excavation and the subsequent recording of the remains in accordance with Policy CH/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- H) No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:

- i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted highway)
- ii. Contractor parking, for both phases all such parking shall be within the curtilage of the site and not on street
- iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted public highway)

- iv. Control of dust, mud and debris, in relationship to the functioning of the adopted public highway.

Development shall commence in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- I) No development shall commence until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an Agreement has been entered into under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a Private Management and Maintenance Company has been established).
(Reason - To ensure satisfactory development of the site and to ensure estate roads are managed and maintained thereafter to a suitable and safe standard.)
- J) No development of the new dwellings shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works, including boundary treatments, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land and details of any to be retained. The details shall also include specification of all proposed trees, hedges and shrub planting, which shall include details of species, density and size of stock.
(Reason - To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity in accordance with Policies DP/2, CH/5 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- K) All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years from the date of the planting, or replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.
(Reason - To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity in accordance with Policies DP/2 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- L) Prior to commencement, site preparation or the delivery of materials to site the applicant shall submit a tree protection strategy, including a tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement (in accordance with the BS 5837:2012 standard), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The protection measures recommended in the approved tree protection strategy shall be implemented prior to the commencement of building operations, site preparation or delivery of materials and remain in position until the practical completion of the development.
(Reason - To protect trees which are to be retained in order to enhance the development, biodiversity and the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- M) No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan not justified (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in

writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.

- i. Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
- ii. Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
- iii. Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
- iv. The location and timings of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- v. The times during which construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- vi. Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- vii. The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- viii. Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs if applicable.

The approved CEMP shall be ahead to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

(Reason - To protect trees which are to be retained in order to enhance the development, biodiversity and the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- N) Prior to the commencement of the development a scheme of biodiversity enhancement shall be supplied to the local planning authority for its written approval. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented within an agreed timescale unless otherwise agreed in writing.
(Reason: NPPF expects development to provide for biodiversity and this can be achieved at this site through enhancement measures as set out in the Ecological Appraisal and Reptile Survey Report and in accordance with Policy NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007 .)
- O) During the period of construction, no power operated machinery shall be operated on the site, and there shall be no construction related deliveries taken at or dispatched from the site, before 0800 hours and after 1800 hours on weekdays and before 0800 hours and after 1300 hours on Saturdays, nor at any time on Sundays and Bank Holidays, unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To minimise noise disturbance for adjoining residents in accordance with Policy NE/15 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- P) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until:
- a) The application site has been subject to a detailed desk study, including site walkover and preliminary Conceptual Site Model, to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
 - b) The application site has been subject to a detailed scheme for the investigation and recording of contamination and remediation objectives have been determined through risk assessment and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - c) Detailed proposals for the removal, containment or otherwise rendering harmless any contamination (the Remediation method statement) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- Development shall commence in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of

the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy DP/1 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007).

- Q) Once the works specified in the approved remediation method statement have been completed, and a Verification report submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the approved scheme.

If, during remediation and/or construction works, any contamination is identified that has not been considered in the remediation method statement, then remediation proposals for this material should be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Development shall commence in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy DP/1 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007).

- R) The proposed access shall be a minimum of 5m in width, shall be constructed from a bound material for the first 5m to prevent displacement of materials onto the highway and constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the public highway. The development shall be retained as such thereafter.

(Reason - In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- S) The proposed access be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway.

(Reason - In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- T) The proposed access be constructed using a bound material to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway.

(Reason - In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- U) Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling, a 2m wide footway shall be provided from the entrance of the site eastwards to the existing footway outside number 8 Bartlow Road, Castle Camps. Details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall include a plan showing the location, design and materials of the footway. Development shall commence in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason: To provide suitable pedestrian connectivity to the village from the site in accordance with policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.) (Reason - The application is in outline only.)

Informatives

116. a) The granting of planning permission does not constitute a permission or

licence to a developer to carry out any works within, or disturbance of, or interference with, the Public Highway, and that a separate permission must be sought from the Highway Authority for such works.

- b) The applicant should take all relevant precautions to minimise the potential for disturbance to neighbouring residents in terms of noise and dust during the construction phases of development. This should include the use of water suppression for any stone or brick cutting and advising neighbours in advance of any particularly noisy works. The granting of this planning permission does not indemnify against statutory nuisance action being taken should substantiated noise or dust complaints be received. For further information please contact the Environmental Health Service.
- c) There shall be no burning of any waste or other materials on the site, without prior consent from the Environmental Health Department to ensure nuisance is not caused to local residents.
- d) Should driven pile foundations be proposed, then before works commence, a statement of the method of construction of these foundations shall be submitted and agreed by the District Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.
- e) The Highway Authority will not be seeking to adopt this development in its present format as the internal roads serve no highway function and all of the proposed dwellings have an existing highway frontage.
- f) The Written Ministerial Statement and Planning Practice Guidance first introduced on 28/11/2014 (and later reintroduced on 19/05/2016 following legal challenge) seeks to limit the section 106 contributions secured from smallscale development (i.e. those of 10 dwellings or fewer and those where the gross floorspace does not exceed 1000 square metres). The Planning Portfolio Holder for South Cambridgeshire District Council made a decision published on 18/02/2015 that tariff style section 106 contributions should no longer be sought from developments beneath this national threshold. This decision was endorsed by Planning Committee on 4/3/2015. However, where the Council approves an outline application of 10 dwellings or fewer, any reserved matters application that is approved and which provides a combined gross floorspace of more than 1000sqm may be subject to financial contributions secured by a section 106 agreement in accordance with Development Control Policies DP/4 and SF/10.

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 Core Strategy (adopted January 2007)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)
- Planning File Ref: S/4469/17/OL

Report Author:

Michael Sexton
Telephone Number:

Senior Planning Officer
01954 713417

