

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

4 April 2018

AUTHOR/S: Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development

| | |
|--|--|
| Application Number: | S/2184/16/OL |
| Parish: | Hauxton |
| Proposal: | Outline planning permission including means of access for the demolition of structures, remediation, and redevelopment for up to 32 dwellings with new areas of open space, associated infrastructure and other associated works |
| Site address: | Former Waste Water Treatment Facility, Cambridge Road, Hauxton |
| Applicant(s): | Harrow Estates PLC |
| Recommendation: | Delegated Powers to Approve subject to prior completion of a S106 and safeguarding conditions |
| Key material considerations: | Contamination and Environmental Health; Green Belt impact and Very Special Circumstances; Clearance and Remediation of Site; Affordable Housing, Housing Mix and Viability; Design and Visual Impact; Neighbouring Amenity; Transport and Parking, Ecology |
| Committee Site Visit: | Yes |
| Departure Application: | Yes - Advertised as a departure on 13 September 2016 |
| Presenting Officer: | Dan Smith |
| Application brought to Committee because: | The application represents a significant departure from the adopted local plan. Neighboring Parish Council's also requested referral to Committee. |
| Date by which decision due: | 30 April 2018 |

Executive Summary

1. The application relates to the former Bayer CropScience waste water treatment works and surrounding land. It seeks outline planning permission for the demolition and removal of the buildings and structures which comprise the existing works, the remediation of the heavily

contaminated site (which is designated contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990) and the erection of up to 32 dwellings, new areas of open space on the wider site, associated infrastructure and other works. The application is EIA development and is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

2. The site is outside the development framework of Hauxton and within the Cambridge Green Belt. Due to the scale of buildings proposed and their position on the site the development is, on balance, considered to be inappropriate by definition, but the benefits of the scheme in terms of the remediation of the pollution on site, the visual enhancement provided by the redevelopment of the waste water treatment works, the landscape enhancements to the surrounding open space which would be publicly accessible and the ecological enhancement of the wider site are considered very special circumstances sufficient to outweigh the Green Belt and other harm.
3. The Parish Council for Hauxton is supportive of the application, while the Parish Councils of Harston and Haslingfield have objected to it. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its visual impact, the remediation of the contaminated land and the potential impacts on neighbours and local people, the impact on the public highway, trees and ecology on site and in terms of its drainage and flooding impacts. The development would not provide any affordable housing and would be comprised of only larger 4+ bedroom dwellings due to the viability implications of the cost of remediating the site. Given the significant benefits of the scheme, including the remediation, this is considered acceptable as a significantly exceptional case.
4. The application has been referred to the Planning Committee by officers because it represents a departure from adopted policies DP/7 and GB/1. Planning Committee is requested to grant delegated powers to approve the application subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement securing contributions towards local infrastructure, a remediation costs review, the specification for children's play space, arrangements for the access to and management and maintenance of the landscaping on the wider site and the establishment and meeting of a multi-agency consultative committee on remediation.

Relevant Planning History

5. S/0536/15/OL - Planning permission refused for the redevelopment of the site to provide up to 32 dwellings with new areas of open space and woodland including the countryside park and associated infrastructure.
6. S/2767/13/E1 - Scoping Opinion issued for 35 new dwellings.
7. S/2458/13/E1 - EIA Screening Opinion given (ES required) for the erection of up to 35 dwellings, with associated parking, landscaping and open space.
8. S/0397/91/F - Planning permission granted for the erection of a boiler house.
9. S/1542/87/F - Planning permission granted for the extension to waste water treatment laboratory.
10. S/1979/79/F - Planning permission granted for the erection of a store/workshop
11. S/0121/78/F - Planning permission granted for the erection of squash courts building.
12. S/0962/74/F - Planning permission granted for improvements to effluent plant and the erection of laboratory.

13. C/0446/67/O - Planning permission granted for the use of the land for treatment of trade effluent.

Policies

National

14. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

South Cambridgeshire LDF Core Strategy Policies DPD, 2007:

15. ST/1 Green Belt
ST/2 Housing Provision
ST/3 Re-Using Previously Development Land and Buildings
ST/6 Group Villages

South Cambridgeshire LDF Development Control Policies DPD, 2007:

16. DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments
DP/7 Development Frameworks
GB/1 Development in the Green Belt
GB/2 Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt
HG/1 Housing Density
HG/2 Housing Mix
HG/3 Affordable Housing
NE/1 Energy Efficiency
NE/3 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Developments
NE/6 Biodiversity
NE/8 Groundwater
NE/9 Water and Drainage Infrastructure
NE/10 Foul Drainage - Alternative Drainage Systems
NE/11 Flood Risk
NE/12 Water Conservation
NE/14 Lighting Proposals
NE/15 Noise Pollution
SF/6 Public Art and New Development
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
TR/4 Non-Motorised Modes

South Cambridgeshire LDF Site Specific Policies DPD, 2010:

17. SP/8 Bayer Cropscience, Hauxton

South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

18. District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010
Trees and Development Sites SPD - Adopted March 2010
Landscape in New Developments - Adopted March 2010
Affordable Housing SPD - Adopted March 2010
Open Space in New Developments - Adopted January 2009
Waste Management Design Guide SPD - Adopted February 2012

Draft Local Plan:

18. CC/1 Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Change

CC/3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Development
 CC/4 Sustainable Design and Construction
 CC/7 Water Quality
 CC/8 Sustainable Drainage Systems
 CC/9 Managing Flood Risk
 H/2 Bayer Cropscience, Hauxton
 H/7 Housing Density
 H/H Housing Mix
 H/9 Affordable Housing
 H/11 Residential Space Standards for Market Housing
 HQ/1 Design Principles
 HG/2 Public Art and New Development
 NH/4 Biodiversity
 NH/8 Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining the Green Belt
 NH/9 Redevelopment of Previously Developed Sites and Infilling in the Green Belt
 NH/10 Recreation in the Green Belt
 NH/14 Heritage Assets
 S/3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 S/4 Cambridge Green Belt
 S/7 Development Frameworks
 S/10 Group Villages
 SC/1 Allocation of Open Space
 SC/2 Health Impact Assessment
 SC/4 Meeting Community Needs
 SC/6 Indoor Community Facilities
 SC/7 Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments
 SC/8 Open Space Standards
 SC/10 Lighting Proposals
 SC/11 Noise Pollution
 SC/12 Contaminated Land
 SC/13 Air Quality
 TI/2 Planning for Sustainable Travel
 TI/3 Parking Provision
 TI/8 Infrastructure and new Developments
 TI/9 Education Facilities

Consultations

19. **Hauxton Parish Council** – “supports the development and new A10 access, but is still concerned about the lack of affordable housing and would like to see this somewhere in the village to offset its lack on the development”. It has requested contributions from the development to be obtained as a sports contribution towards the provision of a sports pavilion on the adjacent sports ground site.
20. **Haslingfield Parish Council** – “objects to more houses being built along the A10 corridor, due to lack of infrastructure and effect on open landscape, layout and density”.
21. **Harston Parish Council** - objects to the application and that it is “concerned at the apparent lack of affordable housing in the project and at the increase in traffic on the A10. Our traffic survey in January this year showed almost 20,000 vehicle movements on an average working day on the northern section of Harston High Street [A10]. This development will add yet more traffic to a total that is already too high”.
22. **SCDC Affordable Housing Team** - notes that the scheme does not provide policy compliant mix or affordable housing. Initially stated that the viability appraisal does not demonstrate that a compliant scheme would be achievable due to the fact that it did not acknowledge Land Remediation (tax) Relief (LRR) and that the density of the scheme is low and results in

a sub-optimal use of the site. Subsequently the team provided a viability appraisal for a viable, policy compliant scheme which would require the provision of 53 dwellings on site. The potential for such a policy compliant scheme is discussed in the planning assessment section.

23. **SCDC Urban Design Officer** - states that since previous iterations the area to be developed has been restricted to that previously occupied by the buildings associated with the chemical works and that as well as the removal of the industrial buildings within the Green Belt is welcomed. The density of the development is low, but should allow the development to respond positively to the sites open location and is therefore supported. The officer notes that the layout has been changed in response to previous comments and now includes a perimeter road which is also supported. Concern is expressed regarding the suburban layout comprising only large houses with in relatively small gardens. The officer suggests that the layout does not appear to meet the required back to back distances and would need to be amended at reserved matters stage.
24. **SCDC Landscape Officer** - states that the site can accommodate the number of dwellings proposed and that the layout has improved since the previous scheme including through the addition of a perimeter road layout. Concern is raised regarding the situation of the development within the plot and the suburban 'character' and loose structure of the layout. Suggests a better model would be to use a farmstead/hamlet approach and use of differing styles of housing types rather than just large, detached houses. Suggests the layout should link more with the sports ground. States that the landscape layout is acceptable and notes that the detail of these areas will require careful design, stating that the removal of bunding and planting would increase the visibility of the site.
25. **SCDC Ecology Officer** - states that given the previous use of the site the biodiversity impact of the development is limited, but that an opportunity for enhancement still exists where semi-natural habitat is present. There is therefore potential for impacts on protected species and natural habitats. A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) has been produced and is considered useful, however it can be improved and should not be considered the final document. The final document should be worked up and provided at detailed planning stage and this could be secured via condition. Funding for the LEMP should be secured through the section 106 agreement as should control of future development to ensure suitable safeguards and the provision of an equal area of land in terms of size and biodiversity value.
26. **SCDC Trees Officer** - states that there are no trees of merit or significant amenity value on the site.
27. **SCDC Scientific Officer** - reviewed the application including the Environmental Statement and notes that extensive communication with the applicant and its remediation consultants took place during the application process. States the revised Remediation Strategy provides a satisfactory general remediation strategy with detail to be secured via condition. The odour management which is possible on the application site would greatly reduce the potential for odour generation compared to the main Hauxton Meadows site and an Odour Management Plan should be required via condition.
28. **Public Health England** - does not object to the proposed development and notes the multi-agency approach to devising and assessing the remediation proposals. It states that it expects the Remediation Method Statement to be submitted for approval, as well as proposals for environmental monitoring of emissions, an Odour Management Plan, a risk assessment of remediation activities on off site receptors, a verification report, post remediation qualitative risk assessment in respect of human health and community engagement to address local concerns regarding remediation.

29. **Environment Agency** - notes concerns and risks associated with contamination of controlled waters, amenity issues caused by noise, dust and odour and flood risk, but does not object to the granting of permission subject to conditions requiring the submission of a risk assessment and remediation method statement to address the contamination of the site, submission of a Materials Management plan, submission of a surface water drainage and pollution prevention scheme, restrictions on piling and investigative boreholes using penetrative methods and compliance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment. It also comments on the need for permits relating to discharge of contaminated waters, odour management, foul sewerage, dewatering, vehicle wash water disposal, oil and chemical storage and new outfalls.
30. **SCDC Environmental Health Officer** - does not object in principle to the proposed development. Conditions are recommended in respect of noise and vibration during construction, noise insulation and artificial lighting.
31. **SCDC Air Quality Consultant** - does not object to the application stating that the odours generated during remediation by the releasing of volatile organic compounds are considered under separate regulatory mechanisms as an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency is in place and the remediation works are being regulated by SCDC and Public Health England. With respect to the construction and operational phases conditions are requested in respect of electric vehicle charging points and the use of construction vehicles and plant which comply with European Emissions standards.
32. **SCDC Waste Management Team** - notes that the detailed scheme will need to address waste collection, waste storage containers, and street cleansing. These matters could be controlled by condition given the outline nature of the proposal.
33. **Lead Local Flood Authority** - initially issued a holding objection based on a lack of drainage information, however it was subsequently provided with further detailed drainage information and has since removed its objection subject to a condition relating to the submission of a SuDS based surface water drainage scheme being applied to any permission.
34. **Anglian Water** - notes it has no assets within the site. It states there is capacity within the foul sewerage network and wastewater treatment facility to accommodate the development. It notes that consents may be required if surface, foul or trade effluent disposal requires connection to its assets.
35. **Local Highways Authority** - The Local Highways Authority initially responded to consultation stating that the application did not contain sufficient information to allow it to take a view on the potential highways impacts. Meetings were held between the LHA and the applicant's transport consultants and additional information was provided to the LHA. Having considered that information, the LHA recommended refusal of the application on the grounds that the requirement for an additional set of lights on the junction with the A10 would be likely to have a severe impact on the capacity of the highway network and that the pedestrian and cycle route across the A10 was convoluted.
36. Further information and junction modelling was subsequently provided by the applicant which the LHA formally assessed. On the basis of that information, the LHA has removed its objection to the scheme and has concluded that while the levels of queuing on the northbound side of the A10 would increase and the levels of waiting time on the minor arms of the A10 junction would be relatively long, the queues would not cause a highway safety issue and it therefore removed its objection, subject to conditions requiring the implementation of the works to the junction prior to first occupation, the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan, the submission of a programme of works and the provision of travel information to the occupants of the new dwellings.

37. The LHA also stated its view that in highway safety terms there was no scope to increase the number of dwellings on site above 32.
38. **County Council Education Team** - states demand for education generated by the proposed scheme would be 10 early years places (including 5 with free provision), 12 primary school places and 8 secondary school places. No contribution is sought for early years provision as there is sufficient capacity locally to accommodate the demand. £75,889 is requested towards the expansion of Hauxton Primary School as a contribution towards the necessary expansion of the school to accommodate additional demand. No contribution is sought for secondary school provision as there is sufficient capacity at Melbourn Village College. A contribution of £2,313 is sought towards additional provision of mobile library services and a contribution of £268 is sought towards Thriplow Recycling Centre, however both of these facilities have 'pooled out' in terms of the s106 funding which they have received and no further contributions can be required towards them. A Monitoring Fee of £650 is sought towards the monitoring of the s106 agreement by County Council officers, however monitoring fees cannot be sought towards the monitoring of s106 obligations which are solely comprised of financial contributions.
39. **County Archaeologist** - notes that its records indicate that the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential and extensive cropmarks in each direction indicate that the landscape was intensively farmed and settled from at least the Late Prehistoric period (Historic Environment Record reference MCB10005, MCB11474, MCB10730, MCB11466, MCB11473). In addition, an archaeological excavation to the east revealed Prehistoric and Roman occupation (MCB6172), while to the north east is evidence of Bronze Age occupation (MCB6024) and Roman burials (MCB6025). However, due to the extent of disturbance caused by the lagoons present in the 1950's, 1960's and 2000's, there is no objection to the proposed development nor requirements for further archaeological investigation.
40. **Cambridge Past, Present and Future** - recommends refusal. Although it supports the demolition of the existing structures, it states that the very special circumstances for the redevelopment are insufficient, the development is not sustainable development, the impact of the proposed development on the Green Belt and countryside and its view that the existing tree and hedge screening cannot be relied upon.

Representations

41. The following representations have been received in respect of the proposed development:
42. Owner/occupier of 87 Church Road, Hauxton raises concern regarding the proposed remediation work and its impact on air quality particularly due to health problems during the remediation of the main Bayer Cropscience site at Hauxton.
43. Owner/occupiers of The Old Rectory, Harlton raise concern regarding the impact of remediation work and its impact on air quality. Citing issues including health problems and impact on businesses during the remediation of the main Bayer Cropscience site at Hauxton. Request safer method of remediation with more stringent monitoring to prevent similar problems to those experienced previously. Suggest site should not be redeveloped and instead tarmacked over and used as a park and ride site.
44. Owner/occupier of 5 Mill Road, Great Gransden raises concerns regarding the level of contamination present on the site and the potential for contamination to the River Cam.

Site and Proposal

The Site

45. The application site is located outside of the village framework of Hauxton and in the Cambridge Green Belt. The site is located to the west of the A10 on land opposite the Hauxton Meadows development which occupies the former Bayer CropScience site. It is accessed off the A10 with a section of the site running alongside the access while the main element of the site is separated from the A10 by the playing fields immediately to the east. The northern portion of the application site falls within a Flood Zone 3 area. A public bridleway (Harston 116/1) runs to the south of the site in an east-west direction connecting Hauxton and Harston to Haslingfield to the west. The river Cam runs close to the northern boundary of the application site. The nearest neighbouring properties are those immediately to the south of the site fronting the A10 and those on the Hauxton Meadows site opposite.
46. The central portion of the application site is a now redundant Waste Water Treatment facility associated with the former Bayer CropScience site. That portion of the site currently houses buildings and structures associated with that former use including silos, tanks and other plant as well as a redundant recreation building containing squash courts. Lagoons have also previously been dug on the site and since filled in and a c-shaped bund encloses the site on its western side.
47. The surrounding land which is within the application site is mostly open land with some tree planting and is relatively open to the countryside beyond. The section of the site which runs along the southern side of the access road is well treed adjacent to the A10 and is more open to the rear where there is a disused bowls green. The site access road is taken from a junction with the A10 which is part of the same junction now used to access the Hauxton Meadows development. Due to the contaminative use of the waste water treatment works in association with the Bayer CropScience site, the application site is designated as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and is therefore EIA development. An Environmental Statement has been submitted with the application.

The Proposal

48. The application seeks outline planning permission for the demolition and removal of existing buildings and structures from the site, remediation of contaminated land and the redevelopment of the central part of the site for up to 32 dwellings, with new areas of landscaped open space on the wider site including woodland, meadow and a natural playground. Associated works and development including the upgrading of the main access are also proposed. The application is for outline permission with details of access provided at this stage, but with the layout, scale and appearance of the development and the landscaping proposals reserved for future consideration. The application includes a parameter plan for the site which details the areas for development and landscaping and the quantum of development. A Design Code has also been submitted which provides guiding principles for the residential and landscape elements.

Planning Assessment

49. The proposed development has been assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy Guidance and the local planning policies listed above.

Policy background

50. The Development Plan currently consists of the Core Strategy DPD (adopted January 2007), Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007) and Site Specific Policies DPD (adopted January 2010). The application site is referred to in the

supporting text of policy SP/8 of the Site Specific Policies DPD and draft policy H/2 which relate to the main Bayer CropScience site.

51. The National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and the Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2013) are material planning considerations in decision taking.
52. The DPDs referred to in the above section were adopted prior to the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework. The NPPF states that planning law requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material consideration. Para 211 of the NPPF states “For the purposes of decision-taking the policies in the Local Plan should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted prior to the publication of this framework.” The NPPF also sets out how to determine the amount of weight that should be attached to policies. Para 215 states “Due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that they may be given)”
53. LDF policy GB/1 states that there is a presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. It defines inappropriate development as development defined as such within PPG2, which was previously the national guidance on Green Belts. That guidance has since been replaced by the NPPF, which allows for the redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt, providing development does not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt or impact the reasons for including the land in the Green Belt. Where development would have a greater impact on openness or on the reasons for including land within the Green Belt, the NPPF requires that such development only be approved where very special circumstances which would clearly outweigh the overall harm of the development exist.
54. The Site Specific Policies DPD policy SP/8 and Proposed Submission Local Plan policy H/2 relate to the main Bayer CropScience site, however the supporting text for the policies refers to the current application site stating that *“proposals for the redevelopment of the recreation buildings and waste water treatment facility on the western side of the A10 will be considered in the context of proposals for appropriate development within the Green Belt. As a planning objective it would be highly desirable to secure the removal of the incongruous industrial structures on the western part of the site. Particular consideration should be given to proposals that remove these structures and improve the visual appearance of the Green Belt.”*

Appropriateness of the Development within the Green Belt

55. Significant weight is given to the Green Belt location of this site and to Section 9 of the NPPF that relates to the Green Belt. Paragraph 87 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt, however paragraph 89 states that the construction of new buildings should not be considered inappropriate where it consists of the complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. The impact of the proposed development on the purpose of including the land within the Green Belt and on its openness have therefore been assessed.

Purposes of the Green Belt

56. Paragraph 80 of the NPPF states that Green Belt land serves five purposes: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
57. The proposed development has been assessed in respect of these five purposes. The central portion of the site is previously developed with sizeable buildings and structures enclosed by an earth bund. This element of the site is the area which would be development with housing. The remainder of the site would be set aside for landscaping as publicly accessible open space. It is not considered that the redevelopment of the site would impinge on the purposes of checking unrestricted sprawl, preventing the merging of towns, safeguarding the countryside or protection the setting and character of towns. It is considered that it would assist in the recycling of derelict land. As such, the proposed development is considered to be compatible with the purposes of including the land within the Green Belt.

Impact on the openness of the Green Belt

58. The application seeks to demonstrate that the development would not impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It makes a comparison of the proposed quantum of development with the existing industrial buildings and structures on site. It states that the existing buildings and structures on site total 35,500 m³ whereas the residential development would only total approximately 33,000 m³. It also states that the proposed development would not result in a significant change to openness from key viewpoints and that the removal of bunding and the unsightly industrial structures would benefit the openness of the site by allowing landscaping to permeate the site.
59. However, officers are not persuaded that the proposed development would not have a greater impact on openness than the existing development. Firstly, the methodology used for the calculation of the existing structures includes elements such as the areas under elevated pipework, areas enclosed by walling and the volume of the existing bund and it is not clear that these elements have a significant impact on the level of openness of the site commensurate with a similar amount of built development. Furthermore, a significant portion of the western side of the brownfield part of the site, within the landscape bund does not contain any significant built development. This area would be occupied by dwellings as part of the proposed development and would result in structures approximately 9 metres in height extending further to the west of the site than the existing built development. While it is accepted that the density of proposed development across the site would be somewhat comparable with the existing and that there would be landscaped areas (gardens and internal streets) within the site which would be more open than at present, the proposed development would extend further to the edges of the site and be taller than much of the existing development which would increase the perception of built development across the site.
60. While there are, as detailed below, considered to be significant benefits to the redevelopment of the site, not least a significant improvement to the visual amenity of the land within the Green Belt, in terms of the test of paragraph 89, which is restricted to an assessment of openness, it is considered that the proposed development would, on balance, result in a loss of openness and should therefore be considered 'inappropriate development' within the Green Belt. As per Paragraph 87, such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

61. Paragraph 88 of the NPPF states that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt and that 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. It is therefore necessary to first assess whether any 'other harm' would result from the development and then whether there are other considerations which would clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, sufficient to be considered very special circumstances.

Principle

Development outside Development Framework

62. The development would not normally be considered acceptable in principle in this location as the application site lies outside of any development framework of in the countryside. Policy DP/7 states that outside of development frameworks only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted.
63. However, the planning policies relating to the wider Bayer CropScience site (current Local Development Framework Site Specific policy SP/8 and draft Local Plan policy H/2) make reference to the removal of the incongruous industrial structures on the western part of the site as being highly desirable and that particular consideration should be given to proposals that remove these structures and improve the visual appearance of the Green Belt. On that basis, while the site is outside of the development framework for Hauxton, the strong imperative for the redevelopment of the site is considered to be a material planning consideration in this case.
64. The development would also require and bring about the decontamination of the site which is currently designated as a Part IIA land under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Land is designated as Part IIA land where it is by reason of substances in, on or under the land in a condition where either significant harm is being caused or there is a significant possibility of such harm being caused or where significant pollution of controlled waters is being caused, or there is a significant possibility of such pollution being caused. The remediation of this site is also considered to be a material planning consideration in this case which should be given significant weight as it would bring about the remediation of the polluted site through development and to a level sufficient to make it suitable for residential occupation.
65. Furthermore, the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF - it currently has 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). As a result, the Council's housing supply policies should not be considered up-to-date as per paragraph 49 of the NPPF. The recent Hopkins Homes Supreme Court judgement has re-emphasised that where relevant policies are out of date, the 'tilted balance' within paragraph 14 of the NPPF will apply meaning that permission should be granted "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.
66. A balancing exercise needs therefore 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 benefit which a proposal brings in terms of delivery of new homes. It is only when the conflict with other development plan policies including policy DP/7, which seek to direct development to the most sustainable locations, is so great in the context of a particular application as to “significantly and demonstrably outweigh” the benefit of the proposal in terms of delivery of new homes, that planning permission should be refused. This approach reflects the decision of the Supreme Court.

67. The benefits from the development are the provision of up to an additional 32 dwellings towards housing land supply, additional employment created during construction and a greater use of local services and facilities resulting from occupation. The redevelopment of the site would also result in the removal of the incongruous existing buildings and structures from the site and, crucially, allow the remediation of the significant level of contamination of the industrial site which has been designated as Part IIA contaminated land. These site-specific benefits of the redevelopment are considered to weigh heavily in terms of the balance of the benefits versus adverse impacts. The potential adverse impacts of the development would be the location of the site outside the village framework defined by policy DP/7, any harm to the Green Belt or character and appearance of the area, the lack of a mix of dwelling sizes and affordable housing provision and any harm caused as a respect of the detailed impacts of the development considered below.
68. The redevelopment of the site and removal of the existing structures and the opportunity and incentive to remediate the significant contamination of the site are considered to be significant benefits of the scheme. The provision of up to 32 new dwellings towards the Council’s housing shortfall is considered to be a moderate benefit and these benefits have been given due weight in the consideration of the ‘tilted balance’. The additional benefits of employment created during construction and greater use of local services and facilities have also been afforded some weight. Overall, the extent of the benefit of the proposed development is considered to be high.
69. While outside of the existing development framework of Hauxton, the site is relatively close to the existing Hauxton Meadows development and would have footpath access to the facilities which will be located on that site as well as to those in the villages of Hauxton and Harston. There is also footpath and cycle path access to the Trumpington Park and Ride site giving sustainable transport options for travel into Cambridge and the wider area, as well as local bus stops at the Hauxton Meadows site which provides a bus link to the Park and Ride site. The scheme would provide public access to areas of open space within the wider development site as well as play space and would contribute towards the provision of additional community and sports facilities in the immediate locality. These aspects of the development are all considered beneficial in terms of the economic, social and environmental elements of sustainability.
70. Due to the high cost of remediating the site, discussed in more detail below, the scheme would not provide any affordable housing and would be comprised of only larger dwellings, which would impact on the social element of the sustainability of the development. It would also result in some additional impact on the highway network, albeit within acceptable limits and would, on balance, result in some loss of openness within the Green Belt, notwithstanding the potential visual benefits of the removal of the existing structures. These aspects of the development are considered to be adverse impacts in terms of the sustainability of the site, however, when weighed against the significant benefits of the redevelopment, as detailed below, it is not considered that they would “significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of granting planning permission” and the development is therefore considered to be sustainable on that basis.

Affordable housing and housing mix and the impact of high remediation costs on viability

71. The application identifies significant costs associated with the remediation of the site to both prevent it from continuing to pollute groundwater in the area and also to make the site safe for residential development. Approximately £4.9 million has been set aside for on-site environmental works, including approximately £3.75 million for demolition and remediation works on the development site and £730,000 for in situ treatment of the wider contamination and groundwater management. These costs have been provided by the contractor which remediated the main Bayer CropScience site and the Council's contamination consultant has considered them reasonable given the level of contamination present on the application site.
72. The high cost of remediation of the site has had a significant impact on the viability of the development of the site such that the applicant is not proposing to provide any affordable dwellings on site and is proposing a scheme comprised of large 4+ bedroom dwellings. The scheme therefore does not comply with the Local Development Framework policies which seek 40% or more affordable housing (HG/3) and a mix of sizes of dwelling tilted towards the provision of a larger proportion of smaller dwellings (HG/2). However, both policies state that economic viability will be considered in the application of the policies, indeed policy HG/3 states that account will be taken of any particular costs associated with the development including site remediation.
73. Given the importance of the provision of affordable housing and a balanced mix of housing, the Council's viability consultant has considered the submitted viability appraisal. The costs associated with development and the expected gross development value of the site and developers profit contained within the submitted viability assessment have been considered reasonable. The viability assessment identifies that, due to the high remediation costs, there is a negative residual value and the provision of either affordable housing or a mix of smaller dwellings would therefore not be viable. Officers have sought advice on the inclusion of the Land Remediation (tax) Relief (LRR) which might be available to developers and whether this could be included within the viability appraisal to provide more headroom in terms of viability to allow provision of affordable housing, however the advice is that LRR should not be included.
74. Officers have considered whether a denser residential development of more dwellings which would allow a policy compliant mix of sizes and a 40% provision of affordable housing would be achievable on the site. Such a scheme would need to provide 53 dwellings in order to provide both 40% affordable housing and a policy compliant mix. However, the Local Highways Authority has explicitly stated that any further additional dwellings on the site would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and it would therefore not support the provision of a larger scheme.
75. While the remediation costs are considered to be acceptable in terms of the likely level extent of contamination on site, the final level of remediation would be specified once a full Remediation Method Statement (RMS) has been designed based on further site investigation. There is therefore the potential that remediation costs may change depending on the final specification of the RMS. Officers have therefore sought agreement from the applicant that a review of the remediation costs would be required as part of the section 106 agreement and that should remediation costs decrease and provide a saving to the point that there is a positive residual value in the site, the developer would provide 100% of that saving towards an offsite contribution to affordable housing provision locally.

76. It is therefore considered that the site specific circumstances are such that the provision of affordable housing and a policy compliant mix are not viable in this case based on the remediation costs as currently predicted, but that given the significant benefits of redevelopment and remediation of the site, this should not be an impediment to granting permission for the proposed development.

Design and Impact on visual amenity

77. The submitted parameter plan indicates the area within which the residential element would be located which is broadly that area which is currently the developed area of the waste water treatment works including its landscaped bund. The surrounding area would be given over to landscaped public open space including tree planting. The parameter plan indicates that dwellings would be up to two and a half storeys with a maximum of height of 9.3 metres (with a 10% tolerance). The need to cap the land remediated for residential development means that the dwellings would sit on a slightly raised plateau compared to the existing established land levels. The residential development would be surrounded by a landscape buffer which would be low density planting allowing a level of visual permeability and the boundary of the leading into the informal open space which would be planted with clusters of trees. The boundary of the site would have its existing planting retained and supplemented along the western boundary of the site.
78. The application also includes a Design Code which sets out further guidance on the hierarchy and character of the streets, the general approach to layout and building frontages and the building typology. The general approach to the residential development has generally been supported by officers, who have noted that the design has been improved since previous iterations and is considered to represent a good starting point and contains reasonable guiding principles for the detailed development of the scheme at reserved matters stage.
79. Some concern has been expressed by urban design and landscape officers regarding the loose 'suburban' character of the layout which comprises only large houses and suggestions have been made that a farmstead type approach could be used which would better suit the location of the site. Those concerns are acknowledged and serious consideration has been given to the suggestions regarding the layout and the appropriateness of the character that would be created by the development. While it is accepted that the development would likely have a somewhat suburban character with large houses set loosely around the internal streets, it is not considered that this would result in any significant harm to the visual amenity of the area. The starting point for that consideration is the character of the site at present which is a derelict industrial water treatment works and it is considered that the removal of the existing structures and their replacement with a scheme that complies with the outline parameters and Design Code would bring about significantly improved visual amenity.
80. Furthermore the landscaped surroundings would soften the impact of the residential development on site on the surrounding area and bring about significant public benefit. The provision of only large dwellings is dictated by the need to ensure sufficient return from the site that the necessary and costly remediation works can take place and this fact limits the scope of the the development to take alternative approaches to its overall layout and design, such as the suggestion for a farmstead type approach. There remains the flexibility to address detailed design concerns at reserved matters stage and on that basis, it is considered that the impact of the proposed development on the visual amenity and character of the area is acceptable.
81. The landscaping of the wider site would result in the removal of the incongruous bands of existing conifer trees and would bring about an enhancement of the landscaping on site. The approach to landscaping has been supported by the Council's Landscapes Officer States while noting that the detail of these areas will require careful design. The supplementary planting, particularly on the western boundary site would soften the appearance of the

residential development which would extend further to the west of the site than the majority of the existing large structures. Again, the removal of the existing waste water treatment plant would provide significant landscape benefits which would enhance the character of the area and the Green Belt.

82. The design of the proposed development, insofar as it is prescribed by the parameter plan and Design Code at this outline stage, is considered to be acceptable and is therefore in accordance with policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3 and GB/2.

Community facilities

83. The application proposes the onsite provision of public open space and play space. The extent of this provision would be determined based on the finalised housing numbers, however the submitted design coding and indicative identifies the areas where the provision would be made with the majority of the landscaped area around the perimeter of the site being given over to public open space and the provision of a nature playground on the southern side of the site. As detailed within the design and visual amenity considerations above, the provision of a significant amount of public open space is one of the significant benefits of the scheme. The detailed layout for these elements would be required by condition to come forward at reserved matters stage and the management and maintenance agreements and the specification for the play area would be the subject of planning obligations. On that basis, the onsite provision of public open space and play space is considered to be acceptable.
84. The proposed development would not seek to address the requirements for the provision of indoor community facilities and sports facilities on site and the additional demand for those facilities from the development would therefore need to be made in the form of contributions towards offsite provision. While the final contributions would be determined by the housing numbers and mix, a scheme for 32 4-bedroom dwellings would result in contributions of £49,609 towards sports facilities and £22,523 towards indoor community space. The Parish Council has indicated that it would use these contributions to help fund the pavilion on the adjacent sports field. The Parish Council has secured planning permission for the pavilion but is still seeking funding for its development. Such contributions would be secured via a planning obligation within the section 106 agreement.
85. On that basis the application is considered to be acceptable in terms of its provision for community facilities, in accordance with policies SF/10 and SF/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework.

Education provision

86. The proposed development has the potential to impact on education and lifelong due the creation of additional households. Based on County Council guidance, the proposed development is expected to generate a net increase in demand of 10 early years places, 12 primary school places and 8 secondary school places. County Council education officers have confirmed that there is enough capacity in the area to accommodate the early years demand and the secondary school demand and it does not seek contributions towards those elements.
87. The primary school demand would contribute to the need for additional capacity at Hauxton Primary School for which a classroom and hall expansion project was identified to accommodate the additional places from this and other development schemes locally. The scheme has already been completed and was largely funded by other development in the locality however a shortfall of £75,889 remained which was not met by other development. On the basis that the scheme would place additional demand on the school which can only be accommodated due to the school expansion, it is considered necessary to require the

contribution of £75,889 towards education provision via a planning obligation within a section 106 agreement. This provision would adequately address the impact of the development on education provision.

88. The development would also increase demand on library facilities, namely the mobile library which serves Hauxton. This could be mitigated by the provision of additional resources through contributions of approximately £29 per projected occupant which would be based on the finalised housing numbers. This would be an obligation in the section 106 agreement and would adequately provide for the additional demands the development would place on library provision.

Neighbouring amenity

89. The impact of the proposed development on neighbours in terms of the remediation of the site has been detailed above.
90. In terms of the other potential impacts on residential amenity, the central part of the application site is relatively distant from neighbouring dwellings and it is not considered that the proposed dwellings would have any significant impact on the amenity of occupants of neighbouring dwellings in terms of either the physical impact of the buildings or the noise from the residential use of the site. The vehicle traffic along the existing access road would increase but similarly, given the separation of the access from neighbouring dwellings, it is not considered that this would cause significant harm, to the amenity of occupants of those dwellings.
91. The public use of the areas of proposed landscaped areas of the wider site would not have any significant impact on neighbouring amenity given the separation of these areas from the dwellings and their gardens.
92. On that basis the proposed development accords with policies DP/3 and NE/15 of the adopted Local Development Framework.

Contaminated Land and Remediation

93. The site is heavily polluted due to its former use as a waste water treatment plant for the former Bayer CropScience site. It is designated as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.
94. The successful remediation of the site is therefore considered to be both a significant priority and a significant benefit of the proposed development. The Council's Scientific Officer, alongside officers from Public Health England and the Environment Agency, has undertaken extensive consultation with the applicant's contamination specialists regarding the remediation of the site and this has resulted in revisions to the relevant technical documents. On that basis, the Council, Public Health England and the Environment agency are satisfied with the overall approach to the remediation and development of the site proposed. The application includes a general strategy for remediation following an options appraisal to assess the most appropriate approach to remediating this site which is considered acceptable, however the full technical details and specification would be provided within a full Remediation Method Statement which would be produced once final site layout details are established following the granting of planning permission for the development. The requirement for a full Remediation Method Statement to be submitted and approved would therefore be secured by condition.
95. The remediation of the land would break the pollutant linkages to the groundwater, which would halt the continued spread of the contamination plume which has to date spread out of the site to the north and east to the River Cam. Such remediation and breaking of pollutant linkages would be sufficient to address the Part IIA designation of the land. However, as the

site is being redeveloped for housing, remediation to be carried out to a higher level to ensure that the site was fit for such a sensitive end use. Were housing not being provided on the site, this additional remediation would not be required in order to remove the Part IIA designation. The residential redevelopment of the scheme, therefore brings about significant additional benefits in terms of remediation of the site.

96. The submitted documents include risk assessments which provide remedial targets for the protection of both human health and controlled waters. Whilst the currently proposed targets have been agreed during the Council's consultation with the applicant, such risk assessments would be subject to review and change to allow the incorporation of site specific data as it becomes available. Any changes to proposed targets would then be fully justified and supported with the relevant risk assessments. A final post remediation Human Health Risk Assessment would be produced on completion of site works to incorporate all of the post remediation site/ground conditions. A condition applied to any planning permission would ensure that this information is submitted to the Local Planning Authority as part of the Verification Report documents and agreed prior to construction of the proposed dwellings.
97. During remediation of the Main site to the east of the A10, odour generated from the remediation works was a significant issue for local residents. While the current application site is further removed from the village itself than the main site, there are residential properties nearby and concern has been expressed by some residents regarding the potential for similar impacts during the remediation of the application site. Though the approach for the remediation of the water treatment plant is similar to that previously used on the main site and will also entail excavation and treatment of soils, the ground conditions for this site are such that an initial pre-treatment of the most odorous soils is feasible. Therefore, the Remediation Strategy incorporates in-situ vacuum extraction of soils prior to excavation. This should greatly reduce the potential for odour generation and limit the impact of the remediation on neighbouring residents. Nonetheless, an Odour Management Plan detailing further odour mitigation measures during works is considered necessary and would need to be produced and submitted for approval by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of works. This requirement would be addressed through a condition.
98. Furthermore, to address public concerns regarding the development, it is considered necessary to produce and implement a communications strategy to inform local people about the works which are being undertaken and provide information and possibly controlled access to the site to help allay concerns regarding the impact of the works.
99. Given the nature of the site and the works, statutory consultees have recommended a suite of conditions to ensure the adequate remediation of the site and the protection of human health and controlled waters during remediation and development stages. Those conditions relate to the submission of a full Remediation Method Statement, a Materials Management plan, a surface water drainage and pollution prevention scheme, proposals for environmental monitoring of emissions, an Odour Management Plan, a risk assessment of remediation activities on off site receptors. Restrictions on piling and investigative boreholes using penetrative methods are also required as is a condition requiring compliance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment. The submission of a verification report and post remediation qualitative risk assessment and a community engagement to address local concerns regarding remediation would also be required by condition.
100. On the basis of the above, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of the level of remediation proposed and the impact of it being carried out, in accordance with policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3, NE/6, NE/8, and NE/16.

Environmental health

101. In addition to the potential impacts of the remediation of the site, identified above, the impact of the construction and occupation phases of the development have been considered in

terms of their potential impacts. Given the separation of the developable site from the neighbouring properties, it is considered unlikely that they would suffer from a significant level of noise disruption from construction activities, however in order to ensure an acceptable impact during construction it is considered necessary to control construction hours and delivery hours as well as a requirement that should piled foundations be proposed, a piling method statement is submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The hours for deliveries and construction would be required as part of an overall Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for the site.

102. The demolition and construction phases have the potential to result in airborne dust which could impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has recommended a condition requiring a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust as well as a condition requiring the submission of a comprehensive construction programme. It is considered that both of these measures are required, but that they should form part of the CEMP referred to above.
103. The noise sensitivity of the proposed dwellings and their amenity areas has also been considered, however given the separation of the site from the A10 and the significant distance between the site and the M11 to the north, it is not considered that the residential development would be likely to suffer from noise disturbance once occupied. The Council's Environmental Health Officer recommends an informative is applied to any permission regarding the standards of insulation required for new residential properties.
104. The proposed development would likely require street lighting on the residential element of the site which would have the potential to impact on both the amenity of the area and the amenity of existing and proposed residential dwellings. It is considered that a lighting scheme which would have an acceptable impact on the surroundings could be achieved, however given the potential for light spillage and impact on residential amenity, it is considered necessary to apply a condition requiring the submission of an artificial lighting scheme prior to the commencement of residential development.
105. Further to the above discussion in respect of the potential impacts during the remediation phase, the Council's Air Quality Officer has no objection to the proposed development in terms of the impact of the construction and occupation phase of the development on air quality. The Officer requests details of electric vehicle charging infrastructure prior to commencement and the use of low emissions construction vehicles to reduce the impact of the development on air quality in the area during construction and occupation. However, while these elements would be beneficial to the scheme, they are not considered necessary to make it acceptable and therefore informatives would be applied referring to those matters rather than conditions.
106. On the basis of the above, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on environmental health in accordance with policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3, NE/14, NE/15 and NE/16 of the adopted Local Development Framework.

Highway safety and parking

Highway Safety

107. The site is currently accessed off the A10 via an access road which serves both the application site and the adjacent sports ground. The access meets the A10 directly opposite the new junction for the Hauxton Meadows site. The junction is signalised on both directions on the A10 and on the Hauxton Meadows arm, but not on the arm providing access to the site. The proposed development would result in additional vehicle movements to the site over and above those which occur for its current use and to mitigate the impact of those additional movements the application includes proposals to upgrade the arm serving the application

site including the provision of traffic signals which would be integrated with the timings of the existing traffic signals creating a signalised crossroads junction.

108. The Local Highways Authority initially objected to the application on the basis that signalling the access on the A10 and its incorporation into the timings of the existing junction would cause significant additional queuing on the A10 in morning peak hours. It also expressed concern regarding the pedestrian and cycle crossings from the Hauxton Meadows site to the sports field becoming more complex as a result of the signalling of the access and the potential for this to lead to pedestrians and cyclists crossing on a desire line rather than using the signalised crossings.
109. Further modelling was carried out by both the applicant and the LHA including on the potential for revised timings on the traffic signals. On the basis of that modelling, the LHA removed its objection on the basis of the impact on queuing, judging that while the development and the associated signalling of the access would increase queuing on the northbound carriageway in the am peak, it would not result in a safety issue. It noted that this would require reprogramming of the timings of the existing junction and, due to the need to protect the flow of vehicles along the A10 this might result in the side roads experiencing relatively long waiting times. The LHA confirmed that there were no outstanding highway safety concerns regarding the proposed development subject to conditions requiring the carrying out of all highways works prior to first occupation of the development, the provision of a Construction Traffic Management Plan prior to commencement, the agreement of a programme of works prior to the commencement of any works and the provision of welcome packs for occupants of the dwellings detailing sustainable travel options and providing travel vouchers. These matters would be secured by planning conditions.
110. On that basis, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on highway safety in accordance with policy DP/1 of the adopted Local Development Framework.

Vehicle Parking

111. Given the outline nature of the application, detailed car parking proposals are not provided, however the application confirms they would be consistent with the Council's adopted standards. As a result of the relatively large plots provided for the dwellings, on plot parking in garages and driveways for both residents and visitors would be possible. Although the detailed parking arrangements are a matter which would ultimately be determined at reserved matters stage, it is considered that adequate parking provision for the dwellings can be accommodated on site and the proposed development is therefore acceptable in that regard.

Cycle Parking

112. The application confirms that covered, secure cycle parking storage would be made for at least one bicycle per dwelling. This is consistent with the requirements of the Council's adopted cycle parking standards and would be secured by condition.
113. On the basis of the above, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its vehicle and cycle parking provision and its impact on highway safety in accordance with adopted policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3, TR/1 and TR/2.

Fire servicing, waste collection and bin storage

114. The Fire Service has not commented on the proposals, however the site would be accessible by fire tenders along the access road. The detailed layout for the housing element of the development would not be determined until reserved matters stage, however there is no obvious impediment to provided suitable access to properties within the site and subject to

the provision of fire hydrants which could be secured by condition, it is considered that the principle of development is acceptable in terms of fire safety. Similarly, access for waste collection vehicles would be possible and the Council's Waste Management team has no objection to the proposal provided the detailed detailed scheme addresses waste collection, waste storage containers, and street cleansing. Again these matters could be controlled by condition given the outline nature of the proposal. On plot bin storage would be possible and details of these arrangements would be conditioned to come forwarded at reserved matters stage. The provision of waste receptacles for the dwellings would be addressed via a planning obligation within the s106 agreement at a rate of £73.50 per dwelling.

115. On that basis, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of fire servicing and provision for waste collection in accordance with policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework.

Ecology and Trees

116. Given the previous use of the site as a waste water treatment works, the potential for ecological impact is relatively limited on the element of the site identified for housing, although there is potential for enhancement on that element of the site and on the wider site on which the public open space would be created. Surveys for badgers, otters, voles, bats, birds, newts and other reptiles have been carried out and submitted as part of the Environmental Statement and a draft Landscape and Ecological Management Plan has been submitted with the application.
117. The Council's Ecology Officer assessed the submitted surveys and initially requested further information in respect of the identified ecological interests on the site including badger setts, bat roost and bird roosts including the presence of Marsh Tits and Barn Owls in the survey. Further information has been provided on those matters by the applicant. The badger setts are outside of the area currently identified for remediation and would be unlikely to be impacted by the proposed redevelopment however it has committed to providing mitigation for any impact on those setts via the licensing process should it become necessary. Emergence surveys have identified one building on site as a potential bat feeding roost which would need to be removed under licence prior to demolition. The applicant has committed to re-providing and enhancing bat roosting facilities within the site as part of the redevelopment. No roosts for Barn Owls were found on the site and the Marsh Tit was recorded once at the northern boundary of the site in an area which is not subject to the remediation proposals. Nonetheless, the applicant has committed to providing Barn Owl boxes and habitat enhancements for breeding birds as part of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan for the site.
118. In terms of habitat, as the full extent of the area required to be remediated is not yet known at this stage, the applicant accepts that the extent of grassland habitat affected by the development cannot currently be quantified. However, the submitted ecological information commits to reinstating and enhancing that grassland habitat and vegetation, which is considered to be adequate mitigation. Hedgerow retention and reinforcement to the northern and western boundaries is considered necessary as is positive management of scrub habitats. The proposed linear orchard is welcomed as a biodiversity resource as is the enhancement of the parcel of land on the north side of the river Cam which is in the applicant's ownership. While all these matters are considered acceptable in principle, further detail is required prior to the commencement of development in the form of an updated LEMP.
119. The above mitigation and enhancement measures would therefore be secured by condition as part of the requirement for the submission and implementation of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. The licensing requirements (covered by separate legislation) relating to the protected species on site would be referred to in an informative. On that basis,

the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the ecological interests of the site in accordance with adopted policy NE/6.

120. The proposed development would not result in the loss of any important trees from the site although some existing conifer trees would be removed. Areas of tree and hedge planting would be undertaken as part of the landscaping of the proposed development which is considered to be beneficial in terms of the level of tree planting on site.
121. On that basis the proposed development accords with policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework.

Drainage and flooding

122. The site is largely located within Flood Zone 1 and all the area identified for residential development is within that lowest risk zone. A small area of the site at the northern boundary is located within the higher risk Flood Zones 2 and 3. A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted with the application and further drainage information has been provided at the request of the Lead Local Flood Authority. This sets out the provisions for ensuring that the dwellings would not be at risk of flooding by ensuring that finished floor levels are raised a minimum of 600mm above the projected 1 in 100 year flood levels.
123. The potential impact of the development on flood risk from surface water flooding would be mitigated by limiting the run-off water from the site to greenfield levels through the use of drainage swales and permeable paving. This would ensure that the development had no additional impact on the level of flooding in the area and the approach has been supported by the Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer, subject to conditions relating to the provision of a detailed surface water drainage schemes, pollution prevention measures and the carrying out of development in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.
124. There is capacity within the foul drainage system locally to incorporate the demands from the proposed development and the proposed development is therefore considered acceptable subject to a condition requiring the provision of a detailed surface water drainage scheme.
125. On that basis, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of flood risk, surface and foul water drainage and pollution control measures, in accordance with policies Ne/8, NE/9, NE/10 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework.

Sustainability

126. The application proposes that the policy requirements for the provision of renewable energy and carbon reduction be addressed through a scheme for solar photovoltaic panels on buildings and by the use of energy efficient building elements. While a detailed scheme cannot be provided at this stage, given the outline nature of the proposals, the submitted information is considered to adequately demonstrate that a policy compliant scheme could be provided. The application also proposes that water conservation measures would be incorporated into the dwellings, although detail is similarly not provided at this outline stage.
127. On that basis, it is considered that the scheme would be able to provide appropriate renewable energy, energy efficiency and water conservation measures and conditions would be applied requiring schemes for such measures to ensure their provision. The proposed development is therefore considered to accord with policies DP/1, NE/1, NE/3 and NE/12 of the adopted Local Development Framework.

Archeology

128. The application site lies within an area of high archaeological potential with crop marks indicating the area was settled from the Late Prehistoric period. In addition, an archaeological excavation to the east revealed Prehistoric and Roman occupation, while to the north east is evidence of Bronze Age occupation and Roman burials. However, the County Archaeologist has indicated that due to the extent of disturbance caused by the existing lagoons on site dating from the 1950's to the turn of the century, there is little potential for significant archaeological remains to be found on site and the proposed redevelopment of the site is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of the archaeological impact without further archaeological investigation.
129. On that basis, the proposed development is considered to accord with policy CH/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework.

Very Special Circumstances case

130. As set out in the Green Belt section above, the proposed development is considered to represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt as it would, on balance, have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing buildings, structures and bunding.
131. 'Other harm', in addition to that caused by inappropriate development, has been identified in the assessment of the other elements of the development in terms of the lack of provision of affordable housing and a lack of an appropriate mix of dwellings. The development would also result in some additional impact on the adjacent highway, albeit not to a level that would cause any significant harm.
132. The application should therefore only be approved where "very special circumstances" exist that clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness caused by the loss of openness and the other harm.
133. The scheme would provide significant benefits. In visual terms, while the development is considered to lead to a loss of openness in the Green Belt, it would significantly improve the visual amenity of the area and the character of the Green Belt by removing the existing incongruous buildings, structures and earth bund and replacing them with residential dwellings and a landscaped surroundings. There is support for such an approach in the adopted Local Development Framework and the draft Local Plan and it is considered that the proposed development would provide a significant benefit in that regard. While set back from the main road and relatively secluded in public views, the site is close to and visible from the adjacent sports fields which the Parish Council is currently improving and are becoming more intensively used. The improvement to the setting of the sports fields would be significant.
134. The scheme would also provide public access to the landscaped open space around the development. The NPPF states that enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access to it, should be an aim for Local Planning Authorities. This redevelopment would increase public access to the wider site, which is currently limited and would provide an enhanced landscape for public enjoyment.
135. The redevelopment of the site would also bring about the remediation of the contamination on site which would result in the removal of the pollutant linkages to groundwater in the area and bring about significant environmental benefits. The site would be remediated to a higher level and a greater spatial extent than would be required were it not being developed for residential use. This remediation is considered to be a significant benefit of the proposed development. As well as

environmental benefits, the remediation and redevelopment would also provide opportunity for significant ecological enhancement of the site which would provide benefits for priority species and habitat.

136. In accordance with the NPPF, substantial weight has been given to the harm caused to the Green Belt both by reason of inappropriateness through the loss of openness of the Green Belt in this location and the other harm caused by the lack of a policy compliant mix of dwellings and affordable housing. However, it is considered that the considerable benefits of the application - the removal of the existing waste water treatment plant and the improvements to the visual amenity of the area and the character of the Green Belt, the remediation of the heavily contaminated site including the ecological enhancement and the provision of public open space and access to the Green Belt - are so substantial that taken collectively they clearly outweigh the identified harm and constitute very special circumstances to approve the development.
137. Under The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009, as the development is 'inappropriate development' within the Green Belt and is over 1,000 m² in floor area, if Committee grants delegated powers to approve the application as requested, the decision would be referred to the Secretary of State who has the opportunity to call in the decision.

Conclusion

138. It is therefore considered that very special circumstances exist to grant permission for the proposed development within the Green Belt in accordance with policies GB/1 and GB/2 and section 9 of the NPPF.

Recommendation

139. Delegated approval subject to:

Legal Agreement

140. Contributions to be secured by way of a Section 106 (or other appropriate) legal agreement as set out below, final wording to be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair prior to the issuing of planning permission. The contributions are as set out in appendix 1 attached to this report.

Conditions and Informatives

141. 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 scale of the buildings, the access for the site (other than the main vehicular access to and from the site, which is not reserved) and the layout, appearance and landscaping of the development (hereinafter called "the Reserved Matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing prior to the commencement of development and shall be carried out as approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)
- b. Application for the approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
(Reason - To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)

- c. The development, hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the date of the last reserved matters application to be approved for that phase.
(Reason - To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)
- d. The development, hereby permitted, shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and documents:
Location Plan drawing – PL1246-1-AB-002-D
Phasing Plan drawing – PL1246-ID-003-Phasing Plan
Parameter Plan drawing – PL1246-VW-0004-08
Proposed Site Access Design drawing – W120566/SK/04 Rev B
Design Codes Rev 01 dated 16 May 2015 by Planit Intelligent Environments LLP
Design and Access Statement Rev 01 dated 9 May 2015 by Planit Intelligent Environments LLP
Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) dated February 2016 by BWB Consultancy
Sustainability Statement Rev D dated 11 May 2016 by Harrow Estates
(Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)
- e. Prior to or concurrent with any application for the Reserved Matter of Layout, a detailed scheme for the public open space and natural play area on site, including a timescale for its implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall thereafter be fully implemented in accordance with the approved timescale.
(Reason - To ensure adequate space for play is provided within the site and to provide enhanced public open space and access to the wider site, which is a key benefit of the scheme which has been given weight in the planning balance, in accordance with policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3, DP/4, SF/10, SF/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- f. 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, DP/3, GB/2 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- g. Prior to the first occupation of the development, hereby approved, all works to the junction with the A10 and the access road shown on approved drawings W120566/SK/04 Rev B shall be carried out and thereafter retained.
(Reason – In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy DP1 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- h. Prior to the commencement of demolition or construction works on site, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning 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 the 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. The demolition and construction works shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved CTMP.

(Reason – In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy DP1 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- i. Prior to the commencement of demolition or construction works on site including any works to the junction with the A10 and the access road, a full programme of construction works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason – In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy DP1 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- j. No remediation or development approved by this planning permission shall take place until a remediation strategy that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
- (i) A Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) including a Conceptual Site Model (CSM) of the site indicating potential sources, pathways and receptors, including those off site;
 - (ii) The results of a site investigation based on (i) and a detailed quantitative risk assessment, including a revised CSM.
 - (iii) Based on the risk assessment in (ii) an options appraisal and Remediation Method Statement giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken. The Remediation Method Statement shall include detailed and comprehensive feasibility, sustainability and cost benefit analysis reports to justify selection of technologies and remedial targets. The Remediation Method Statement shall include a plan providing details of how the remediation works shall be judged to be complete and arrangements for contingency actions. The plan shall also detail a long-term monitoring and maintenance plan as necessary, including ecology monitoring of the River Cam.
 - (iv) No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the Remediation Method Statement in (iii). The verification report shall include a post-remediation detailed quantitative risk assessment including a revised CSM. The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan in (iii) shall be updated and be implemented as approved.

(Reason - To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3) and 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 policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3 and NE/8 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- k. If, during remediation or development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

(Reason - To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3) and 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 policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3 and NE/8 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- i. Prior to the commencement of any remediation or development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of odour management (Odour Management Plan) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.
(Reason - To prevent the increased risk of pollution to the air environment and impact on human senses in accordance with policies DP/1, DP/2 and DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- m. Prior to the removal of structures from the site, demolition, remediation or commencement of development, a strategy setting out measures to communicate with people in the local area during the site clearance, remediation and construction phases of the development (Communications Strategy) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority. The Communications Strategy shall thereafter be fully carried out for the full duration of the site clearance, remediation and construction phases of the development.
(Reason – In the interests of clear communication with local people to ensure public understanding of the development and a minimisation of the impact on neighbours and local people in accordance with policies DP/1 and DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- n. Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:
- (i) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site;
 - (ii) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material;
 - (iii) Include an inspection and sampling strategy for the testing of excavation formations;
 - (iv) Include a stockpile validation strategy;
 - (v) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site;
 - (vi) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development;
 - (vii) Include details of arisings processing;
 - (viii) Include a verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in (i) to (vii) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action; and, confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.
- All works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.
(Reason - To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3) and to ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto or used within the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3 and NE/8 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- o. No piling nor any other foundation designs or investigation boreholes which use penetrative methods shall be undertaken on site unless a scheme for their use, which demonstrates that such works would not pose an unacceptable risk to groundwater, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason - To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Environment Agency Groundwater

Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3) and policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3 and NE/8 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- p. Prior to the commencement of demolition or removal of existing structures, remediation or development, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include:
- (i) Details of construction hours, delivery hours and site working practices;
 - (ii) Mitigation of construction noise and vibration. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report/method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents noise and or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5528, 2009 - Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites Parts 1 - Noise and 2 -Vibration (or as superseded);
 - (iii) Dust management (including the consideration of wheel washing and dust suppression provisions);
 - (iv) Construction programme including construction activities and a timescale for their execution.
- Development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved CEMP.

(Reason – To protect the amenities of nearby residential properties in accordance with policies DP/3, DP/6, NE/15 and NE/16 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- q. Prior to the commencement of development, an artificial lighting scheme, to include details of any external lighting of the site such as street lighting, floodlighting, security, residential lighting and an assessment of impact on any sensitive residential premises on and off site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:
- (i) Layout plans and elevations with luminaire locations annotated;
 - (ii) Full isolux contour maps and diagrams showing the predicted illuminance in the horizontal and vertical plane (in lux) at critical locations within the site, on the boundary of the site and at adjacent properties;
 - (iii) Hours and frequency of use;
 - (iv) A schedule of equipment in the lighting design (luminaire type and profiles, mounting height, aiming angles an orientation, angle of glare, operational controls);
 - (v) An assessment of artificial light impact in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professionals “Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011”.
 - (vi) A timescale for the implementation of the lighting scheme.

The approved lighting scheme shall thereafter be fully installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details and timescale, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(Reason – To ensure an acceptable impact on the Green Belt, visual amenity, ecological interests on site and protect and safeguard the amenities of nearby residential properties in accordance with policies DP/2, DP/3, GB/1, GB/2, NE/6 and NE/14 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- r. Prior to or concurrent with any application for the Reserved Matter of Layout, a Waste Management & Minimisation Strategy (WMMS) for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The WMMS shall include:
- (i) A completed RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit and supporting reference material;
 - (ii) A detailed Waste Audit and Strategy, to include anticipated waste type, source, volume, weight etc. of municipal waste generation during the occupation stage of the development;
 - (iii) A Site Waste Management Plan

The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved WMMS and the approved facilities shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the development. (Reason - To ensure that waste is managed sustainably during the occupation of the development in accordance with National Planning Policy for Waste and objectives of Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003.)

- s. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme to dispose of surface water drainage and install pollution prevention measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage element of the scheme shall include the following:
- (i) Full calculations detailing the existing surface water runoff rates for the QBAR, Q30 and Q100 storm events;
 - (ii) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as Q100 plus climate change), inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with an assessment of system performance;
 - (iii) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers;
 - (iv) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;
 - (v) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;
 - (vi) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
 - (vii) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water. Infiltration systems shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. The approved surface water drainage and pollution control scheme shall thereafter be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development. (Reason - To ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage and reduce the risk of pollution to the water environment in accordance with policies NE/8, NE/9 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- t. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage for the site including a timescale for its implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the approved scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved timescale. (Reason - To reduce the risk of pollution to the water environment and to ensure a satisfactory method of foul water drainage in accordance with policies NE/8 and NE/10 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- u. The development, hereby permitted, shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) dated February 2016 by BWB Consultancy, and the following mitigation measures detailed within that FRA:
- (i) All residential development will be limited to land within Flood Zone 1.
 - (ii) Finished floor levels will be set at a minimum of 11.28m AOD.
- (Reason - To minimise the likelihood of flood water entry in an extreme event, to ensure the development is safe for its lifetime and to mitigate the flood risk in the area in accordance with policies NE/9 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- v. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the provision of on-site renewable energy to meet 10% or more of the projected standard operational baseline energy requirements of the development, including a timescale for its implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme and timescale. (Reason - To ensure an energy efficient and sustainable development in accordance with policies DP/1, NE/1 and NE/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- w. Prior to the commencement of any development, a water conservation strategy for the development, including a timescale for its implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme and timescale.
(Reason – To ensure appropriate water conservation in accordance with policy NE/12 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- x. Prior to or concurrent with each application for the Reserved Matter of Layout, a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants on site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme which shall be fully operational prior to the first occupation of any dwellings to which it relates.
(Reason - To ensure the provision of adequate water supply infrastructure to protect the safe living and working environment for all users and visitors. The provision of an emergency fire strategy is required prior to the commencement of development, apart from prior to the works outlined above, to ensure that all fire protection options remain feasible at the time of submission of the fire strategy.)
- y. Prior to or concurrent with each application for the Reserved Matter of Layout relating to dwellings, a scheme for secure, covered cycle storage provision for each dwelling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall thereafter be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the dwellings to which it relates.
(Reason - To ensure adequate provision of cycle parking and bin storage in accordance with policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3 and TR/1 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- z. Prior to or concurrent with each application for the Reserved Matter of Layout relating to dwellings, a scheme for the screened storage of waste receptacles for each dwelling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall thereafter be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the dwellings to which it relates.
(Reason - To ensure adequate provision of cycle parking and bin storage in accordance with policies DP/1, DP/2 and DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- aa. Prior to or concurrent with each application for the Reserved Matter of Landscaping, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) including a timescale for its implementation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved LEMP shall thereafter be fully implemented in accordance with the approved timescale.
(Reason - To ensure adequate the protection and enhancement of the ecological interests on site and the enhancement and management of the landscape, in accordance with policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3, GB/2 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

Background Papers

- 142. Where the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 require documents to be open to inspection by members of the public, they must be available for inspection: -
 - (a) at all reasonable hours at the offices of South Cambridgeshire District Council;
 - (b) on the Council's website; and
 - (c) in the case of documents to be available for inspection pursuant to regulation 15, on payment of a reasonable fee required by the Council by the person seeking to inspect the documents at the offices of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- 143. 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 January 2007)

South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Site Specific Policies DPD (adopted 2010)

Planning File References: S/2184/16/OL

Report Author: Dan Smith – Consultant Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713181