

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

3 June 2015

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

Application Number:	S/1888/14/OL
Parish:	Dry Drayton
Proposal:	Outline application for redevelopment of existing garden centre to provide new garden centre building, outdoor sales and storage areas, establishment of orchards and tree and plant nurseries, creating of a balancing lake, access and parking alterations, and associated and ancillary activities (all matters reserved)
Site address:	Land south of Huntingdon Road, Dry Drayton
Applicant:	Hackers Fruit Farm and Garden Centre
Recommendation:	Refusal
Key material considerations:	Principle of development (whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt by definition), any other harm to the Green Belt, landscape and highway impact, very special circumstances
Committee Site Visit:	No
Departure Application:	Yes
Presenting Officer:	Paul Sexton
Application brought to Committee because:	Officers are of the view that the proposal raises issues that merit consideration by Planning Committee, and at the request of Councillor Bunty Waters
Date by which decision due:	27 November 2014

Executive Summary

1. This proposal seeks permission for the erection of a garden centre building, car parking and associated works in the Green Belt and open countryside.

2. The proposal is not considered to be acceptable in a planning policy context. The development is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework or the adopted Local Development Framework. The development amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt by definition.
3. The development will also undermine the reasons for including land in the Green Belt and will result in a loss of openness and harm to countryside character.
4. The applicant considers the proposed works are required in the light of the proposed improvements to the A14 to enable the long established Hacker's operation to remain viable and competitive and that this provides the 'very special circumstances' required to justify approval of inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The 'very special circumstances' have been carefully considered, however, officers are of the view that these do not clearly outweigh the identified harm.

Site and Proposal

5. This outline application, with all matters reserved relates to approximately 14.2 hectares (35 acres) of land located on the south side of the A14. The land concerned is largely now in use as arable farmland and includes buildings associated with the nursery use. The site is generally flat and includes field hedgerows; these also include some hedgerow trees.
6. The northern part of the site is immediately adjacent to the A14. To the south east is the Cambridge Crematorium and to the north west is junction 30 of the A14. Existing site accesses are available from the A14 and Oakington Road. The land to the south of the site is for the most part arable farmland within the open countryside.
7. Generally, apart from the existing nursery buildings located adjacent to the A14, the application site is undeveloped and has the appearance of being a part of the open countryside.
8. The application, as amended by illustrative details received on 16 March 2015, proposes the erection of a garden centre building of approximately 2800m², along with covered area and outdoor plant display, located to the west of the existing Hacker's Fruit Farm buildings, immediately to the south of the A14 and the existing access driveway from Dry Drayton Road, and east of the Dry Drayton interchange.
9. A new area of car parking is shown to the south of the proposed building and display area, with new orchards to the south of this, and a tree nursery and plant preparation area to the east.
10. The illustrative layout plan shows the proposed new route of the new local road proposed as part of the A14 Improvements, and access to the garden centre will be from the Oakington road, at the new junction proposed by the Highways Agency.
11. The application is accompanied by a Planning Statement, Design and Access Statement, Transport Assessment, Ecological Report, Arboricultural Report, Flood Risk Assessment and Retail Impact Assessment.

Planning History

12. S/2008/14/OL – Erection of buildings to form garden centre together with access and car parking and provision of World War 1 living museum – Refused

13. S/1245/13/LD – Lawful Development Certificate for existing use of land for retail of garden centre products, trees, shrubs, seeds, fertiliser, garden equipment, home produce etc. – Application Awaiting Determination. (This application relates to the existing buildings at Hackers Fruit Farm).
14. The site is subject to a number of applications for planning permission relating to the developed area of the existing Fruit Farm. None are relevant to the determination of this application.

Policy

15. **National Policy**
National Planning Policy Framework
16. Paragraph 79 states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their permanence and openness.
17. Paragraphs 87 to 90 advise on the definition of inappropriate development, and harm to the Green Belt (see paras 66-68 below).
18. Paragraph 19 states that planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed upon the need to support economic growth through the planning system.
19. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy**
ST/1 Green Belt
ST/9 Retail Hierarchy
20. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies**
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
ET/5 – Development for the Expansion of Firms
SF/2 – Applications for New Retail Facilities
SF/5 – Retailing in the Countryside
SF/6 – Public Art and New Development
NE/1 – Energy Efficiency
NE/3 – Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development
NE/4 – Landscape Character Areas
NE/6 – Biodiversity
NE/9 – Water and Drainage Infrastructure
NE/10 – Foul Drainage – Alternative Drainage Systems
NE/11 – Flood Risk
NE/12 – Water Conservation
NE/14 – Light Pollution
NE/17 – Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
CH/2 – Archaeological Sites
TR/1 – Planning for More Sustainable Travel
TR/2 – Car and Cycle Parking Standards

TR/3 – Mitigating Travel Impact
TR/4 – Non-motorised Transport

21. **South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)**

Landscape in New Developments SPD - Adopted March 2010
Biodiversity SPD - Adopted July 2009

22. **Draft Local Plan**

S/1 – Vision
S/2 – Objectives of the Local Plan
S/3 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S/5 – Provision of New jobs and Homes
S/7 – Development Frameworks
CC/1 – Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change
CC/3 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments
CC/4 – Sustainable Design and Construction
CC/6 – Construction Methods
CC/7 – Water Quality
CC/8 – Sustainable Drainage Systems
CC/9 – Managing Flood Risk
HQ/1 – Design Principles
HQ/2 – Public Art and New Development
NH/2 – Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
NH/3 – Protecting Agricultural Land
NH/4 – Biodiversity
NH/7 – Mitigating the Impact of Development in and Adjoining the Green Belt
NH/9 – Redevelopment of Previously Developed Sites and Infilling in the Green Belt
E/16 – Expansion of Existing Businesses in the Countryside
E/21 – Retail Hierarchy
E/22 – Applications for New Retail Development
SC/10 – Lighting Proposals
TI/2 – Planning for Sustainable Transport
TI/3 – Parking Provision
TI/8 – Infrastructure and New Developments

Consultation by South Cambridgeshire District Council as Local Planning Authority

23. **Dry Drayton Parish Council** – recommends refusal because of concerns about increased traffic, and development within the Green Belt.
24. **Oakington and Westwick Parish Council** – No objections in principle, but would expect to see comprehensive details of transport access and water management plans with any full application.
25. **Boxworth Parish Meeting** – Approve.
26. **Swavesey Parish Council** – No objection.
27. **Landscapes Officer** – Objects to the construction and location of the proposed garden centre buildings, covered area and outdoor plant display. The Green Belt is of great importance and to prevent urban sprawl. It is recommended that the applicant considers replacement of existing buildings provided that the new building is no larger than the existing foot print.

28. The revised layout indicates a relocated car parking space and garden centre to the northern boundary of the site. The fishing lake/balancing pond have been removed from the illustrative plan. The above comments still apply to the revised layout.
29. The landscape quality of the site has been assessed as Good with a clear pattern of characteristic elements and with minor incongruous elements. It is considered that the site and the surrounding area would have a high landscape sensitivity to the proposed development. Key characteristics of the landscape are highly vulnerable to the type of change being assessed, with such change likely to result in a significant change in valued character. These include the removal of arable farmland and rural character.
30. The visual effects from the north of the site would be minimal due to the retention of existing large conifers. However, the effects of change and development on the views to the south, east and west would be adverse. Applicant has indicated some planting adjacent to the car to reduce this effect. These works would be insufficient and both the car park and the new garden centre would still be visible.
31. The application cannot be supported because of the unacceptable adverse impact on both the landscape and visual amenity.
32. **Ecology Officer** – No objection to the principle of development. The scheme has the potential to significantly diversify the range of habitats present on site which, as they mature, should provide habitat gain.
33. The Ecology Officer states that he has previously discussed the potential extent of Great Crested Newt (GCN) habitat that was on site, and concluded that this was negligible given that the vast majority of it is in arable land in cultivation. A condition can be included in any consent requiring a survey to be carried out for GCN.
34. The large orchards and waterbody are particularly welcomed.
35. The ecological assessment also identified a low level of badger activity in the area. Should any consent be granted then pre-commencement surveys for badgers should be undertaken.
36. A condition should be used to control the removal of vegetation during the bird breeding season. Bird and bat boxes should be erected to provide instant nesting and roosting sites whilst on-site trees mature.
37. **Highways Agency** – No objection subject to conditions requiring no direct access to the A14, and provisions is the event that the proposed A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement scheme is constructed simultaneously with the development.
38. **Local Highway Authority** – believes that there should be no significant adverse effect on the public highway, as the main populations to the site are connected by the Highway Agency's network, which has a far more convenient access.
39. The Highway Authority believes that it is unlikely that vehicles will use Dry Drayton, but not impossible, although the village economy may benefit through trade and employment.
40. **Cambridgeshire County Council (Transportation)** – lodges a holding objection, stating that it requires a standalone Transport Assessment document detailing the current proposals and associated trip generation, with it being made clear that the

WW1 Museum no longer forms part of the application. Comments on the revised document will be reported.

41. **Environmental Health Officer** – No objections.
42. **Scientific Officer (Contaminated Land)** – comments that the land has been used for intensive agriculture, which has the potential to cause land contamination. A condition should be included to secure a scheme for remediation of any contamination, not previously identified, found during the course of development.
43. **Environment Agency** – No objection subject to conditions requiring detailed surface and foul water drainage, pollution control schemes for the site, and a condition dealing with any contamination found during the course of development.
44. **Cambridgeshire Archaeology** – comments that the site was subject to an archaeological evaluation in connection with a previous application for this site, which demonstrated that no significant archaeological assets survive. It is considered that no further archaeological work, or condition, is required.
45. **Asset Information Definitive Map Officer (Cambridgeshire County Council)** – comments in respect of the original layout that Public Bridleway No.12 Dry Drayton runs through and along the edge of the application site. The plan appears to indicate that the bridleway may be blocked at one point by additional landscaping, but it is not clear. The bridleway must remain open at all times, and there would be an objection to any attempt to block it.
46. Any change of surface to the bridleway must be agreed. The fact that the applicant is considering creating new pedestrian and cycling access connection is welcomed. Details of this should be submitted when available, and would help to compensate for the additional traffic along Bridleway 12 that this application creates.
47. Comments on the revised illustrative layout will be reported.

Representations

48. One letter has been received in respect of the original proposal from the occupier of Crouchfield Villa, Huntingdon Road, expressing concern about the impact on outlook and traffic.
49. Cllr Bunty Waters supports the application.

Applicants Representations

50. In a letter and the Planning Design and Access Statement accompanying the application it is stated that proposed garden centre has been substantially reduced in size, with the garden centre building being one-third of the site originally proposed. The applicant considers this the minimum to size to constitute a viable development in the open market, and would ensure the future of the Hackers business, which would otherwise have to close.
51. Expansion of Hackers Fruit Farm & Garden Centre will save it from closure. Hackers Fruit farm was established over 90 years ago and employed up to 150m people. The garden centre element was added in the 1970's and 1980's but trade has suffered immensely in recent years because of inadequate access as a result of the closure of access points on the A14. Expansion of the garden centre is acceptable in terms of

planning policy for the expansion of existing businesses. Although the retail aspect is not an exception to green belt policy, its development as a leisure proposal is undoubtedly acceptable in this location.

52. The existing buildings on the application site are obsolete, sited in a haphazard fashion and mixed with residential property. All the buildings at the farm (other than the farm workshop) and enclosures (some 1600 sq. m) are to be demolished to make way for the new residential/farm access, revised residential curtilages and storage for the fruit farm.
53. A modern garden centre building (approx. 2800 sq. m or 1200 sq. m net) is to be sited on the adjoining land together with a modern outdoor sales area and parking for 150 cars. The overall size of the garden centre extension has been reduced from the refused scheme of 13,800 sq. m to the new proposed 7,800 sq. m. The new building will permit the expansion of products on sale, or which were on sale until the recent demise of the garden centre business, and the products which were described both in the Hacker's history supporting document and the currently undetermined Lawful Use application.
54. The statement states that the proposals will help maintain openness of the Green Belt and provide a foil to the introduction of the engineering works that will constitute the A14 improvements.
55. The applicant is of the view that the revised proposal is acceptable development in the Green Belt in that it either relates to agriculture/horticulture and does not affect openness, or it relates to an expansion of an existing business. It is accepted that the expansion of the retail element can be regarded as inappropriate development within the Green Belt, but the applicant considers that there are 'very special circumstances' why this redevelopment of the garden centre should be permitted, and these are set out in paragraphs 56 - 63 below, and relate to business viability, the A14 improvements, recreational benefits, environmental benefits, and reduction in building size.
56. *Business viability.* The scheme has been substantially reduced from that previously proposed and refused, and will allow for potential annual sales of between £4-5m, which is the minimum that has been advised as necessary for the garden centre to compete in the market place. This figure is lower than the £8 referred to in the earlier application due to the substantial reduction in infrastructure and highway costs as a result of the reduced size of the application proposal. Cash flow figures are set out in Appendix 6 of the Planning Design and Access Statement.
57. The applicant considers the above to be a very special circumstance as this local family business should be maintained, rather than closing. This is in line with Local Plan and NPPF policies supporting the expansion of existing businesses. Some 30 years ago Hacker's employed between 100-150 people on this and other sites. The proposed redevelopment will provide approximately 50 new jobs for people in the local area. The proposed improvements will fill a void in the garden centre sales in the north-west sector out of Cambridge, and will allow the Hacker's business to revive and expand so as to compete with larger garden centres at Coton and Huntingdon, and the recently enlarged garden centre at Oakington.
58. The statement refers to garden centre premises in Coton and Great Shelford, which are also on Green Belt sites, and which have recently been extended to update them to modern retail requirements. The smaller garden centre a mile to the east of the application site in Oakington is also in the Green Belt but is now allowed to provide

extensive catering facilities, and sells a wide variety of goods. The need for modern facilities were advanced as 'very special circumstances' at all these sites.

59. *A14 Improvements.* It is considered that these are of national importance and in themselves represent 'very special circumstances' as the application helps to implement this particular section of the works. In addition it must be accepted that the A14 improvements as proposed will irretrievably change the appearance of this part of the Green Belt, and the substantial proposals for planting as part of the overall proposals in terms of new orchards, strategic planting, provision of a landscaped car park, and the provision of tree nurseries, will all help to reduce the impact of the road proposals in this area and to maintain the openness of the Green Belt.
60. *Recreational benefits.* A combination of the now proposed Cambridge access road, as part of the A14 improvements, along with the proposals to link both Dry Drayton and Bar Hill (and possibly Northstowe) to the site will enable a considerable extension of the footpath/cycleway connections from the area direct into the centre of Cambridge. Details were referred to in the original travel plan and are now made more possible by the latest amendments to the A14 improvements, with the proposed road 25a. As such these recreational benefits are regarded as being 'very special circumstances'. To aid these recreational benefits it is proposed as part of the facilities of the garden centre to provide eating and drinking facilities for walkers and cyclists, in addition to the normal cafeteria facilities within the garden centre.
61. *Environmental benefits.* The ability to redevelop the present garden centre and provide a complex in sustainable materials is also a 'very special circumstance' The details of these are set out in the 'Design Considerations' section of the Planning Design and Access Statement.
62. *Reduction in building size.* The redevelopment proposals, which entail the demolition of existing outdated buildings on the present site, together with the provision of a new garden centre on adjoining land, allows the business to sufficiently expand, with only a net increase of 1200 sq.m of floor space. This is a clear opportunity to retain the existing business with minimum impact upon the green belt, which should also be regarded as a 'special circumstance'.
63. The Green Belt policy allows necessary expansion of business. Without the expansion, as proposed, there will be no business and therefore the Green Belt policy and its appropriateness or otherwise will be irrelevant.
64. A further letter in support of the application, which has been submitted by the applicant for Member's consideration, along with additional comments from the applicant's agent and proposed layout plan, are attached at Appendix 1.

Planning Considerations

65. There are a number of key issues for Members to consider in this case; whether the proposed development is appropriate development by definition in the Green Belt; whether the proposal results in any other harm to the Green Belt; landscape impact; highway safety, residential amenity, lighting; ecology; drainage, archaeology and any other matters.
66. If it is concluded that the proposal is inappropriate by definition, then this, and the extent of any other harm, will require Members to consider whether the applicant has demonstrated that very special circumstances exist which clearly outweigh that harm.

Principle of development

67. Paragraph 87 of the NPPF confirms that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 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.
68. Paragraph 89 of the NPPF states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate, but lists exceptions, which include buildings for agriculture or forestry; provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor recreation as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including and within it; the replacement of a building provided the new building is in the same use and is not materially larger than the one it replaces; and the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed site, whether redundant or in continuing use, provided it 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.
69. The proposed garden centre (which is not a leisure/recreation use, but a Class A1 retail use) and in officers view does not fall with the categories of exceptions set out above.

Any other harm to the Green Belt

70. The development, the building proposed and the associated works such as car parking areas would detract significantly from the openness of the Green Belt. The revised illustrative scheme shows the proposed building sited close to the A14 and will be largely screened from views from the north by the existing line of conifer trees, which are to be retained. However the development would result in the loss of a significant area of presently undeveloped Green Belt land. In coming to this view officers recognise that the removal of some of the existing much smaller buildings within the current area of buildings may increase openness, but consider any benefit to be outweighed by the scale and impact of the new building. The development is considered to conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt and to have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and, hence, fails to comply with the NPPF and Policy GB/1 in this respect.

Impact on landscape character

71. The development of the application site would result in a significant change in the character and appearance of the site. At the present time, apart from the limited previously developed area of the Fruit farm adjoining the A14, the land is open farmland with field hedgerows. The majority of the site therefore is undeveloped and has a rural and arable open countryside appearance. Development would introduce a significant amount of buildings, roads, parking and associated external lighting onto the site which would detract from the appearance of the site in the open countryside. It is considered that the introduction of this level of development would be harmful to the appearance of the site and the open countryside.
72. Officers accept that the proposed A14 improvement works will have an impact on the current openness and character of the land to the south of the site, particularly from the new local access road and junction with Dry Drayton Road. Officers are also of the view that the proposed location of the new building, other than being on the site of the existing buildings, is in the optimum position to reduce visual impact as far as

possible. The applicant has also provided details of a possible design for the new building, which would result in a low profile 'rural' building, and officer would support that design approach.

Access and highway safety

73. There has been no objection in principle to the development on highway from either the Highways Agency or Local Highway Authority. Access and highway safety was not a reason for refusal in respect of the earlier application, and the scale of development proposed has now reduced.

Introduction of additional retail activities

74. The application is accompanied by a retail impact assessment. This seeks to demonstrate that the proposed garden centre is acceptable in terms of retail impact. The assessment considers existing garden centres for the most part and not wider retailing and associated issues. It also makes assumptions in relation to potential catchment area based on 20 minute travel times and estimates catchment as being some 325,000 people. Following estimating and discounting trade to other garden centres, the assessment determines that catchment will be some 165,000, including urban extensions. The assessment also estimates expenditure and turnover. However, the assessment contains little detail to underpin its assumptions. The assessment also goes on to consider site access and layout. Apart from the limited material relating to catchment and turnover, there is little conclusive material as to impact of the proposed development. Nor is there any meaningful analysis of impact on other retailing.
75. The assessment contains little if any sequential analysis relating to the proposed location of the garden centre. It has not therefore demonstrated that the proposed site is an appropriate location for an enlarged retail development of this size. However, the reasons for refusal of the earlier application, which proposed a larger retail floorspace, did not make specific reference to this matter. Officers are therefore of the view that it would be unreasonable to object to the current application on these grounds.

Other matters (including very special circumstances)

76. Officers have concluded that the proposal is inappropriate development by definition as it will not preserve the openness of the Green Belt.
77. The applicant does not agree with the officer view but has, without prejudice to that view, set out what are considered to be the very special circumstances that exist in this case. These are outlined in paragraphs 56-63 above.
78. Officers recognise that the Local Development Framework and NPPF encourages and supports rural businesses, and the need set out for the expansion of the business on viability grounds, however policy states that Green Belt issues still need to be considered where sites are located within that area. Officers are of the view that in this case the harm to the Green Belt identified above outweighs the argument for the redevelopment of the existing site in paragraphs 56-63 above.
79. The recreational benefits are recognised, but are not considered to be of a scale in this case that would outweigh the identified harm.

80. The applicant has referred to other garden centre on Green Belt sites in the Cambridge Area, and the consents granted to these. Each application will have been considered on its merits, but there are no recent consents that would compare to the erection of a new building of the size currently proposed. The cafeteria referred to at Oakington was secured by way of the conversion of an existing building rather than a new build.
81. In officers view the applicant has not demonstrated that these circumstances are “very special” to warrant a departure from advice in the NPPF or from the Council’s own adopted policies. The applicant has not provided any real justification as to why the proposed development should be considered to be an exception.

Conclusion

81. This proposal is clearly not consistent with guidance set out in the NPPF relating to the Green Belt. The proposed development does not fall within the exceptions for development within the Green Belt set out in the NPPF nor within the Council’s own adopted planning policies or emerging Local Plan. The development proposed will result in a loss of openness of the Green Belt and in addition detriment to the appearance of the application site, both as a part of the Green Belt and also as a part of the open countryside.

Officers have considered the ‘very special circumstances’ put forward in support of the application. However, whilst officers would like to be able to support a scheme which aids the retention and future viability of a long established local company, in this case the harm to the Green Belt in terms of being inappropriate development by definition, and the other harm to the Green Belt and landscape referred to above. The ‘very special circumstances’ put forward are not considered to clearly outweigh the identified harm.

Recommendation

That the application is refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development does not fall within any of the exception categories set out within the National Planning Policy Framework relating to development within the Green Belt and as such is unacceptable in principle. It would lead to an unacceptable loss of the openness and the essential undeveloped nature of the Green Belt. The development proposed would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt and would not therefore be consistent with guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and conflict with Policy GB/1 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.
2. Notwithstanding the harm by reason of inappropriateness, the proposed development would result would result in a significant change in the character and appearance of the site which is located within the open countryside. The present undeveloped, arable and open appearance of the site as an integral part of the open countryside would be lost as a consequence of the development proposed. The development of the site is therefore considered to be detrimental to the appearance of the open countryside and the appearance of the site. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DP/3 (m) of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007, which states that development will not be permitted if it would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the countryside and landscape character.

3. Insufficient very special circumstances, have been put forward to demonstrate why the harm, by reason of inappropriateness in the Green Belt and other harm identified above, is clearly outweighed by these considerations. The application therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of paragraph 88 of the NPPF 2012.

Background Papers

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.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission July 2013
- South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- Planning File References: S/2008/13/OL and S/1245/13/LD

Report Author: Paul Sexton – Principal Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713255