

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

7 September 2016

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

Application Number:	S/0191/16/OL
Parish(es):	Guilden Morden
Proposal:	Outline application for up to 30 dwellings and formation of new access (all other matters including landscaping, layout, scale and appearance are reserved).
Site address:	Site south of Thompson's Meadow, Trap Road, Guilden Morden, Cambridgeshire SG8 0JE
Applicant(s):	Mr John Boston, Guilden Morden Executive Homes
Recommendation:	Refusal
Key material considerations:	The main issues are whether the proposed development would provide a suitable site for housing, having regard to housing land supply, the principles of sustainable development, scale of development and impact on townscape and landscape character, drainage issues, services and facilities, access and transport and ecology.
Committee Site Visit:	6 September 2016
Departure Application:	Yes
Presenting Officer:	John Koch (Development Control Team Leader – West)
Application brought to Committee because:	The application proposal raises considerations of wider than local interest and approval would represent a departure from the Local Plan
Date by which decision due:	09 September 2016 (Extension of time agreed)

Executive Summary

1. This proposal seeks outline permission (access only for approval) for a residential development of up to 30 dwellings on a greenfield site. The site lies within the countryside, outside the designated Development Framework of a Group village as identified in the adopted Local Development Framework and emerging Local Plan. The original proposal was for 36 units and has been reduced to 30 following concerns expressed regarding the indicative layout and potential impact on protected trees.
2. The development would not normally be considered acceptable in principle when set against current adopted policy as a result of its scale and location. It is recognised that

the district does not currently have a 5 year housing land supply, and therefore the relevant adopted LDF policies in relation to the supply of housing are considered not up to date for the purposes of the NPPF.

3. However, the local planning authority must still determine the appropriate weight to apply to relevant development plan policies even where out of date. In this instance whilst Policies ST/6 and DP/7 of the adopted Core Strategy and adopted Development Control Policies which influence the supply of housing land, are considered out of date, they continue to perform a material planning objective, consistent with the policies of the NPPF, in forming part of a suite of policies to control the distribution and scale of new housing by ensuring that development is sustainably located and unsustainable locations are avoided. The strategy supporting the policies is therefore afforded considerable weight.
4. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and where relevant policies are out of date, planning permission should be granted for development unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole. It is considered that Guilden Morden is not a sustainable location for the scale of development proposed, having regard to the level of services and facilities in the village and the accessibility to necessary services and facilities by sustainable modes of transport.
5. In this case, the location and scale of the development are such that officers are of the view that the harm arising from the unsustainable location, significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the proposal. These include a contribution of up to 30 dwellings towards the required housing land supply, and provision of 40% affordable dwellings (12 units).

Planning History

6. None relevant to the determination of this planning application

Planning Policies

7. The following paragraphs are a list of documents and policies that may be relevant in the determination of this application. Consideration of whether any of these are considered out of date in light of the Council not currently being able to demonstrate that it has an up to date five year housing land supply, and the weight that might still be given to those policies, is addressed later in the report.
8. *National Planning Policy Framework*
Planning Practice Guidance
9. *South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, adopted January 2007*
ST/2 Housing Provision
ST/6 Group Villages
10. *South Cambridgeshire LDF Development Control Policies, adopted July 2007*
DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments

- DP/7 Development Frameworks
- HG/1 Housing Density
- HG/2 Housing Mix
- HG/3 Affordable Housing
- CH/4 Setting of Listed Buildings
- CH/5 Conservation Areas
- SF/10 Outdoor Play space, Informal Open Space, and New Developments
- SF/11 Open Space Standards
- 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/15 Noise 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

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

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

12. *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
- S/10 Group Villages
- S/12 Phasing, Delivering and Monitoring
- 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
- NH/2 Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
- NH/3 Protecting Agricultural Land
- NH/4 Biodiversity
- NH/6 Green Infrastructure
- NH/14 Heritage Assets

H/7 Housing Density
H/8 Housing Mix
H/9 Affordable Housing
SC/8 Open space standards
SC/11 Noise pollution
T/I Parking provision

Consultations

13. **Guilden Morden Parish Council** – In relation to the amended proposals, the Parish Council remains unanimously in support of the application and state that the scheme should be accepted for the following reasons:
- The revised scheme has addressed key points raised at the village meeting in March (original proposal), namely slightly lower density and provision of sufficient parking to avoid congestion.
 - The application should be assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework, namely the sustainability of the development. The additional homes are a welcome way to increase the sustainability of the village – including the community facilities, churches, pre-school, school and local businesses such as the pub (and potentially in the future, the Three Tuns which is currently not trading as a pub). Most older pupils travel to Bassingbourn, which currently has a dedicated school bus.
 - The scheme will address the Local Housing Need as it provides the number and mix of homes identified in the 2015 survey.

Raised no objection to the original scheme but did make the following comments:-

- The scheme proposes too many houses resulting in a cramped and ill fitting layout.
 - The amount of car parking proposed within the development is considered insufficient – given the size of the units and overspill car parking
 - The footpath and internal road widths are not acceptable.
 - Concerns regarding foul water drainage. Although Anglian Water state that there is capacity within the system, there is local evidence of drainage problems and not just at times of high rainfall.
 - Highway safety concerns regarding the proximity of the access to the development along Thompsons Meadow and the junction with Trap Road.
14. **District Council Affordable Housing Officer** - Comments that the application of 40% affordable housing applies to the net increase in dwellings. The tenure split for the affordable properties should be 70/30. Therefore 70% of these should be rented and 30% should be provided as intermediate/shared ownership. The highest demand for housing is for 1 and 2 bedroom properties, this is reflective of most of the villages in South Cambridgeshire. The applicants have proposed the following mix:

1 x 3 bed house
9 x 1/2 bed house
2 x 1/2 bed bungalow

The proposed mix is considered to be acceptable, reflecting the need within the District and would make a significant contribution to meeting the identified need for 18 affordable units in Guilden Morden.

15. **District Council Urban Design Officer** – Raises no objection to the principle of

development following revisions to the indicative layout and reduction in the number of units to 30. The low density of the scheme is considered appropriate for the village edge location. Back to back distances must be a minimum of 25 metres between corresponding elevations, the public open space requires improved natural surveillance and minimum garden size standards must be met. The amount of public open space to be provided exceeds the required standards and therefore there is space to address these issues at the reserved matters stage.

16. **District Council Ecology Officer** – Raises no objection to the proposal. The applicant has submitted an ecological assessment in support of the application which raises no concerns in terms of harm to the biodiversity value of the site. Following revisions to the indicative layout and the reduction in the number of units and the confirmation of a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on the northern and western boundaries of the site, it is considered that these important ecological features could be preserved by the proposed scheme.
17. **District Council Landscape Officer** – Raises no objection to the principle of development and welcomes the retention of the mature trees on the boundaries of the site. Additional measures to enhance biodiversity, along with details of landscape planting and boundary treatments will need to be secured at the reserved matters stage. A loose knot pattern of development should be encouraged at the reserved matters stage to ensure a rural character to this edge of village development.
18. **District Council Tree Officer** - Raises no objection to the revised proposals which has reduced the number of units. The revised indicative layout demonstrates that the proposed quantum of development can be achieved on the site and the area of public open space organised in a manner that would preserve the tree belt around the perimeter of the site – including those that are the subject of TPO's.
19. **Local Highways Authority** – Raises no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of conditions regarding a traffic management plan and levels of access road.
20. **Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team** – Raises no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of a condition regarding a programme of archaeological investigation, following the submission of additional information which identifies an area for further investigation and potential mitigation in the north western corner of the site.
21. **Environment Agency** – Raises no objection to the proposal. Comment that a sustainable scheme for surface water drainage will need to be submitted and that Anglian Water should be satisfied that the main foul sewage drainage network can accommodate the demands of the proposal.
22. **Anglian Water** – Confirm that the Guilden Morden Water Recycling Centre wastewater treatment plant has capacity to deal with the additional flows that would result from the proposed development. In relation to foul water sewage, there is no objection on the basis that further details are submitted by the applicant to demonstrate that off site flood risk can be mitigated. The Lead Local Flood Risk Authority and the Environment Agency should be consulted regarding surface water.
23. **Cambridgeshire County Council Flood and Water Team** – Raises no objection to the proposal following the submission of additional information, subject to the imposition of conditions requiring the submission of a detailed surface water drainage strategy and details of the management and future maintenance of the system

24. **District Council Environmental Health Officer and Health & Environmental Services** – Raises no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of conditions regarding hours of construction work, a noise assessment relating to the traffic on the adjacent highways and the impact of the development on the existing properties on Thompson's Meadow, pile foundations, airborne dust, a construction programme, a lighting scheme and details of waste management during construction and once the development is occupied. No objection to the content of the Health Impact Assessment.
25. **District Council Contaminated Land Officer** - no objection subject to the imposition of a standard condition requiring the submission of a contaminated land assessment and compliance with the agreed mitigation measures, prior to the commencement of development.
26. **District Council Section 106 Officer** - Comments that contributions are required towards off-site open space and community facilities and monitoring to ensure that the development is acceptable in planning terms. The details of the contributions are appended to this report and summarised in paragraphs 97-103 below.
27. **Design Enabling Panel** – commented on the original submission. Issues relating to the density of development in the central part of the scheme, the location of the open space and the orientation of the properties adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. These design points have been reflected in the revisions to the indicative layout of the scheme
28. **Cambridgeshire County Council Growth Team** - confirm that no contributions are required as there is capacity at pre-school, primary school and secondary school level and there are no expansion of lifelong learning is considered necessary
29. **Representations**

21 letters of representation have been received from third parties objecting to the proposals, raising the following concerns:

- The proposal will result in a detrimental impact on highway safety.
- The proposals would involve development close to the northern boundary of the site, which would threaten the condition of the protected trees.
- The site is a green field on the edge of the village. There are more suitable sites for development within the village that could provide the affordable housing proposed.
- Access to the site should be taken from Trap Road on the eastern boundary and the 30 mph area extended to result in a scheme from a highway safety perspective.
- The proposal would not meet the definition of sustainable development due to the size of the proposed development on the edge of a village with limited facilities.
- The supporting documentation associated with the application is inaccurate in assessing the impact that the anticipated population would have on the capacity of services and facilities within the village.
- The proposal would result in landscape harm as an extension beyond the strong village edge which currently exists.
- There are insufficient employment opportunities in the village. Occupants of the development would be reliant on the car to access employment and anything above basic services and facilities – ensuring that the scheme does not meet the definition of sustainable development.
- There is no village store in Guilden Morden and the bus service is limited
- Surrounding roads are narrow and lack street lighting, ensuring that the local

environment is not conducive to cycling.

- The site is a significant distance from the closest secondary school (Bassingbourn Village College).
- The site is of biodiversity value and this would be adversely affected by the proposals.
- The proposal would be contrary to policy ST/6 of the Core Strategy
- The proposal is on a greenfield site, development should be concentrated on brownfield sites.
- The village does not need more 'executive' homes – development should focus on increasing the level of affordable housing.
- Development should be focussed in the more sustainable locations in the District (Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres) as expressed in policies ST/b-k of the Core Strategy.
- The proposal would have an adverse impact on the setting of the heritage assets Morden Hall and Morden House, both of which are adjacent to the application site
- The proposal would have an adverse impact on surface water drainage and foul water drainage capacity.
- The applicant refers to there being a hospital in Bassingbourn, a clinic in Steeple Morden. This is considered to be inaccurate as is the quoted distance to Ashwell and Morden Station.
- The supporting information suggests that the proposal would provide less car parking space due to the sustainable location – this is considered unjustified given the limited public transport provision in the village.
- This scheme is similar to that in Balsham which was recommended for refusal – the same conclusions apply in this case.
- The SHLAA process undertaken in support of the emerging Local Plan recognised the group villages are not sustainable locations for significant development as the vast majority of proposed allocation sites are located in Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.
- The lack of services and employment opportunities and distance to the secondary school were identified as issues which led to the dismissal of an appeal in Over for 26 units – similar circumstances exist in this case.
- Noise and pollution during the construction period would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

Site

30. The site is within the countryside, adjacent and opposite the Guilden Morden Development Framework. It is comprised of approximately 1.75 hectares of land accessed from the northern boundary by a field gate, leading off Thompsons Meadow. The site is located on the eastern edge of the village and is surrounded by a mature tree belt. The trees on the northern and eastern boundaries of the site are the subject of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's).
31. Pursuant to Policy NE/4, the District Design Guide SPD adopted March 2010 has assessed the site area as 'The Chalk lands'. Key characteristics of this designation include rolling chalk hills and gently undulating plateau. The site itself is paddock land and the land levels are relatively flat.

Proposal

32. The proposal seeks outline planning permission for the erection of up to 30 dwellings and the formation of a new access onto Thompsons Meadow (all other matters including landscape, layout, scale and appearance are reserved). The scheme has been revised to propose 6 fewer units than the original submission, following concerns

expressed with regard to the layout and potential impact on protected trees.

Planning Assessment

Housing Land Supply

33. The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF) requires councils to boost significantly the supply of housing, including by meeting their objectively assessed need for housing and by identifying and maintaining a five-year housing land supply with an additional buffer as set out in paragraph 47.
34. The Council accepts that it cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply in the district as required by the NPPF, having regard to appeal decisions in Waterbeach in 2014, and as confirmed by more recent appeal decisions. The five-year supply as identified in the latest Annual Monitoring Report (February 2016) for South Cambridgeshire is 3.9 years on the basis of the most onerous method of calculation, which is the method identified by the Waterbeach Inspector. This shortfall is based on an objectively assessed housing need of 19,500 homes for the period 2011 to 2031. This is identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 together with the latest update undertaken for the Council in November 2015 as part of the evidence responding to the Local Plan Inspectors' preliminary conclusions. It uses the latest assessment of housing delivery contained in the housing trajectory November 2015. The appropriate method of calculation is a matter before the Local Plan Inspectors and in the interim the Council is following the method preferred by the Waterbeach appeal Inspector.
35. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that adopted policies "for the supply of housing" cannot be considered up to date where there is not a five year housing land supply. This includes the rural settlement policies and village framework policy.
36. Further guidance as to which policies should be considered as 'relevant policies for the supply of housing' emerged from a recent Court of Appeal decision (*Richborough v Cheshire East and Suffolk Coastal DC v Hopkins Homes*). The Court defined 'relevant policies for the supply of housing' widely so not to be restricted to 'merely policies in the Development Plan that provide positively for the delivery of new housing in terms of numbers and distribution or the allocation of sites,' but also to include, 'plan policies whose effect is to influence the supply of housing by restricting the locations where new housing may be developed.' Therefore all policies which have the potential to restrict or affect housing supply may be considered out of date in respect of the NPPF.
37. In the case of this application policies which must be considered as potentially influencing the supply of housing land include ST/2 and ST/6 of the adopted Core Strategy and adopted policies DP/7 and NE/17 of the adopted Development Control Policies. Policies S/7, S/8, S/10 and NH/3 of the draft Local Plan are also material considerations but are also considered to be relevant (draft) policies for the supply of housing.
38. However the Court also made clear that even where policies are considered 'out of date' for the purposes of NPPF paragraph 49, a decision maker is required to consider what (if any) weight should be attached to such relevant policies having regard to compatibility with the NPPF

39. The rural settlement classification in the adopted and emerging development plans identifies the sustainability of villages in South Cambridgeshire, having regard to the level of services and facilities within a village and the availability and frequency of public transport to access higher order services in Cambridge and elsewhere. They are a key factor in applying paragraph 14 of the NPPF which says that where a five-year supply cannot be demonstrated, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole. The NPPF also includes as a core principle that planning should “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable”.
40. In light of the lack of five-year housing land supply and having regard to recent local appeal decisions, the rural settlement policies are considered to continue to have significant weight in the determination of planning applications adjacent to or within close proximity to village frameworks. This will help ensure that development proposals outside and in close proximity to village frameworks have due regard to the availability of an appropriate level of services, facilities, employment and sustainable transport options.
41. As a general principle, the larger, better served villages categorised as Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres are likely to be more able to support unplanned housing growth than the smaller, less well served Group and Infill Villages, without fundamentally undermining the development strategy for South Cambridgeshire. This has some commonality with the approach taken in the submitted Local Plan where a limited number of housing allocations in the rural area were included for Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, including for larger sites that the windfall threshold in Minor Rural Centres, but no allocations for Group and Infill Villages other than a very limited number where they were put forward by Parish Councils under the Localism agenda.
42. As such, in Rural Centre and Minor Rural Centres, subject to all other relevant material considerations, it is considered that there is a case to be made that conflict with relevant settlement hierarchy policies should not be given significant weight, under the circumstances of a lack of five-year housing supply and in light of paragraph 14 of the NPPF and the test of significant demonstrable harm. This is consistent with the recent appeal decision in Melbourn where the Inspector said that as the rural settlement policies are out of date due to a lack of five-year supply, but that the conflict with those policies “carried limited weight”. However, given the limited sustainability of Group and Infill villages, there is a case to continue to resist proposals that would conflict with the rural settlement policies which would allow for unsustainable forms of development, unless there are particular site specific considerations that indicate that there would not be significant demonstrable harm.
43. Notwithstanding the above, each planning application must be considered on its own merits taking account of local circumstances and all other relevant material considerations.

Principle of development

44. The site is located in the countryside, outside the Guilden Morden Development Framework, although adjacent to and opposite on its northern boundary, where Policy DP/7 of the LDF and Policy S/7 of the Draft Local Plan states that only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted.
45. Guilden Morden is identified as a Group Village under Policy ST/6 of the LDF and Policy S/8 of the Draft Local Plan, one of four categories of rural settlements. The rural settlements, in terms of preference for housing provision, are placed behind the edge of Cambridge and new town of Northstowe. Group Villages are less sustainable settlements than Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, having fewer services and facilities and allowing only some of the day-to-day needs of residents to be met without the need to travel outside the village. As noted under paragraphs 79-90, Guilden Morden has only relatively limited facilities and services, with no secondary school, and limited easily accessible public transport services.
46. Development in Group Villages is normally limited to schemes of up to 8 dwellings, or in exceptional cases 15, where development would make best use of a single brownfield site. This planning objective remains important and is consistent with the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development, by limiting the scale of development in less sustainable rural settlements with a limited range of services to meet the needs of new residents in a sustainable manner. In this case the proposal to develop a scheme for up to 30 dwellings is considered unsustainable due to the relatively low level of services and facilities in the village. Therefore existing Policies ST/6 and DP/7 which form part of a suite of policies to control the distribution and scale of new housing can be afforded considerable weight since they contribute to ensuring that development is sustainably located and unsustainable locations are avoided. When set against the NPPF the proposal also therefore fails as it cannot be considered to be a sustainable location capable of supporting a development of this size. These considerations weigh significantly against the scheme.
47. The Local Plan Village Classification Report June 2012, informed by the Village Services and Facilities Study, reviewed the settlement hierarchy in the adopted Core Strategy 2007, and as part of this considered where individual villages should sit within the hierarchy. The NPPF requires that 'planning policies and decisions should actively manage patterns of growth to make fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.'
48. Whilst the village of Guilden Morden was not referenced specifically within the Report, the document did however provide criteria used in the assessment of the sustainability of settlements within the district. These were public transport, secondary education, village services and facilities, and employment. Furthermore the Report concluded that Guilden Morden did not merit consideration for a higher status within the settlement hierarchy, remaining as classified as a Group Village.
49. Development within group villages such as Guilden Morden is normally limited to schemes of up to 8 dwellings (up to 15 in exceptional circumstances on brownfield sites). This planning objective remains important and is consistent with the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development, by limiting the scale of development in less sustainable rural settlements with a more limited range of services to meet the needs of new residents in a sustainable manner than in Rural

Centres. Within the context of the lack of a five year housing land supply, officers are of the view that sites on the edges of more sustainable Minor Rural and Rural Centres can accommodate more than the indicative maximum of 30 units allowed under policy ST/5 and still achieve the definition of sustainable development due to the level of services and facilities provided in these villages. Due to the lack of facilities and services in group villages generally and Guilden Morden specifically, it is considered that significant increases beyond the indicative numbers in adopted policy ST/6 does not, as a matter of principle, comply with the definition of sustainable development in the NPPF.

Deliverability

50. There are no known technical constraints to the site's delivery. Officers are therefore of the view that the site can be delivered within a timescale whereby significant weight can be given to the contribution the proposal could make to the 5 year housing land supply.
51. The environmental issues are assessed in the following sections of the report but specifically in relation to the loss of higher grade agricultural land, policy NE/17 states that the District Council will not grant planning permission for development which would lead to the irreversible loss of grade 2 (in this case) agricultural land unless :
 - a. Land is allocated for development in the Local Development Framework
 - b. Sustainability considerations and the need for the development are sufficient to override the need to protect the agricultural value of the land.
52. Whilst the substantive issues are discussed in detail in the remainder of this report, it is considered that, given the sustainable location of the site for residential development and the fact that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, the loss of agricultural land can only be given limited weight in this instance.

Sustainability of development

53. The NPPF states that there are 3 dimensions to sustainable development, economic, social and environmental. The aspects are considered in the assessment of highlighted issues below.
54. Policy DP/1 of the adopted Local Development Framework and Policy S/3 of the Draft Local Plan set out the principle of sustainable development. Although in respect of DP/1 1a. The policy relates to the supply of housing, in that it refers to the sequential approach to development, and therefore in this respect can be considered out of date; the remainder of the objectives of the policy are consistent with the aims of the NPPF in promoting sustainable development. Officers are therefore of the view that this policy can be given significant weight in the determination of this application.

Economic.

55. The provision of up to 30 new dwellings will give rise to employment during the construction phase of the development, and has the potential to result in an increase in the use of local services and facilities, both of which will be of benefit to the local economy.

Social Aspects.

Provision of new housing

56. Paragraph 55 of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas advising '*housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities*', and recognises that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.
57. The development would provide a clear benefit in helping to meet the current housing shortfall in South Cambridgeshire through delivering up to 30 residential dwellings. 40% of these units will be affordable (12 units). The affordable housing can be secured through a Section 106 Agreement. Officers are of the view the provision of up to 30 houses, including the affordable dwellings, is a benefit and significant weight should be attributed to this in the decision making process.
58. Policy HG/2 of the current LDF requires the mix of market dwellings within developments to be split 40% (at least) 1 or 2 bed and approximately 25% 3 bed and the same for 4 or more bed properties. Policy H/8 of the emerging Local Plan is being given significant weight in the determination of planning applications however, due to the limited nature of the unresolved objections to the policy, in accordance with the guidance contained within paragraph 216 of the NPPF. This policy requires a minimum of 30% of each of the three size thresholds to be provided, with the remaining 10% allocated flexibly across developments.
59. This proposal would allocate the following mix to the market housing within the scheme: 54% 1 and 2 bedrooms (16), 23% 3 bedrooms (7) and 23% 4 bedrooms (7). Clearly this equates to any under provision of larger properties when assessed against either the existing or the emerging policy on housing mix.
60. In Guilden Morden, according to data was taken from the 2011 census, 36% of the housing stock in the village is 3 bedrooms in size and 38% have 4 or more bedrooms. Taking the District as a whole, 37% of the housing stock in South Cambridgeshire is 3 bedrooms in size, 33% is 4 or more bedrooms in size.
61. This evidence appears to corroborate the supporting text of emerging policy H/8 which states that 'housing stock (in the District) has traditionally been dominated by larger detached and semi-detached houses. Whilst recent developments have helped to increase the stock of smaller properties available, the overall imbalance of larger properties remains. The 2011 census for example identifies that 75% of the housing stock' are detached or semi-detached houses and bungalows, with 18% terraced homes and 6% flats or maisonettes.'
62. The number of 4 bedroom properties in this scheme does not meet the minimum requirement as set out in local policy. However, Within the context of sustainable development, it is considered that there is clear evidence of an oversupply of larger properties within the District generally and Guilden Morden specifically. Paragraph 50 of the NPPF also requires planning authorities to 'plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs for different groups in the community' and to 'identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand.'
63. Public open space is shown on the indicative layout plan, and this will need to be secured through a Section 106 agreement, along with off-site and maintenance contributions where appropriate. The adopted Open Space SPD requires the provision of approximately 750 square metres of open space for a development on the scale proposed. The indicative proposal would provide 2500 square metres of open

space. However, as the density in parts of the site would need to be reduced to ensure adequate separation distances between properties (plots 21-30), this amount would reduce at the reserved matters stage. Nevertheless, it is considered that the amount of open space in the final scheme would at least meet the policy compliant level of provision. Given that Guilden Morden has an identified shortfall in play space and informal open space, this level of provision is considered to be a significant social benefit of the proposals, particularly the provision of the equipped play space within an area that is substantially greater than the level of open space required by the SPD.

64. Paragraph 204 of the NPPF relates to the tests that local planning authorities should apply to assess whether planning obligations should be sought to mitigate the impacts of development. In the line with the CIL regulations 2010, the contributions must:
- necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms
 - directly related to the development
 - Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed.
65. The County Council as Education Authority has confirmed that there is capacity within the pre-school, primary school (Guilden Morden) and secondary school (Bassingbourn Village College), as well as within the library service in terms of lifelong learning facilities. This factor would weigh in favour of the social sustainability of the scheme.
66. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF states that the social dimension of sustainable development includes the creation of a high quality built environment with accessible local services. The Urban Design Officer has raised no objection about the proposed development of the site for 29 dwellings, in terms of the resultant form of development.
67. The matter of the sustainability of the site in terms of access to local services is discussed further below.

Environmental.

Impact on character of the village and landscape

68. The application proposes new housing at a density of approximately 17 dwellings per hectare (dph). Policy HG/1 requires new developments to make best use of the site by achieving average net densities of at least 30 dph unless there are exceptional local circumstances that require a different treatment. Policy H/7 of the Draft Local Plan confirms that density requirement, but states that it may vary on a site where justified by the character of the locality, the scale of the development or other local circumstances.
69. Both Policy HG/1 and H/7 are considered to be policies that relate to the supply of housing, and are therefore to be considered as being out of date. However, one the aims of the policy is to the need to respond to local character, which is supported by the aims of the NPPF as identified below, and Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the adopted LDF. Policies DP/2 and DP/3 are not considered to be housing supply policies and are not therefore considered to be out of date. Officers are of the view that considerable weight can therefore be given to Policy HG/1 and H/7 where the proposed density of a particular development compromises local character and the aims of paragraph 58 of the NPPF which states that it should be ensured that developments respond to local character, and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials.

70. Policy DP/2 of the LDF states that all new developments should preserve or enhance the character of the local area; conserve or enhance important environmental assets of the site; and be compatible with its location in terms of scale, mass and form.
71. Policy DP/3 of the LDF states that planning permission will not be granted where the proposed development would, amongst other criteria, have an unacceptable adverse on village character, the countryside and landscape character.
72. The site is subject to extensive tree and hedge planting, with mature tree belts most prominent on the eastern, western and southern boundaries, which screen the site to a significant extent from views along Trap Road. The presence of existing and surrounding residential properties and extensive planting, combined with the appearance of the paddock land opposed to the open agricultural fields to the south, means the site does not read as part of the wider countryside.
73. The site is located on the edge of the village and the approach to the site from the south is rural in character, with properties to the south and east set in substantial plots and open fields separating this part of the village from the High Street (which has a prevailing linear pattern of development) to the west. Development along Church Street and Church Lane is relatively dense although an area of open space associated with the development on Thompsons Meadow provides a sense of openness adjacent to the village framework.
74. The Urban Design and Landscape Team have raised no objection to the proposal, noting the screened nature of the site, following amendments to the indicative design and relocation of the public open space to the eastern portion of the site, ensuring the preservation of the protected trees. It is acknowledged that the density in the central portion of the site would need to be reduced to achieve adequate separation distances between the dwellings. However, as the Design Officer concludes, due to the low density of the scheme, there is no objection to the principle of erecting 30 units on the site from a layout and landscape character point of view.
75. In respect of conservation areas, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to pay "special attention to the desirability of preserving the character and appearance of that area". It is considered that the amended indicative layout would not have any adverse affect on the setting of the conservation area, which is located in excess of 160 metres from the site. The application site is well screened and is separated from the conservation area by the modern housing development which extends north of Thompsons Meadow. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to pay "special regard to the desirability of preserving the (listed) building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses". The grade II listed Dove Cottage (north of the site) is separated from the site by an area of open space which is extensive enough to ensure that its setting would not be adversely affected by the proposed scheme. No other listed buildings would be adversely affected by the proposals.
76. Officers are of the view that the illustrative scheme demonstrates that the site is capable of providing the proposed number of dwellings, having regard to the constraints of the site, and in manner which would not materially detract from the rural character of the area or setting of the village, in accordance with the aims of Policies CH/3, CH/4, CH/5, DP/2 and DP/3.

Residential amenity

77. The application is in outline and therefore the layout plan submitted is for illustrative purposes only. However, officers need to be satisfied at this stage that the site is capable of accommodating the amount of development proposed, without having a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of occupiers of adjacent properties.
78. The submitted drawings demonstrate that the site could accommodate the amount of development proposed without having an unreasonable impact on residential amenity through overlooking or overbearing impact. As stated previously this would require a revision to the layout of the central part of the development as currently indicated, but there is space within the site to achieve this given the low density of the development. Adequate separation distances would be retained to the neighbouring properties to the north, south and east of the site and the retention of the majority of the established tree belt on the boundaries of the site would emphasise the sense of separation. The proposals therefore accord with the relevant amenity criteria of policy DP/3 of the Local Development Framework

Services and Facilities

79. Paragraph 55 of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas advising *'housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities'*, and recognises that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.
80. An appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the erection of 26 dwellings on a site at 7 Station Road Over was dismissed in February 2013 (S/0440/12/FL). In dismissing the appeal the Inspector identified 3 key areas where he considered Over being deficient in terms of meeting the requirements for a sustainable location, those being; sources of employment in the vicinity; the nearest secondary school; and services fulfilling anything other than the most basic shopping trips. These requirements and the criteria outlined within The Local Plan Village Classification Report June 2012 have informed the assessment of whether Guilden Morden is a sustainable location.
81. Guilden Morden village is served by relatively few services and facilities but includes a village hall, church, primary school, recreation ground, a grocery store (currently closed – closure has occurred since this application was submitted), a pub (at the time of writing this report this is currently closed) and 2 allotment garden sites.
82. This relative lack of services and employment opportunities is reflected in Guilden Morden being designated a 'Group Village' in the Core Strategy settlement hierarchy. Group villages are described as *'generally less sustainable locations for new development than Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, having fewer services and facilities allowing only some of the basic day-to-day requirements of their residents to be met without the need to travel outside the village'*, and new housing proposals are restricted to limited development which will help maintain remaining services and facilities.
83. Whilst the village is served by some community and social facilities, it is deficient in its function to provide significant sources of employment, secondary education and services to fulfil other than the most basic shopping trip. As such, journeys out of the village would be a regular necessity for the majority of residents in order to access many day-to-day services.

84. The nearest settlement that would offer services and social facilities, including sources of employment and secondary education, to possibly meet day-to-day needs would be the Minor Rural Centre of Bassingbourn, located approximately 5 miles to the south east. Beyond this, Royston is approximately 9.5 miles from Guilden Morden
85. A school bus service connects Guilden Morden to the nearest secondary school, Bassingbourn Village College.
86. There is a bus stop on Trap Road, approximately 200m from the site. A service connects Guilden Morden to Royston, with 1 bus to Royston and 23 back at commuting times during the week, with an infrequent return service during the rest of the day. A similar service operates on a Saturday, with no service on a Sunday. The service between the village and Cambridge is extremely limited and would not allow commuting from the proposed development without access to private motor transport.
87. It is noted that Thompsons Meadow has a public footpath (on the opposite side of the road), connecting to Trap Road. The existing footpath network allows access to the bus stops referred to above from Thompsons Meadow however this requires crossing the road from the application site. The proposal involves the installation of a footway along the northern boundary of the site to improve connectivity and this would improve the sustainability of the scheme. Details of the extent of the footpath and details of the construction of the link within the highway can be secured by condition at this outline stage.
88. Given the distance to settlements that meet day to day functions however (outlined above), there is little potential for journeys to those locations from the development by bicycle or by foot. Whilst the bus stop is within a convenient distance and accessible given the public footpath and street lighting, the choice of routes and frequency are limited to an extent that reduces the connectivity of the site overall, despite the proposed localised footpath improvements. Furthermore, 2011 Census data regarding modes of transport to work indicate a reliance on private vehicles, with approximately 70% of the working population in work traveling by car or van. Given the above, alternative means of transport to private vehicles would not provide a sufficiently attractive or convenient option for residents.
89. Whilst Guilden Morden is subject to a school bus service to Bassingbourn, providing some offering to students opposed to private vehicular transport, the limited potential for journeys by bicycle or by foot, as identified above, remains relevant.
90. In conclusion, the proposal site is an unsustainable location for the scale of housing proposed, conflicting with the aims of the NPPF, failing to meet the environmental role of sustainable development and the aims of Policies DP/1, DP/7 and ST/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007. As such, the harm resulting from the unsustainable location is significant .

Access and Transport

91. The Highways Authority raises no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of conditions regarding construction of the proposed drive and submission of a traffic management plan. The proposal is thereby acceptable in this regard.
92. A footpath is provided from the proposed access to join up with the existing footpath which currently ends just south of the junction onto Cambridge Road/High Street. This can be secured by condition.

Surface water drainage

93. The site lies in Flood Zone 1.
94. The Lead Local Flood Authority raises no objection to the proposal, subject to the imposition of conditions regarding restriction in run-off and surface water storage and details of long term maintenance arrangements for any parts of the surface water drainage system which will not be adopted.

The Council's Drainage Manager raises no objection to the proposal, subject to the imposition of a condition requiring details of the surface water drainage system. The proposal is thereby acceptable in this regard.

Foul water drainage

95. Anglian Water raises no objection to the proposal, stating there is capacity for Wastewater Treatment and Foul Sewerage. The proposal is thereby acceptable in this regard.

Ecology and Trees

96. The Ecology Officer raises no objection to the proposal. The proposal is thereby acceptable in this regard.
97. The Tree Officer has raised no objections to the proposals following a revision to the indicative masterplan and a reduction in the number of units proposed, which ensure that adequate separation could be retained to the protected trees on the northern and eastern boundaries and the mature planting on the other boundaries of the site. Details of the means of protection of existing trees during the construction of the development and once the scheme is occupied could be secured at the outline stage and details of new planting at the reserved matters stage, had the principle of development been considered acceptable.

Renewable Energy

98. The applicant has indicated that the scheme will have regard for Policy NE/3 and the requirement of renewable technologies, but has stated that this can only be resolved at the detailed stage as further design and layout information becomes available.
99. Officers are of the view that this matter can be dealt with by condition, however the detailed layout and orientation of dwellings should seek to maximise energy saving possibilities.

Other Constraints

100. Consultees have also suggested a number of other conditions in the event the application was to be approved. These include matters relating to archaeology (paragraph 20 above), construction details (paragraph 24) and contamination (paragraph 25). These are all considered to meet the relevant tests and would need to be imposed if permission was granted.

Planning Obligations

101. From 6 April 2015, the use of 'pooled' contributions toward infrastructure projects has been restricted. Previously, LPAs had been able to combine planning obligation

contributions towards a single item or infrastructure 'pot'. However, under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 123(3), LPAs are no longer be able to pool more than five planning obligations together if they were entered into since 6 April 2010, and if it is for a type of infrastructure that is capable of being funded by the CIL. These restrictions apply even where an LPA does not yet have a CIL charging schedule in place.

102. The Section 106 Officer has confirmed that there have not been 5 Section 106 agreements in respect of developments in the village of Guilden Morden since 6 April 2010 contributing towards (i) offsite open space and (ii) offsite indoor community space improvements.
103. Planning Practice Guidance requires that 'In all cases, including where tariff style charges are sought (which could apply in Guilden Morden), the local planning authority must ensure that the obligation meets the relevant tests for planning obligations in that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind'. It goes on to say that 'Planning obligations must be fully justified and evidenced' and as such the LPA take the view that a project should be identified in order to ensure CIL compliance.
104. Appendix 1 provides details of the developer contribution required to make the development acceptable in planning terms in accordance with Policy DP/4 of the LDF and paragraph 204 of the NPPF. Following consultation with Guilden Morden Parish Council, it has been identified that there is a project to provide outdoor gym equipment at the recreation ground and improve the existing outdoor bike activity area. Given the deficit in open space and play provision within the village (as identified in the Open Space and Recreation Study of 2013 commissioned by the Council), it is considered that securing a contribution commensurate with the anticipated population arising from the development would be reasonable, if the scheme was to be approved. The total pooled contribution towards the provision of these facilities would be £33,000.
105. In relation to outdoor community facilities, the Parish Council have identified the need for a new play area, replacing the existing facility adjacent to the primary school which is no longer in a condition that is fit for use. A tariff contribution based on the anticipated population increase arising from the scheme of £49,000 towards this scheme could be secured by a Section 106 agreement.
106. In term of indoor facilities, a 2009 audit commissioned by the District Council recommended that 111 square metres of indoor space should be provided per 1000 people. The audit identified a shortage in provision of indoor community space in Guilden Morden and the Parish Council have identified the installation of a solar PV system as a project to which a pooled contribution could be sought, commensurate with the anticipated population increase from this development. This contribution would be in the region of £13,500 and could be secured via the Section 106 agreement.
107. Household Waste Receptacles charged at £72.50 per dwelling and a monitoring fee of approximately £500 (dependent on number of Council employee hours involved) would also be applied.

Other Matters

108. The recommendation for refusal of this planning application is considered to be consistent with the strategy that the Local Planning Authority has pursued in relation

to resisting larger scale development in the less sustainable group and infill villages.

109. An appeal decision relating to an application for outline planning permission for up to 95 dwellings (reduced to 75) at Land off Shepreth Road in Foxton was dismissed earlier this year. Foxton is a Group Village. The inspector concluded that, due to serious harm to the setting of the listed Foxton House, the proposal did not comprise sustainable development.
110. The Foxton appeal started on the 31 July 2015, with statements due on the 11 September 2015 and the inquiry evidence given on the 12 January 2016 and held on the 9 February 2016.
111. Given the date of the Foxton appeal, it is considered that both the application and appeal pre-date the Court of Appeal decision (*Richborough v Cheshire East and Suffolk Coastal DC v Hopkins Homes*) dated 17 March 2016. As such the local authority in presenting the statements and inquiry evidence and the inspector's assessment of these particulars, did not benefit from this ruling and in particular to recognition by the Court of Appeal that out of date housing supply policies can still be given weight- even considerable weight – if they still maintain a planning function.
112. It is considered that policy ST/6 and DP/7 still maintain an important and valid function because they ensure that development is sustainably located and unsustainable locations are avoided. This matter was not addressed in considering this appeal. As such, the relevance of that decision and the desirability in principle of consistency in decision making is outweighed by the fact that this important factor was not addressed or considered in earlier appeal decisions. Following the decision of the Court of Appeal, it is necessary in all cases to consider what weight should be attached to out of date housing supply policies having regard inter alia to whether they still fulfil a planning function.
113. Notwithstanding the timing of the Foxton appeal decision, that village has access to a mainline railway station with a regular service to Cambridge and London. This is considered to be a significant point in concluding that, although both Group Villages, Foxton could be considered a far more environmentally sustainable location for development than Guilden Morden.
114. A decision to allow up to 35 dwellings in Duxford (also a Group Village) was also decided on a timescale which ensured that the Local Planning Authority's defence was made prior to the Court of Appeal decision referred to above. The Inspector in that case considered that policy ST/6 should be afforded limited weight due to its 'out of date' status. However, Duxford has a much more frequent bus service and therefore occupants of the development approved would be able to access a wide range of facilities far more easily and in a more sustainable fashion than would be the case in this application. The Duxford decision is considered to emphasise that the impact of a proposed development on each settlement must be considered on its own merits, including villages that fall within the same broad category within the defined settlement hierarchy. As such, applying significant weight to Core Strategy ST/6 in determining this application on the edge of Guilden Morden is not inconsistent with the Duxford decision, as the purpose of the policy is compliant with the NPPF and it is considered that additional harm has been identified in this case.
115. An appeal for outline planning permission for up to 30 dwellings on land at 18 Boxworth End, Swavesey was allowed, also earlier this year, after the Foxton decision. The majority of the site is located within the countryside and Swavesey is currently designated as a Group Village. The appeal was allowed and planning

permission granted, with the inspector concluding that the development would represent sustainable development.

116. With respect to those appeal sites not being considered unsustainable locations, their individual merits in terms of availability and accessibility of services, public transport links and employment opportunities are not comparable in this instance. Furthermore, each site is assessed on its individual merits.
117. It is also considered important to note that Swavesey is proposed to be re-classified as a Minor Rural Centre in the emerging Local Plan under Policy ST/5, an upgrade from its current status as a Group Village in the current LDF. This reflects an assessment that this village is considered to be a more sustainable location than Guilden Morden or the other villages which it is proposed to retain in that category of hierarchy of settlements. Swavesey has a greater range of services and facilities and superior public transport links than the level of provision in Guilden Morden. Therefore officers consider that giving significant weight to Core Strategy policy ST/6 in this case is not inconsistent with the definition of sustainable development.
118. Finally, the most recent appeal decision where housing land supply was a key consideration was at Melbourn for an outline application for 199 dwellings and a care home. In allowing the appeal, the inspector gave only "limited weight" to the conflict with Policy ST/5. This decision can also be distinguished from the present case as it involved a Minor Rural Centre and not a Group Village and does not implicitly alter the strategic approach to policy ST/6 and the protection of the smaller, less sustainable villages from inappropriate levels of development.

Conclusion

119. In considering this application, the following relevant adopted development plan policies are to be regarded as out of date while there is no five year housing land supply:
120. ST/6: Group Villages – indicative maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings
DP/1 – Sustainable Development (by virtue of paragraph (1a))
DP/7: Village Frameworks
HG/1: Density
HG/2: Housing Mix
NE/6: Biodiversity
NE/17: Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
CH/2: Archaeological Sites
CH/4 Setting of Listed Buildings
CH/5 Conservation Areas
NE/17 Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
121. This means that where planning permission is sought which would be contrary to the policies listed above, such applications must be determined against paragraph 14 of the NPPF.
122. For the reasons outlined in the main body of this report, officers are of the view that significant weight can be given to Policies ST/6 and DP/7 in this case. Officers have identified in the report the areas where they consider that significant and demonstrable harm will result from the proposal, in terms of the unsustainable location for a development of the scale proposed.

- 123 In coming to this view officers have had regard to the recent Court of Appeal decision in assessing the weight that can be given to housing supply policies that are out of date. Nonetheless, these adverse impacts must be weighed against the potential benefits of the development outlined in the preceding section of this report.
- 124 In this respect, officers are mindful that the Parish Council remains unanimously in support of the application. It is noted that it considers that the revised scheme has addressed key points raised at a village meeting and that the additional homes are seen as a welcome way to increase the sustainability of the village and provide the number and mix of homes identified in a 2015 survey.
- 125 While this is a very balanced decision, in this case the adverse impacts of the development are still considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole. Although the development would provide a larger number of dwellings to meet the identified shortfall in supply and this is a benefit, this increase would equally compound the concerns that Guilden Morden is not a sustainable location for the scale of development proposed.
- 126 Planning permission should therefore on balance be refused because material considerations do not clearly outweigh the substantial harm identified, and conflict with out of date policies of the LDF. Officers have outlined in paragraphs 41 why Policies ST/6 and DP/7 should still be given significant weight in this case.

Recommendation

Officers recommend that the Planning Committee should refuse the proposal for the following reasons.

1. Guilden Morden is identified as a Group Village in the Adopted Core Strategy DPD 2007, where Policy ST/6 states that development is normally restricted to groups of a maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings within the village framework. The proposed site is outside the village framework of Guilden Morden where DP/7 of the adopted Development Control Policies DPD development restricts development to uses which need to be located in the countryside. The Council recognises that the aforementioned policies are currently considered out of date, and that the application therefore needs to be determined in accordance with paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. However, the Council is of the view that considerable weight can be given to Policy ST/6 as it continues to fulfil a planning objective in and is consistent with the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development, by limiting the scale of development in less sustainable rural settlements with a limited range of services to meet the needs of new residents in a sustainable manner. Some weight can also be given to Policy DP/7 as it continues to fulfil a planning objective of limiting development, and is also consistent with the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Council also recognises that Policy DP/1 is out of date in so far as DP/1 1a. relates to the supply of housing, however in all other respects the Council is of the view that Policy DP/1 is consistent with the aims of the NPPF in respect of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, and therefore significant weight can be given to Policy DP/1 as it continues to fulfil a planning objective consistent with the NPPF.

In this case the scale of the development proposed is considered not to represent a sustainable form of development in Guilden Morden. Although some local community and social facilities are available, the services in Guilden Morden have been found deficient in three areas, which are likely to generate regular journeys. These are the lack of significant sources of employment in the vicinity, the nearest secondary school being Bassingbourn Village College, and that anything other than the most basic shopping trip not being able to be fulfilled within the village. As such, journeys out of the village would be a regular necessity for the majority of residents in order to access many day-to day services. Due to the irregularity of public transport services in the village, alternative means of transport to private vehicles would not provide a sufficiently attractive or convenient option to future residents. On this basis the proposal is considered to materially and demonstrably conflict with the aims of the NPPF as it fails to meet the environmental role of sustainable development and Policies DP/1, DP/7 and ST/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007, which are all policies which are considered to continue to fulfil a planning objective in terms of securing development is located sustainably. Any benefits arising from the development are considered to be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the identified harm.

Background Papers:

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted January 2007)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Planning File Ref: S/0191/16/OL

Report Author:

David Thompson

Principal Planning Officer

Telephone Number:

01954 713250