

South Cambridgeshire Hall  
Cambourne Business Park  
Cambourne  
Cambridge  
CB23 6EA  
  
t: 03450 450 500  
f: 01954 713149  
[www.scambs.gov.uk](http://www.scambs.gov.uk)



South  
Cambridgeshire  
District Council

3 May 2019

To: Chairman – Councillor John Batchelor  
Vice-Chairman – Councillor Pippa Heylings  
All Members of the Planning Committee - Councillors Dr. Martin Cahn,  
Peter Fane, Bill Handley, Brian Milnes, Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts,  
Peter Topping, Heather Williams and Nick Wright

Quorum: 3

Dear Councillor

This is a supplement to the agenda dated 29 April 2019 for the next meeting of **PLANNING COMMITTEE**, which will be held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **WEDNESDAY, 8 MAY 2019 at 10.30 a.m.**

Members are respectfully reminded that when substituting on committees, subcommittees, and outside or joint bodies, Democratic Services must be advised of the substitution ***in advance of*** the meeting. It is not possible to accept a substitute once the meeting has started. Council Standing Order 4.3 refers.

Yours faithfully  
**Mike Hill**  
Interim Chief Executive

**The Council is committed to improving, for all members of the community, access to its agendas and minutes. We try to take all circumstances into account but, if you have any specific needs, please let us know, and we will do what we can to help you.**

#### AGENDA SUPPLEMENT

	PAGES
5. <b>S/2487/18/RM - Linton (Land to the North and South of Bartlow Road)</b>	<b>1 - 16</b>

Approval of the matters reserved for the layout of the site, the scale and appearance of buildings and landscaping following outline planning permission S/1963/15/OL for up to 55 dwellings with landscape buffer and new vehicular access

#### EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The law allows Councils to consider a limited range of issues in private session without members of the Press and public being present. Typically, such issues relate to personal details, financial and business affairs, legal privilege and so on. In every case, the public interest in excluding the Press and Public from the meeting room must outweigh the public interest in having the information disclosed to them. The following statement will be proposed, seconded and voted upon.

"I propose that the Press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following item number(s) ..... in accordance with Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that, if present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph(s) ..... of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act."

If exempt (confidential) information has been provided as part of the agenda, the Press and public will not be able to view it. There will be an explanation on the website however as to why the information is exempt.

### **Notes**

- (1) Some development control matters in this Agenda where the periods of consultation and representation may not have quite expired are reported to Committee to save time in the decision making process. Decisions on these applications will only be made at the end of the consultation periods after taking into account all material representations made within the full consultation period. The final decisions may be delegated to the Corporate Manager (Planning and Sustainable Communities).
- (2) The Council considers every planning application on its merits and in the context of national, regional and local planning policy. As part of the Council's customer service standards, Councillors and officers aim to put customers first, deliver outstanding service and provide easy access to services and information. At all times, we will treat customers with respect and will be polite, patient and honest. The Council is also committed to treat everyone fairly and justly, and to promote equality. This applies to all residents and customers, planning applicants and those people against whom the Council is taking, or proposing to take, planning enforcement action. More details can be found on the Council's website under 'Council and Democracy'.

# Agenda Item 5

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

8 May 2019

**AUTHOR/S:** Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

**Application Number:** S/2487/18/RM

**Parish(es):** Linton

**Proposal:** Approval of the matters reserved for the layout of the site, the scale and appearance of buildings and landscaping following outline planning permission S/1963/15/OL for up to 55 dwellings with landscape buffer and new vehicular access.

**Site address:** Land to the North and South of Bartlow Road

**Applicant(s):** Abbey Developments Ltd.

**Recommendation:** Approval

**Key material considerations:** Affordable Housing  
Market Housing Mix  
Character and Appearance of the Area  
Design Considerations  
Ecology  
Trees and Landscaping  
Highway Safety  
Flood Risk  
Archaeology  
Neighbour Amenity  
Heritage Assets

**Committee Site Visit:** Members visited the site on 9 April 2019

**Departure Application:** No

**Presenting Officer:** Karen Pell-Coggins, Senior Planning Officer

**Application brought to Committee because:** The officer recommendation of approval conflicts with the recommendation of Linton Parish Council and the Local Member has requested that the application is considered by committee as it is of local interest.

**Date by which decision due:** 10 May 2019 (Extension of Time agreed)

### Update to Report

#### Consultation – Paragraphs 9, 10, 12 and 19

1. **Linton Parish Council** – Please see the attached comments.

**Landscape Design Officer** – Has the following comments:-

2.

***ACD Environmental Dwgs***

Land Adjacent to Bartlow Road, Linton – Soft Landscape Proposals-  
ABBEY21616 111 Sheets 1-5 Rev L

***Landscape Layout***

Further to the amendments shown on the above drawings, revision L, the soft landscape is acceptable and I have no further comments on the layout of Soft landscape Proposals.

***Planting specification***

Many of the native shrub species – Hawthorn, Dogwood, Hazel, Blackthorn, Guelder Rose, Elder- are specified as pot grown plants from 3-7.5 ltrs, and up to 3 plants per/m<sup>2</sup>. I am not aware that many of these plants are available as pot grown specimens, and even if available, suggest that the cost, particularly of 5 -7.5ltr plants, would be prohibitive.

Native shrubs and hedging plants should be supplied as bare rooted whips 400-600mm or 600-800mm. These should be planted as per the matrix shown on ABBEY21616 111 sheet 3 for woodlands and scrub, and as a double staggered row at 400mm spacing as suggested for hedgerows. Where the hedgerows are at risk from trampling or cutting through by pedestrians, planting should be either side of a three strand post and wire fence as stated in the landscape specification, paragraph 3.15. All bare root plants would benefit from root dip and the addition of water retaining granules in the backfill

All Holly should be supplied as pot grown plants 2-3ltr.

All whips and trees will require protection from rabbits.

All standard trees in mown grass areas should be fitted with strimmer guards.

***Landscape Maintenance***

As previously commented, all grass areas, plants, whips and trees should be watered as often as is required to ensure establishment and healthy growth throughout the year. Watering should be to field capacity without waterlogging, rather than the amounts suggested at paragraph 8.15 in the soft landscape maintenance document.

3.

***Urban Design Officer*** – Has the following comments: -

- i) Officers are generally supportive of the revisions following the Planning Committee which took place on 10 April 2019.
- ii) Officers consider that there have been improvements to the overall design and layout of the scheme.
- iii) The location of the garage for Plot 35 is located too close (4m) to Bartlow Road in stark contrast to the building line of the proposed and existing neighbouring dwellings on the south side of Bartlow Road, which are generally 8 to 10m distance from the road. This garage would be too prominent on Bartlow Road and inconsistent with the proposed pattern of neighbouring dwellings and garages. Officers request that the location of this garage is reconsidered or removed in order to maintain the characteristic of a continuous building line along the south side of Bartlow Road.
- iv) It would still be beneficial for the scheme to be assessed by the Council's Design Enabling Panel given the scale of the proposed development falls within Category A of the DEP Referral Criteria.

The application was deferred by the Planning Committee on 10 April 2019 for the following design related reasons:

- i) Height of the dwellings in the southern parcel facing Bartlow Road
- ii) Building line of the southern parcel does not align with the existing dwellings west of the site
- iii) Built form and architectural style not-in-keeping with the rural village location
- iv) Entrance to the village requires special care

The applicant has since submitted revised drawings for further assessment. The key drawings that Urban Design Officers referred to in the assessment comprise the following:

- Site layout drawing - Ref. 1552-101 rev M
- Site layout drawing - Ref. 1552-102 rev J
- Street elevation drawing - Ref 1552-104 rev F
- Street elevation drawing - Ref 1552-105 rev D

#### ***Height of the dwellings in the southern parcel facing Bartlow Road***

The applicant has replaced one of the 2.5-storey dwelling (House Type S25) on the Bartlow Road frontage with a part 1.5, part 2-storey dwelling, i.e. Plot 45 (House Type R4). This height reduction is considered to be an improvement.

#### ***Building line of the southern parcel does not align with the existing dwellings west of the site***

The revised layout indicates that the garages proposed for Plots 1 and 2 and 45 and 46 are set back from the associated dwellings and Bartlow Road. Their siting and scale reflect the building line of the existing dwellings located to the west of the proposed development.

The revised layout also indicates a reduction in the number of drives off Bartlow Road, this would help create a more rural character for the proposed development.

#### ***Built form and architectural style not-in-keeping with the rural village location***

The amended 'street elevations drawing' (ref. 1552-104 rev F) for elevation B-B indicates larger house types and a less dense, more spacious appearance of this built form at the west end of the south side of Bartlow Road. It also illustrates the reduction in height of the dwelling at Plot 45. This less dense arrangement of dwellings on the south side of Bartlow Road reflects the context of the site's location, i.e. close to the edge of the village and entrance to / from the countryside to the east.

In the revised layout, a new House Type R4 has been introduced to the southern parcel street frontage (Plots 1, 35 and 45) to better reflect the rural village location. House Type R4 is a 4-bedroom, Part 1.5, part 2-storey dwelling. Its dormer windows and materials i.e. clay roofing tiles, buff brick, dark timber boarding, etc are considered to be in keeping with the rural village character.

House type CL5 is now proposed instead of the C2 house type at Plot 2 along the Bartlow Road frontage. House type CL5 is a 5-bedroom 2-storey dwelling with hipped roof, clay roofing tiles and red brick. It is set within the building line of the proposed development along the Bartlow Road frontage. Its siting and appearance are considered satisfactory and is in keeping with the rural village character.

#### ***Entrance to the village require special care***

In the previous layout, there were ten dwellings in the southern parcel along Bartlow Road. The amended 'Layout at GF level' drawing (ref 1552-101 rev M) indicates that there are now only eight (instead of 10) dwellings on the south side of Bartlow Road. This reduction is considered to be an improvement on the appearance of the street frontage as it better reflects the site's edge of village location.

A revised house type (FARMSTEAD 1, drawing ref. 1552-126 rev A) is proposed for Plot 36. FARMSTEAD 1 replaces House Type HAF10 (apartments). FARMSTEAD 1 is a 3-bedroom, 2 storey-dwelling with clay roofing tiles, dark timber cladding and buff brick base. The siting and appearance of this dwelling is considered satisfactory and would tie in with the other two FARMSTEAD style dwellings in the northern parcel. This traditional architectural styled -dwelling is considered appropriate for the village entrance.

### ***Residential amenity standards***

The distance of Plot 45 and its garage to Bartlow Road is satisfactory. The rear garden size, its back-to-back distances with Plots 39 to 41 and its side-to-side distances with Plots 44 and 46, are considered satisfactory and comply with the amenity standards set out in the '*District Design Guide*' (2010).

Plot 1 – the siting of this dwelling and its garage is satisfactory. The rear garden size, its back-to-back distances with Plots 9 and 10 and its side-to-side distances with 78 Bartlow Road and Plot 2 are considered satisfactory and comply with the amenity standards set out in the '*District Design Guide*' (2010).

Plot 2 – Its rear garden size and back-to-back distance comply with the minimum standards set out in the '*District Design Guide*' (2010).

Plot 35 - Its rear garden size and distances with neighbouring dwellings comply with the minimum standards set out in the '*District Design Guide*' (2010).

Plot 36 - Its rear garden size complies with the minimum rear garden sizes set out in the '*District Design Guide*' (2010). The rear of the dwelling has a window to a habitable room which is 12m distance from the side elevation (containing no 1st floor habitable rooms) of Plot 34, which complies with the minimum side to side distances between dwellings in the Guide.

Plots 30 and 31 - Officers support the replacement of the dwelling (previously house type S2 at what was plot 32) with house type C2 for 2 semi-detached dwellings at plots 30 and 31. The rear garden size of the two gardens complies with guidance about minimum rear garden sizes in the '*District Design Guide*' (2010). The minimum side to side distances for habitable rooms between the dwellings and the proposed dwellings at plots 29 and 32 are satisfactory.

Plot 47 - The applicant has accepted Officers' previous advice and reduced the long parking drive and replaced this with rear garden space, as indicated in the amended 'Site layout at roof level' drawing (ref. 1552-102 rev J). The dwelling (FARMSTEAD 1 house type) has been relocated only a short (2m) distance (to the north) away from Bartlow Road which officers accept.

Plots 49 and 50 - The applicant has replaced the CL5 house type (5 bedrooms) for one dwelling with two semi-detached dwellings that are the C2 house type at Plots 49 and 50 with carports on either side. The rear garden size of the two gardens complies

with guidance about minimum rear garden sizes in the '*District Design Guide*' (2010). There are no first floor habitable rooms facing each other between Plots 48 and 49 and so the dwellings comply with '*District Design Guide*' guidance in relation to minimum side to side distances.

Plot 52 - Officers support the appearance of new House Type R4 which is proposed for this plot to replace house type S25 which represents a reduction in height. The rear garden size complies with guidance about minimum rear garden sizes in the '*District Design Guide*' (2010). The dwelling complies with minimum side to side distances for habitable rooms between the dwelling and the proposed dwellings at Plots 51 and 53. The location of the garage to the side of the dwelling is considered appropriate.

### **Concerns**

The new House Type R4 has been introduced to Plot 35 to replace House Type K3. Whilst the appearance of House Type R4 is supported, officers have concerns over the location of the garage proposed for Plot 35. It is located too close (4m) to Bartlow Road in contrast to the building line of the proposed and existing neighbouring dwellings on the south side of Bartlow Road, which are generally 8 to 10m from the road. This garage would be too prominent on Bartlow Road and is inconsistent with the proposed pattern of neighbouring dwellings and garages. The location of this garage should be reconsidered or removed in order to maintain the characteristic continuous building line along the south side of Bartlow Road.

4. **Local Highways Authority** – Comments on the latest drawings are awaited and members will be verbally updated at the meeting.

### **Planning Assessment – Paragraphs 44 and 57**

5. The dwellings, as amended, now all meet the residential space standards in terms of the size of the dwellings and room sizes.
6. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy H/12 of the Local Plan.
7. The applicants have suggested a revised arrangement to remove the garage to the front of Plot 35 and relocate it to the side of the garage to Plot 36 to address the Urban Design Officer's concerns. This is acceptable and the suggested layout will be shown at the meeting.
8. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan.

### **Recommendation – Paragraph 123**

9. Delegated approval subject to removal of the garage to the front of Plot 35 with the planning conditions and informatics as set out in the main report, with the final wording of any amendments to these to be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair prior to the issuing of planning permission.

### **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 Plan 2018

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)
- Planning File References: S/2487/18/RM and S/1963/15/OL

**Report Author:**

Karen Pell-Coggins  
Telephone Number:

Senior Planning Officer  
01954 713230

South Cambridgeshire Hall  
Cambourne Business Park  
Cambourne  
Cambridge,  
CB23 6EA  
[www.scambs.gov.uk](http://www.scambs.gov.uk)  
0345 045 5215



South  
Cambridgeshire  
District Council

25/04/19

Kathryn Wiseman,  
Linton Parish Council Clerk  
Village Hall  
15, Coles Lane  
Linton  
Cambridge  
Cambridgeshire  
CB21 4JS

Planning and New Communities  
Contact: Karen Pell-Coggins  
Direct Dial: 01954 713230  
Direct Email: [karen.pell-coggins@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:karen.pell-coggins@scambs.gov.uk)  
Our Ref: S/2487/18/RM  
Date: 23 April 2019

Dear Madam

**Proposal:** Approval of the matters reserved of the layout of the site, the scale and appearance of buildings, the means of access and landscaping following outline planning permission S/1963/15/OL for up to 55 dwellings with landscape buffer and new vehicular access.  
**Application Ref:** S/2487/18/RM  
**Location:** Land to the North and South of Bartlow Road, Linton, CB21 4LY  
**Applicant:** Steve Wood, Abbey Developments Ltd.

The above planning application has been amended. A copy of the revised plans is attached.

#### Revised design

Any comments that your Parish Council wishes to make should be made on this form and returned to the above address **not later than 14 days from the date of this letter.** (You should note that at the expiry of this period the District Council may determine the application.)

#### Comments of the Parish Council:

#### Recommendation of the Parish Council:- (please tick one box only)

Approve	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refuse	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Objections	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------	--------------------------	--------	-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------------------

Signed: ..... Date: ..... 31/5/19.....  
Clerk of the Parish Meeting

#### EXPLANATION OF APPLICATION SUFFIX

OL Outline  
FL Full  
RM Reserved Matters  
LB Listed Building Consent  
CA Conservation Area Consent  
AD Advertisement Consent

LD Lawful Development Certificate  
PA Prior Notification of Agricultural Development  
PD Prior Notification of Demolition Works  
PT Prior Notification of Telecommunications Development  
HZ Hazardous Substance Consent  
VC Variation or Removal of Condition  
DC Discharge of Condition

## Privacy Notice

### Who we are

This privacy notice explains how the Greater Cambridge Planning Service uses information in the course of providing planning services to Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils. This work includes:

- Making decisions and providing advice on planning applications
- Making planning policies
- Working with neighbourhoods on their plans
- Working with neighbouring authorities on strategic policies
- Responding to allegations of unlawful development
- Monitoring development
- Entering legal agreements, serving notices and promoting the best use of land

### Why we require this personal information?

We require personal data to process comments so that we know where the comment or information came from and can weigh the relevance of any comments made. We may use the information provided to contact you about the application you have commented on.

### What we do with this information

This information will be used by Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils in determining an application for planning permission. This function is known as a "public task" and is why we do not need you to "opt in" to allow this information to be used.

We process this information as a (Public task) Statutory Duty as laid out in the Town and Country Planning Act and we cannot process your comments unless you provide this personal information. If you do not or if you refuse to allow us to share information we will not be able to carry out the service for you.

We may process the information you provide to prevent and detect fraud in any of our systems and may supply information to government agencies, credit reference agencies, audit or other external bodies for such purposes. We participate in the governments National Fraud Initiative.

As we process this information as a statutory duty you hold the following rights with regard to the personal data provided to us when making comments:

#### Recommendation of the Parish Council:- (please tick one box only)

Approve	Refuse	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Objections	
---------	--------	-------------------------------------	---------------	--

Signed: ..... Date: 31/5/19  
Clerk of the Parish ..... of the Parish Meeting

#### EXPLANATION OF APPLICATION SUFFIX

OD	Outline	LD	Lawful Development Certificate
FL	Full	PA	Prior Notification of Agricultural Development
RM	Reserved Matters	PD	Prior Notification of Demolition Works
LB	Listed Building Consent	PT	Prior Notification of Telecommunications Development
CA	Conservation Area Consent	HZ	Hazardous Substance Consent
AD	Advertisement Consent	VC	Variation or Removal of Condition
		DC	Discharge of Condition

**Right to Access** – You have the right to access (receive a copy) of your personal data and supplementary information.

**Right to Rectification** – You have the right to have any inaccurate or incomplete personal data rectified.

**Right to Restriction** – You have the right to request a restriction of the processing of your personal data in situations where it is inaccurate, unlawful, and no longer needed for the purposes for which it was originally collected, or if a withdrawal of consent has been made.

The comments provided will form part of our public register of applications and, as such, will be open to public inspection at our offices and on our website and your comment will be attributed to your address. However, personal information including your name and contact details will be redacted in line with our redaction policy. In the event of an appeal, representations will be forwarded to the planning Inspectorate and the appellant. The planning Inspectorate may publish appeal documentation, including copies of representations received.

#### **How we share this information**

We do not sell information to other organisations. We do not move information beyond the UK. We do not use information for automated decision making.

We sometimes need to share the information we have with other departments within our Councils, for example to establish how long a building has been used as a dwelling or if you object to a proposal on noise grounds and we feel Environmental Health should be aware.

#### **Redaction ('blanking things out')**

We operate a policy where we routinely redact the following details before making forms and documents available online:

- Personal contact details – e.g. name, telephone numbers, email addresses
- Signatures
- Special Category Data - e.g. supporting statements that include information about health conditions or ethnic origin

#### **Retention ('how long we keep your information for')**

The Town and Country Planning Act requires us to hold most types of applications on our public register permanently. You can find out more by looking at our Retention Policy on our web sites.

#### **Recommendation of the Parish Council:- (please tick one box only)**

Approve	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refuse	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Objections	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------	--------------------------	--------	-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------------------

Signed: ..... Date: ..... 31/5/19.....  
Clerk of the Parish Council or Chairman of the Parish Meeting

#### EXPLANATION OF APPLICATION SUFFIX

OL	Outline	LD	Lawful Development Certificate
FL	Full	PA	Prior Notification of Agricultural Development
RM	Reserved Matters	PD	Prior Notification of Demolition Works
LB	Listed Building Consent	PT	Prior Notification of Telecommunications Development
CA	Conservation Area Consent	HZ	Hazardous Substance Consent
AD	Advertisement Consent	VC	Variation or Removal of Condition
		DC	Discharge of Condition

## **Complaints and problems**

You can find out more about how we handle your data by visiting the Council's Privacy Notice page on the web site

If you think we have got something wrong or if you are concerned with the way we are handling your data please contact us by emailing [applicationsupport@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:applicationsupport@cambridge.gov.uk) for Cambridge City applications and [planning@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:planning@scambs.gov.uk) for South Cambridgeshire District applications. Alternatively you can call us on the numbers above.

If you have a query regarding your rights please contact the Data Protection Officer who can be contacted by emailing [infogov@3cshardservices.org](mailto:infogov@3cshardservices.org) or you can write to the Council and mark your letter for the attention of the Data Protection Officer. Alternatively you can call 07864 604221 or 01954 713318.

If we fail to respond properly you can direct your concerns to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO).

### **Recommendation of the Parish Council:- (please tick one box only)**

Approve	Refuse	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Objections	
---------	--------	-------------------------------------	---------------	--

Signed: .....  
Clerk of the Par

Date: ..... 31/5/19 .....  
arish Meeting

### **EXPLANATION OF APPLICATION SUFFIX**

OL	Outline	LD	Lawful Development Certificate
FL	Full	PA	Prior Notification of Agricultural Development
RM	Reserved Matters	PD	Prior Notification of Demolition Works
LB	Listed Building Consent	PT	Prior Notification of Telecommunications Development
CA	Conservation Area Consent	HZ	Hazardous Substance Consent
AD	Advertisement Consent	VC	Variation or Removal of Condition
		DC	Discharge of Condition

S/2487/18/RM – Steve Wood, Abbey Developments Ltd – Land to the North and South of Bartlow Road, Linton – Amendment: Revised Design.

**LPC Comments:**

This application was taken to SCDC Planning Committee and referred by the committee to take this application to the independent design team. The developers had refused to take the design back to the independent design group, and this will now go to the SCDC full planning Committee meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> May. This is the reason for the receipt of the amendments.

**Response to amendments lodged 23rd April 2019**

The amended plans follow the SCDC Planning Committee decision of 10th April and were submitted without having been reviewed by the independent design panel, contrary to the decision of the committee. This is a lack of respect for SCDC Planning Committee. We are aware of the harm that this design will inflict on our valued landscape, and our objections have been disregarded.

The application was referred by the Planning Committee under category 1 (it is a medium to large scale development outside major growth sites). This is confirmed in the Urban Design Team comments. The Officer's report included an incorrect reference to the category applied by the Planning Committee stating that it is under category 2. The developer has followed that category rather than the correct category 1.

Also, the OL permission is for up to 55 dwellings: it does not mean that 55 dwellings are the only number that could be accepted. This permission was subject to conditions imposed to secure safe development of the site, which we do not consider to have been met.

All through the planning process the developer has failed to respond to the major objections of the design of this site - the houses are too high, with designs insensitive to the nature of the rural site and entrance to the village. The impact on the landscape will be seen over the wide views and across the valley, seen above the brow of the hill when approaching from Haverhill, occupying the valley from the A1307 and on the skyline from the village. The entrance to the village will change from soft countryside hedges to town designs with tame urban hedges and dominated by cars and drives.

The Granta is a rare and protected Chalk Stream, with Pocket Park across the river, a much used village-owned area for leisure and wildlife. Viewed from along the river, the houses will be seen on rising ground, magnifying their impact and overbearing on the slopes. From the village, the houses will be prominent along the road and on the skyline. This is at odds with the rest of the village, which nestles into the contours and is hardly noticeable from outside - unlike the impact of this site.

The illustrative plans do not show the true nature of the development. The site is to be built up substantially above the original ground levels, completely re-configuring the landscape with retaining walls, platforms and other engineering structures. The rise in levels are likely to be generally greater than 2m across the centre of the development with a substantial further built-up to create these platforms - potentially up to 6.5m across the area where the platforms are most prominent. Plot 45 down to plot 15 has a height difference of 7.6m in the first floor level.

We again note the lack of true section plans to demonstrate this.

The site will resemble terraces rising up the valley, with steps leading between levels. The housing will be on these terraces, overlooking houses and gardens below and particularly affecting the privacy of the Social Housing. (See attached plan LPC3). On the soft

landscaping plans, areas of green between housing are actually terraces of hard landscape, not green soakaway areas, exacerbating problems of surface water flooding through the site.

To the people in plots 6-10 and 37 - 43, the plots along Bartlow road will look like the 3rd and 4th floors of a 4 storey building. (a third floor would typically start at about 5m above ground level). The plots fronting Bartlow Rd have their ground floor 4.3 - 4.6m above the ground floor of the plots behind, so almost the equivalent height of a third floor. The illustrative aerial view doesn't show this type of drop, the fading out of the houses in the section views gives a misleadingly softer impression of their bulk and height.

The scale and massing of the proposed houses, their character regarding architectural detail and building materials does not reflect the existing streetscape and settlement character of Linton.

There have been some small changes, but insufficient to make the development acceptable in terms of design, effect on the valued landscape, impact on the skyline and setting of the village, and the long, existing rural views (identified as key characteristics of the area in the South Cambridgeshire District Council Design Guide SPD). The Public Inquiry on the Back Road application was won on the grounds of the effect of that development on the landscape.

These designs on this site would bring urban design of tall housing on raised terraces conspicuous, dominating the skyline and despoiling the wide views of the valued landscape - as the landscape consultant (See report by Liz Lake Associates) confirms:

*"The effects of the development on the residential views along Bartlow Road (VP1 and 2) are considered Major/Moderate Adverse in the LVIA due to the loss of the open views across the Granta Valley. They contribute to both the visual amenity of road user of the A1307 and Bartlow Road as well as the perception of Linton in its landscape setting. The setting of Barham Hall and Barham Cottage (VP10) which are Grade II\* and II listed buildings, respectively are also represented in these views".*

The road through the southern site will lead storm water into the site - the archaeology confirms the route of the ancient road through the southern field roughly follows the contours. This would be a better route, similar to that in the OL illustrative map without such flood potential and recognising the ancient history and importance of this area.

The surface water flooding has not been addressed (and areas of supposed soakaway are occupied by hard landscape terraces) and the effect on the aquifer has become more worrying. This is nominally only 1m below the previous ground level, now the topsoil has been removed it brings it closer to the building level. Houses will have to be built up on platforms to avoid their foundations breaching it.

The pumping station can't be accommodated below ground as it would be within the aquifer. So, either the pump will have to be above ground and conspicuous in the landscape (and already outside the developable area) or the any leakage of foul liquor from a below-ground system will jeopardise our clean water. This area is already short of water and any threat to the clean water of this area is worrying indeed. (See illustration of the Senior Pure flow system LPC4)

The design, together with the site layout and the matters previously raised, remains unacceptable, unsuited to the site, premature and undeliverable.

Compliance and deliverability has not been demonstrated in many aspects, including:

- Keeping within the approved site.
- Keeping outside of the 10m no dig, no plant zone around the gas pipe.

- Addressing the slopes of the site.
- Connecting this development to the existing village. Nothing is proposed and the previous link has been lost (although this did encroach upon neighbouring properties)
- Protecting residents and amenity areas against road noise. Nothing is proposed for external spaces.
- Protecting residents and homes against flooding. It relies on sorting details out later, if at all.
- Protecting residents against overlooking. Nothing is proposed and it is treated as a flat site.
- Dealing with accesses outside the 30mph zone, where shared with the Park and Ride and where there's cumulative impacts. Nothing is proposed and it is treated as a 30mph area.
- Providing sustainable drainage fit for purpose and without risk to existing and proposed users. The porosity tests aren't accepted yet and the lowest drainage relies on draining into clay river silt. The scheme is struggling with drainage even if they spread as they show outside the consented area.
- Protecting the aquifer nominally a metre below the *original* ground level, so approx. 2 feet below the current excavated level. Nothing is proposed.
- Providing a ramp access path suitable for its purpose - it is too contorted to be practical.
- Providing a viable maintenance management scheme especially now they propose to retain the front hedge. The proposal is to offload onto the Parish. Much of the hedge is in private properties so isn't protected at all.

Continuing issues, (revised) still not addressed in the recent amendments;

- Surface water flooding - Condition 10, regarding drainage has still to be discharged - a pre-construction requirement. Any building on this site is dependent upon the safe discharge of this condition. Any proposed drainage scheme must be brought back to committee for consideration and LPC need to be able to comment upon its suitability and potential efficacy
- Suitable peak season porosity testing has still not been completed
- The proposed surface water drainage scheme now mainly appears to consist of soakaways on private/residents land which can be built over, not maintained, etc.). These will not contain the known severe and acute flooding that is known to happen in this area
- The letter from the EA 27th November 2018 refers to a different scheme, the one with swales, etc., so is not relevant to the current application.
- On the Northern site, planting and the LEAP are within the 10m no-build, no-dig boundaries of the high-pressure gas pipe.
- Layout/site plans - The profile or section illustrations are not realistic. The sections do not extend far enough to show all the housing and omit the true impact of height differences and the engineering needed for the platforms.
- The effect of tall housing on a sloping site will be emphasised, especially when viewed from the Public Open Space, across the river, and from the village. In particular, the 2½ storey housing will be very prominent upon the skyline, especially on the northern site, which is only really suited to bungalows (needed and lucrative)
- The predominant views, from Pocket Park, the public space and wildlife area across the river, will be of car parks, bulwarks, platforms and tall houses.
- The flats on top of car parks are still in the scheme. They provide a poor quality inactive street scene, dominated by car parking, and unlike the character of this village (Design Guide e.g. para 6.82-84 pages 120 onwards).
- The extent of walls, steps, bulwarks, etc needed to build on a sloping site has not been fully illustrated - the built up platforms are not shown and careful fading misleadingly minimise their effect on the views and landscape.

- There are major and harmful differences between the indicative designs in the approved outline plans and those of the RM submission - these designs are cramped, bulky and too high for the site.
- Development outside permitted areas - See maps LPC1 and LPC2)  
This is seen at the boundaries of the southern site, the proposed pumping station, beyond the building line of current housing, etc. For example, at the western edge, housing encroaches upon the boundary ditch, barbed wire fence and hedge, with unfeasibly narrow hedges shown on the plans.
- The northern LEAP with play equipment has been lost, with "play boulders" indicated - even the glaciers did not deposit this type of surface boulders on our terminal morain - safety concerns?
- Hedges - Hedges are important buffering between housing and rural landscape. There would not be sufficient space for hedge and footpaths along Bartlow Road without encroaching on the root system of current hedges or risking scratches from the hawthorns. The proposed "trimming to residential size" would lose the integrity of the hedges as a buffer and soft entrance to the village.
- There has been no amphibian survey, despite all the ponds in the area and the developers own Ecologists recommendation. The officer reports that a survey has been done, but this is not on the website, nor has it been sent to LPC, despite being requested. One visit to our wildlife area, across the river, by the Ecology Officer does not constitute a season long survey. This is statutory and has not been performed.
- Road noise - hedges currently reduce noise to the village; this mitigation will be lost as they are removed or cut to "residential" size. The timing of noise measurements was queried as not representative of actual noise levels.
- Highways will not adopt the roads if they depend upon "Smart Sponge" techniques with high maintenance costs that would have to be covered by CCC. No alternative to these has been proposed.
- The exits onto Bartlow Road remain more numerous than in the approved OL application.
- This is an area of local character landscape, the effect on the valued landscape has been evaluated as being severe/moderate (see the report from Liz Lake Associates). The planning appeal for Back Road was won on the grounds of the effect on this landscape.

Here are preliminary comments, mainly based on the revised Design and Access statement section 6.21, which refers directly to the discussions and decision of the Planning Committee meeting

- **Concern 1** - We would have welcomed the retention of some parts of the mediaeval hedges along Bartlow Road. However, the Tree report 1.6) states that "*Unmanaged sections to be uniformly trimmed to a standard suitable for retention in a residential environment*". This means that a feature of the entrance to the village, a large rural hedge will become urban domestic hedging. The green screening and biodiversity of rural hedging will be lost.
- The hedges will be in the gardens of residents and their preservation cannot be guaranteed. The front of the revised type of house will be very close to the hedges, which are substantial. There is no management plan to preserve this important feature.
- The established productive boundary hedges on the northern site are still to be lost to urban decorative planting and with insignificant (1m) hedging along the roadside
- The rural character of the area will be lost at the point that the development begins.
- **Concern 2** - The stated "fall in levels away from Bartlow Road will reduce the impact of the proposed dwellings". However, this will mean housing closer to the road and a steep slope up to road levels. Flooding from Bartlow Road to the site is expected -

historically it is known to be sudden and severe - and these houses have been made more vulnerable. The slopes could make access to the road difficult, particularly in adverse weather.

- **Concern 3-** There are now fewer access points onto the 60mph road, but still more than in the OL approval, with one still impacting on the proposed traffic hub.
- **Concern 4 -** the number of houses on the frontage south of Bartlow Road might have been reduced, but they remain as tall houses and will still be dominant on the street scene.
- **Concern 5 -** the entrance "tower" has been replaced by another "farmstead", unlike any fa in this area; you can tell the designer does not know rural Cambridgeshire. Farmhouses in South Cambs aren't black tarred weatherboard. Barns and outbuildings might be because it was cheap. Farmhouses are in better materials – early ones in rendered timber frame and later ones in brick. Even where weatherboard is used on cheaper houses – it's whitewashed, not tarred nor grey. (See Design Guide e.g. paras 3.49-50 page 41 and 5.12-13 pages 73-74 Farmsteads in South Cambs are not blacked tarred commuter houses with a cartlodge on the side.
- **Concern 6 -** some change in style of housing, but there is no change to the housing mix. As described at the meeting, Linton needs bungalows and truly affordable small houses. The designs and mix do not meet local needs, and Linton no longer has the infrastructure for more inhabitants (this is not a strategic site and Linton has no planning allocation in the Local Development Plan).
- **Concern 7 -** The "*new house design with lower roof eaves (1.75 storeys in height) and dormers in the roof will be used across the Southern site frontage*". In effect this will be almost as high, reducing the mass minimally. The pale grey weatherboard is not typical of this area. Weather board is used on cheaper houses and would be whitewashed.
- **Concern 8 -** This house has been set back a little, but is still shown as being ahead of 78 Bartlow Road, and is very much still an urban design.
- **Concern 9 -**Changes to fenestration - this is a moderately welcome change but insignificant to the real design issues of these houses.
- **Concern 10 -** we already noted that the study/office will be bedrooms - the houses might be described as having, say, 4 bedrooms plus office, but are advertised as 5 bedroom homes. It has also been noted just how small these houses are, although meeting current minimal space standards. Is this really what people would like to live in?
- **Concern 11 -** The mass that is really visible and dominant is that of the housing on the skyline, widely visible from the village and across the valued landscape. This minor height adjustment of one house type does not address the major issue of impact on the landscape.
- **Materials -** The materials proposed in the Design and Access Statement are not the high quality required in HG/1 or in the Design Guide (e.g. Chapter 3 pages 25-31 and 4.10-11 page 67). Concrete roof tiles, cheap bricks, fibre cement cladding, plastic windows and fascias. On typical builder suppliers' websites the general brick cost goes from £400-800 per pallet of bricks .The bricks they propose are in the cheapest 20%.
- The colour palette of materials is not typical of Linton village and not to the standard required by the Design Guide
- A viable management scheme has not been demonstrated for long term maintenance.

This application will have negative effects on the area that far outweigh any possible benefits. The plans are still outside development boundaries and are not deliverable. The planning balance for this submission should be that these plans are rejected.

It is not sufficient to have a development of this size and impact to have design that is adequate," not unacceptable" , or otherwise damned by faint praise - we need to have the best for our special village. There were reasons that this site was rejected for development for at least 30 (or was it 50?) years. Caveat emptor.

**LPC Decision: Object and Refer to SCDC Full Planning Committee**