

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

10 May 2017

AUTHOR/S: Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development

Application Number: S/0415/17/OL

Parish: Castle Camps

Proposal: Outline application for the erection of up to 10 dwellings with all matters reserved except for access

Site address: Land off Bartlow Road, Castle Camps, CB21 4SX

Applicant(s): Arbora Homes

Recommendation: Delegated Approval subject to the completion of a section 106 agreement.

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

Committee Site Visit: Yes

Departure Application: Yes

Presenting Officer: Lydia Pravin, Senior Planning Officer

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

Date by which decision due: 10 May 2017

Executive Summary

1. The proposed development would be located on land adjacent to but outside of the Castle Camps village framework. Due to the District Council's inability to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, the policies that restrict the supply of housing are considered to be out of date. The Balsham, Over and Melbourn appeal decisions have provided additional guidance on weighing the benefits against the harm resulting from a proposal within the context of a lack of a five year housing land supply, a deficit which has further deteriorated (from 3.9 to 3.7 years).
2. A significant benefit of the scheme is the provision of 40% on site affordable housing and this will fulfil the significant need within the Parish of Castle Camps, as well as a substantial need District wide, this is a benefit which officers consider should be afforded significant weight in the determination of the application. The development of up to 10 dwellings will provide towards the lack of five year housing land supply giving rise to significant social and economic benefits through the creation of jobs in the construction industry and an increase of local services and facilities, both of which will be of benefit to the local economy.
3. Castle Camps is a group village with limited facilities and occupants of the development would be required to travel out of the village to access facilities to meet day to day needs and employment opportunities. These factors do weigh against the social and environmental sustainability of the scheme. However, the extent of this harm is considered to be reduced by the fact that there is a bus service which would allow commuting to Haverhill, a market town within a reasonable time and that this service runs within close proximity of the application site. Whilst buses are infrequent throughout the day, occupants of the development would still have an alternative to the use of the private car to access the services and other facilities in Haverhill.
4. There are no objections from statutory consultees and the proposal would not result in significant harm to the character of the landscape, allowing for the retention of the intermittent hedgerow and trees and further hedgerow and tree planting will be provided on the boundaries. This will enable a sense of containment and reduce the impact of the development on the wider landscape to an acceptable degree.
5. In terms of the impact on the Conservation Area and setting of the Grade II listed building the development would be on land that has a ditch along the southern boundary and rises gently to a plateau approx. 2m higher than Bartlow Road. The dwellings are shown as being set back by approx. 15 metres from the site edged red on the site plan which is for illustrative purposes only which will respect the linear character of the dwellings along Bartlow Road. This shows up to 10 dwellings can be accommodated on the site will cause less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area and setting of the Grade II listed building. Officers are therefore of the view that the harm resulting from the proposal is considered to represent less than substantial harm and in accordance with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework has been assessed with regard to the public benefits of the development and its optimum viable use.
6. It is considered the public benefits of providing housing to meet the significant deficit in five year housing land supply and chronic shortage of affordable housing. Overall it is considered the development does not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and as a result, in line with the guidance in paragraph 14 of the NPPF, the recommendation is to grant planning permission.

Site Planning History

7. S/0599/81/O – Hill Farm PT OSP 77 Castle Camps – Residential Development – refused due the development being contrary to the Settlement Policies incorporated in the approved Structure Plan for Cambridgeshire, wherein it is proposed that development in Castle Camps will be restricted to infilling only. The site is considered to be outside the physical framework of the village and its development would represent an undesirable extension of ribbon development in to the open countryside. Development of the scale proposed beyond the framework of the village, would progressively detract from the open and rural character and appearance of the area

Planning Policies

8. 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.

National Guidance

9. *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012*
Planning Practice Guidance

South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, adopted January 2007

10. ST/2 Housing Provision
ST/6 Group Villages

South Cambridgeshire LDF Development Control Policies, adopted July 2007

11. DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/4 Infrastructure in New Developments
DP/7 Development Frameworks
CH/2 Archaeological Sites
CH/4 Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building
CH/5 Conservation Areas
HG/1 Housing Density
HG/2 Housing Mix
HG/3 Affordable Housing
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/16 Emissions
NE/17 Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
SF/10 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space and New Developments
SF/11 Open Space Standards

TR/1 Planning for More Sustainable Travel
TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards
TR/3 Mitigating Travel Impact
TR/4 Travel by Non-Motorised Modes

South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

- 12. District Design Guide SPD – Adopted 2010
Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD – Adopted 2009
Health Impact Assessment SPD – Adopted March 2011
Affordable Housing SPD – Adopted March 2010
Open Space in new Developments SPD – Adopted 2009
Listed Buildings SPD – Adopted July 2009
Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009
Landscape and new development SPD – Adopted March 2010
Biodiversity SPD – Adopted July 2009

Draft Local Plan

- 13. S/1 Vision
S/2 Objectives of the Local Plan
S/3 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
S/5 Provision of new jobs and homes
S/7 Development Frameworks
S/10 Group Villages
S/12 Phasing, Delivering and Monitoring
CC/1 Mitigation and adoption to climate change
CC/3 Renewable and low carbon energy in new developments
CC/4 Sustainable design and construction
CC/6 Construction methods
CC/7 Water quality
CC/8 Sustainable drainage systems
CC/9 Managing flood risk
HG/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
SC/13 Air quality
TI/2 Planning For Sustainable Travel
TI/3 Parking provision

Consultation

- 14. **Castle Camps Parish Council** – commented:
The application was discussed at a Parish Council meeting held on 9/03/17. The meeting was attended by 9 parishioners who raised the following concerns:
- 15. Sewage drains
- a few times over the past couple of years and again last week saw the sewage drains block up at a residence along Bartlow Road. Sewage overflowed out of the

- drains into gardens, garage, and flowed down the road into the village pond.
Environmental Agency were involved
- Manholes leak sewage frequently
 - Can the sewage facilities cope with another 10 dwellings?
 - Norwood and 8 Bartlow Road are the last on the sewage system.
 - Have Anglian Water and the Environmental agency been consulted about this planning application?
16. Surface water
- The plans suggest that surface water run off will be via ditches and down to the village pond. The pond barley copes with heavy rainfall now.
17. Access
- Access width applied for is 5.5m which is only 0.5m over the minimum requirement. What impact will this have on large trade lorries turning in/out
 - What will be the impact of extra cars parking as plans show 3 dwellings without garages. Most houses generally have 2 cars per property
 - One of the plans shows access opposite Norwood entrance. Norwood has no visibility to turn out of at present it is a blind turning. This would create a very difficult and dangerous cross roads.
 - Parking during school pick up and drop off extends down further than existing pavement and encroaches on to the proposed development. If cars park further along the road it will not be possible for residents to use Norwood turning and will become dangerous for development access
 - Will the road be adopted or private?
 - Will the bin lorries access the development or will bins be put on road
18. Traffic
- Speed monitoring strips are needed as the survey is incorrect showing average speed of cars travelling in and out of the village at this point at around 31.7/34.2mph. The average speed is much higher than this.
19. Outside Village Boundary
- Grade 2 agricultural land
20. Village information in sustainability report is out of date
- No mobile pre school
21. Footpath should be extended to the public footpath
22. Bungalows would be more suited to the site due to land being lower the opposite side of road
23. Starter homes for young families and smaller homes/ bungalows for downsizing would be more suitable not large family houses
24. Survey took place in 2012/13 stating that no housing was needed
25. Very vague about hedging and soft planting
26. Major concern that if this application goes through then it opens up the land on all the village entrance and exits for developers.
27. All Councillors present objected to this application on the grounds mentioned above – sewage, flooding, parking, outside the village boundary and access concerns. There

was also concern that if the application goes though it will open up land for potential development on all other village entrances/exits

28. A further email was submitted on 17 April as follows:
29. Castle Camps Parish Council held a meeting on Thursday 13th April 2017 where 4 Councillors and 16 parishioners attended. All Councillors present objected to the amendments for the above application for the erection of up to 10 dwellings with all matters reserved except access
 - The objection is that insufficient detailed plans have been submitted to support the sewage and surface water drainage requirements. It is not acceptable to say detail will be provided and conditions will be acted on. Suggestions have just been mentioned and glossed over.
 - Using and referencing the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) from August 2013 for 2 sites within Castle Camps, of which site 193 is directly opposite to the proposed application, the comments on both sites with regards to sewage were: "The Teversham wastewater treatment works is operating at capacity and will require new consent limits and major capital expenditure to accommodate the proposed development site." Therefore this proposed development would simply add to the current problem and exacerbate the situation further.
 - As previously stated: The sewage system suffered its latest problem a couple of months ago along Bartlow Road that resulted in a blockage and overflow, flooding a property's garage and garden. This resulted in the Environmental Department being called out as effluent flowed onto the highway. In times of heavy continuous rain several manholes in Bartlow Road and Church Lane overflow with sewage. The Village Pond also overflowed several times, the last, a few years ago resulting in flooding a residents property, the resident has added additional pipework at his own expense to avoid further damage. It is agreed that these systems barely cope or just about cope at present.
30. It was agreed and voted on that this complete outline planning application be considered by the District Council's Planning Committee and all objections submitted be included. This request has the support of Cllr Andrew Fraser
31. The Parish Council maintain there original objections to this entire application and now also include agreement and reference to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) from August 2013. The Assessment for site 167 & 193 comments on both sites similarly and are relevant to this application, in particular site 193 which is on land directly opposite the above application
 - it is noted that the same comment is recorded for both sites "the site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints". This situation has not changed and the conclusion from the 2013 SHLAA is still valid and appropriate.
 - It is further noted that the comments recorded for both sites were listed as "Viability Category 4 Least Viable Sites". There have been no positive influences or changes to the area to move from this position and the Parish Council would therefore note that this "least viable" position is again equally valid and relevant today.
 - It is also noted that for site 193 "There is evidence of medieval activity in the vicinity" and for site 167 "There is evidence of Roman activity in the vicinity." Therefore further information and procedures would be necessary to protect this history and heritage in advance of any planning permission being granted in this area

- Both sites state that land is Agricultural land grade 2
 - the Site Assessment Conclusion of site 193 which is opposite this proposed development was “ Site with no development potential” the Status of Site was “ Not allocated for development ; outside Development Framework”
32. The Parish Council maintain their objection to this entire application but further points were agreed at the meeting:
- If this application were to be given permission to go ahead the Parish Council request that the 40% Social Housing / Affordable Homes have a condition attached that gives priority to people with local ties to the Parish
 - If this application were to be granted permission to go ahead the Parish Council request a condition be added that S106 Open Space provision be paid in advance of any building work commencing.
33. Further questions that have come to light on this application are:
What effect would an increase of surface water drainage have on the biodiversity of the Village Pond?
This Grade 2 Agricultural land is currently being used as paddock land and has been for the past 2 years. Has this land been given permission for change of use?
34. The road plan in the outline application shows a “hammer head” design at one end which may lead to the possibility of creating an access into a future development behind this one. There should be a non removable clause/condition along the lines of stopping further access/s being created for any future development.
35. **Local Highway Authority (LHA)** – The Highway Authority would seek that drawing number 2016-F-056-003 be provided to the Planning Authority as a stand alone document (i.e. not as part of the Transport Statement), so details of the proposed access can be separately and clearly referenced as an approved drawing if planning permission is granted.
36. Recommend conditions governing: falls and levels of access (to prevent run-off); bound material for the first 5m of the access from the boundary of the adopted public highway. Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling that a 2m wide footway be provided from the entrance to the site eastwards to the existing footway outside number 8 Bartlow Road, Castle Camps to provide suitable pedestrian connectivity to the village from the site. The footway is shown on the ‘site plan as proposed’ submitted as part of the application.
37. The Highway Authority will not be seeking to adopt this development in its present format as the internal roads serve no highway function.
38. The Local Highways Authority commented on 06 April that drawing number 2016-F-056-003 in terms of the dimensioned layout is acceptable to the Highway Authority (the use of the give way lines as illustrated will not be required)
39. **Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology** – Raises no objection in principle but considered that a condition should be added requiring a programme of archaeological investigation to be secured prior to the commencement of development as the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential.
40. **Contaminated Land Officer** – no immediately evident environmental constraints that would attract a contaminated land condition, however, the development proposed use is one which is particularly sensitive to the presence of any contamination and vulnerable receptors should be taken into account. Therefore recommend an

informative that if during development contamination not previously identified is found to be present then no further development shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how the unsuspected contamination should be dealt with.

41. **Environmental Health Officer** – advises the following conditions:
- No development shall take place until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
Contractors access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel;
Contractors' site storage area(s) and compound(s);
Parking for contractors' vehicles and contractors' personnel vehicles;
Method statement for the control of debris, mud and dust arising from the development during the construction period.
42. • No construction site machinery or plant shall be operated, no noisy works shall be carried out and no construction related deliveries taken at or despatched from the site except between the hours of 0800-1800 Monday to Friday, 0800-1300 Saturday and not at any time on Sundays or Bank or Public holidays.
Reason: To protect the amenity of the locality, especially for people living and/or working nearby, in accordance with local planning policy.
43. • There shall be no burning of any waste or other materials on the site, without prior consent from the environmental health department.
Reason: To ensure nuisance is not caused to local residents.
44. • Should driven pile foundations be proposed, then before works commence, a statement of the method for construction of these foundations shall be submitted and agreed by the District Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.
45. • Details of any external lighting, including security lighting used during the construction phase, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before construction commences.
The lighting impact shall be assessed in accordance with The Institute of Lighting Professionals' "*Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011*".
Reason: To ensure nuisance is not caused to local residents.
46. **Informatives**
- The applicant should take all relevant precautions to minimise the potential for disturbance to neighbouring residents in terms of noise and dust during the construction phases of development. This should include the use of water suppression for any stone or brick cutting and advising neighbours in advance of any particularly noisy works. The granting of this planning permission does not indemnify against statutory nuisance action being taken should substantiated noise or dust complaints be received. For further information please contact the Environmental Health Service.
47. **Urban Design Officer** - This application seeks permission for 10 new dwellings on the edge of Castle Camps. The site is currently an open field, set behind an existing hedgerow and ditch that runs along the road. Though the site is outside the village framework, it adjoins it on two sides, and there is existing development on the south side of the road opposite the site, and also further houses to the west of the site. The principle of development is considered acceptable.
48. The density of 17.2 dwellings per hectare is low, but this is acceptable for this edge of

village rural location, and should allow the site to be developed in a manner appropriate to this location. The indicative layout of a row of houses fronting the road, behind the retained hedgerow, and suggested materials appears appropriate and the garden sizes are compliant.

49. It appears the application has been amended since initial submission to provide 40% affordable houses, which is welcomed. The mix is currently undetermined, but will need to be policy compliant.
50. Given the sensitive village edge location, I strongly suggest this application is presented to the Design Enabling Panel prior to the submission of any reserved matters application.
51. **Landscape Officer - Recommendation:** No objection with a development upon this site.
52. **The Site**
The site is situated to the west of the village of Castle Camps. It is a grass field bounded by
- post and wire fencing to the north,
 - a native hedgerow with trees and Bartlow Road to the south,
 - a public footpath and a native hedgerow to the west and residential properties to the east.
53. **Designations**
The landscape is not subject to any national designations.
The site is located outside the Conservation Area and does not form part of the Greenbelt.
The site is located outside the existing village development framework boundary. There is 1 no. Public Rights of Way - 41/12 Public Footpath running immediately adjacent to the north west site boundary. There is also a Public Right of Way – 41/16 Public Footpath to the north east of the site which has views of the site.
There are no TPO's within or adjacent to the site which would be effected by the development.
54. **Existing landscape character**
At National Level the site is situated within the National Landscape Character Area (NCA) 86: South Suffolk and North Essex Clayland. At Regional level the site is situated within the Wooded Village Farmlands as assessed by Landscape East. At local level the site is situated within the A. South East Claylands as assessed by SCDC within District Design Guide SPD March 2010.
55. **Key characteristics of particular relevance to the site and/ or its surroundings include:**
- It is an ancient landscape of wooded arable countryside with a distinct sense of enclosure.
 - The overall character is of a gently undulating, chalky boulder clay plateau.
 - There is a complex network of old species-rich hedgerows.
 - Smaller fields, landscape and woodlands closer to edges of settlements give a more intimate scale. An historic irregular field pattern remains.
 - The area has a surprisingly remote, rural character.
 - Elevated arable landscape.
 - Often an open landscape with long distance views, although woodland contains views particularly around settlements.

56. **Landscape impact**

As part of the application documents the applicant has submitted a drawing Site Plan – as proposed. As indicated by the applicant all southern boundary trees, hedgerows of landscape interest are to be retained. No key characteristics, individual elements or features are to be removed. There would be negligible effects on the wider and local landscape character areas.

57. **Visual and visual amenity impact**

There are existing open views into the site from Bartlow Road, dwellings running along Bartlow Road and the public footpaths.

58. **Mitigation Works**

The applicant has indicated the following as mitigation and or enhancement measures

- retention of the existing trees and hedgerows upon the southern boundary
- hedgerow planting running adjacent to the west boundary
- hedgerow and tree planting running along the northern boundary

All measures are welcome. Measures would both protect and enhance the local landscape character and reduce visual harm.

59. **Opportunities for the applicant to consider within the detailed design**

- Encouraging the planting of characteristic hedgerow trees from existing hedgerow stocks; that is, oak in Suffolk and field maple and hornbeam in Essex. This will enhance landscape diversity and ecosystem services, including carbon storage. It will also help to counteract the threats to landscape character and biodiversity from tree diseases such as ash die-back.
- Planting characteristic species mixes will support biodiversity and landscape character and should include hawthorn, blackthorn, hazel, field maple, dogwood, spindle and small-leaved lime (derived from woodland).
- Enclose boundaries facing roads by hedgerow or, in appropriate locations, low flint and brick walls.

Avoid the use of standardised and intrusive urban materials, street furniture, lighting and signage as part of traffic calming measures wherever appropriate.

60. **Historic Buildings Officer** - This site is close to the western edge of Castle Camps conservation area, and opposite Wisteria Cottage, a grade II thatched cottage.

61. The site is separated from the conservation area by a row of C20th housing, however, these are set back substantially from the road which allows views from the conservation area to the open countryside beyond across the application site. The indicative layout suggests that the new housing will also respect this substantial setback which allows the existing hedgerow to be retained, so the impact on the setting of the conservation area will be limited. This impact can be further reduced through the detailed design and layout of the houses, boundary treatments etc at reserved matters stage.

62. The development of the site will have more impact on the setting of Wisteria Cottage, which is located very close to the roadside, opposite the site, which contributes substantially to the rural setting of the cottage. However, the setting of the cottage already includes modern housing, so the impact of the development of this site is likely to cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the building, this harm will need to be assessed against the benefits of providing additional housing in the village.

63. The harm can also be reduced through the suggested set back of the houses, retention and strengthening of the hedgerow to Bartlow Road, and through the detailed design and layout of the houses, boundary treatments etc at reserved matters

stage.

64. **Ecology Officer** - The ecological survey provided to inform the application is welcomed and demonstrates that the site is of relatively low ecological value.
65. The indicative site layout has been designed to retain the existing hedgerow and ditch along the southern boundary. The ditch and hedge are being retained outside of garden curtilages which will ensure their retention in the long-term. It is assumed that the lime tree with potential to support roosting bats will be retained and protected, with a sufficient root protection area, during works. If this is not the case, a further bat survey(s) will be required to inform the application. Creation of site access will bridge the ditch and involve the removal of a small amount of hedgerow. The ditch appears to be unsuitable for water vole. The design of a culvert should retain the profile of the ditch as far as possible. Compensatory planting will be required for removal of a native hedgerow. However, this can be achieved within the scheme as demonstrated on the indicative layout plan, ideally by augmenting the existing hedgerow and new native planting around site boundaries.
66. All schemes should achieve net ecological gain to meet the NPPF and SCDC planning policy including LDF Policy NE/6 and Biodiversity SPD. For this scheme this should include in-built bat and bird boxes in a target of 50% of dwellings and native planting including hedgerows and wildflower seed mixes.
67. Please attach appropriately-worded conditions to cover the following to any consent granted:
- 1) Ecological Mitigation**
All works must proceed in strict accordance with the recommendations detailed in Section 6 of the *Preliminary Ecological Appraisal* report (Naturally Wild, December 2016). This shall include avoidance and mitigation measures for features of ecological interest, nesting birds and bats. If any amendments to the recommendations as set out in the reports are required, the revisions shall be submitted in writing to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority before works commence.
Reasons: To minimise disturbance, harm or potential impact on protected species in accordance with Policies DP/1, DP/3 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).
68. **2) Biodiversity Enhancement**
No development shall commence until a scheme for ecological enhancement including a location plan and specification for establishment and management of native planting and in-built features for nesting birds and roosting bats has been provided to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To provide habitat for wildlife and enhance the site for biodiversity in accordance with the NPPF, the NERC Act 2006 and Policy NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.
69. Please also ensure that a condition for details of external lighting to be provided is attached, with protection of wildlife habitat as a reason for the condition.
70. The two ponds to the north of Bartlow Road within 200m of the site were assessed as being of Poor suitability for great crested newt (GCN). There is an additional pond which was not identified by the ecological consultants approximately 130m south of

the site which was not assessed. There is a partial barrier between this pond and the site. The ditch along the southern boundary was dry in November, and therefore is likely to be dry for much of the year and unsuitable to support breeding GCN. On balance, given that there are no records of GCN within 500m, limited optimal terrestrial habitat within the site and few records locally, the species is not considered reasonably likely to be present and impacted. Therefore, no further surveys are required. However, please attach the following informative to any consent granted to make the applicants aware of the law in the unexpected event of GCN being found during works:

71. Great Crested Newt – GCNs are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). In the unlikely event of great crested newt being discovered during works, all activity must cease and a qualified ecologist and/or Natural England must be contacted for advice. It is a criminal offence to kill, injure or disturb great crested newts or to damage or destroy their habitats.
72. **Lead Local Flood Authority – Condition**
 Since our response dated 5th April 2017 (Doc No: 201101422), the applicant has provided the below details to address our concerns. The submitted calculations have been amended to include the ‘upper end’ 40% climate change allowance. The applicant has provided confirmation that the watercourse is a tributary of the River Granta, thus surface water will be able flow into the wider river network. The information submitted to date has been minimal, however we do feel that an adequate surface water drainage scheme can be provided on site through the use of planning condition. It is for this reason that we are willing to **remove our objection**.
73. We recommend the following condition(s) are imposed requiring the following details.

Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before development is completed.

The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Drainage Strategy prepared by cTc Infrastructure dated December 2016 (submitted to LLFA on 27th March 2017) and amended hydraulic calculations (submitted to LLFA on 6th April 2017) and shall also include:

 - a) *Full calculations detailing the existing surface water runoff rates for the Q_{BAR} , 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events*
 - b) *Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm events (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with an assessment of system performance;*
 - c) *Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers*
 - d) *Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures*
 - e) *Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;*
 - f) *Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;*
 - g) *Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water;*

The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG

Reason

To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development.

74. Condition

Details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason

To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of unadopted drainage systems in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 103 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 75. Sustainable Drainage Engineer** – The revised drainage strategy is acceptable subject to a conditions for surface water drainage as follows: No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in The National Planning Policy Framework and associated Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:

- i. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and
- ii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.
- iii. The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and management and maintenance plan.

- 76. Foul Drainage**
No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until foul water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

- 77. Anglian Water** – No assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within the development site boundary.

- 78. Wastewater Treatment**
The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Camps Water

Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.

79. **Foul Sewerage Network**

Development may lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. A drainage strategy will need to be prepared in consultation with Anglian Water to determine mitigation measures. Recommend a condition that no development shall commence until a foul water strategy has been submitted and approved.

80. **Surface Water Disposal**

From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse.

81. **Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.**

82. **Environment Agency – No objection in principle and offer the following recommendations and informatives**

Flood Risk

83. **The application falls within Flood Risk Standing Advice, being within floodzone 1 and less than 1 ha in area. In line with current government guidance on Standing Advice, it will be necessary in this instance, for the Council to respond on behalf of the Environment Agency in respect of flood risk and/or surface water drainage issues**

84. **Informatives regarding surface water drainage ensuring soakaways should only drain uncontaminated surface water and will not be permitted in contaminated areas. In respect of foul water drainage an acceptable method of disposal would be connection to foul public sewer. Anglian Water should be consulted on foul water drainage. Pollution prevention – site operators should ensure there is no possibility of contaminated water entering or polluting surface or underground waters**

85. **Trees Officer – I have no objections to the application in principle but I note that there are trees along the frontage (intended to be retained) but that no arboricultural information has been submitted. If the application is to be approved I recommend the following conditions for any forthcoming reserved matters or full application to address:**

- The applicant shall submit an arboricultural impact assessment and tree protection strategy in accordance with British Standard BS5837 for the approval of the LPA.
- Prior to commencement, site preparation or the delivery of materials to site the tree protection measures recommended in the approved tree protection strategy shall be erected and remain in position until practical completion of the implementation of the development.

86. **Cambridgeshire County Council Asset Information Definitive Map Officer – Please note Public Footpath No. 12, Castle Camps runs along the eastern boundary of the site.**

87. The application proposes screening planting between the Public Footpath and the final plot. I refer you to our document 'Guidance for planners and Developers' available on our website here:
http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/info/20012/arts_green_spaces_and_activities/199/default/efinitive_map_and_statement. Page 3 of the document states "Where a PROW is to be enclosed between fences or boundaries extra land will have to be set aside for the path, for access for maintenance of the route and boundaries, and to ensure that the boundary remains clear of the route. A minimum of 2.5 metres must be left for footpaths and 5 metres for bridleways enclosed by at least one boundary. Hedges and other vegetation must be planted at least 2 metres away from the route to ensure that future growth does not obstruct the path. PROW should not be enclosed by close boarded fencing to both sides; this creates an uninviting route which is difficult to maintain and unwelcoming to users." We would therefore request the following condition is applied to any permission given:
88. Conditions
 No planting shall be placed on or within 2 meters from the boundary of Public Footpath No. 12, Castle Camps.
Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the public.
89. Whilst we do not have any objections to this development, we would like to draw your attention to the informatives below which are required to be adhered to at all times.
90. **Informatives**
 Should you be minded to grant planning permission then we would be grateful that the following informatives are included:
- Public Footpath No. 12, Castle Camps must remain open and unobstructed at all times. Building materials must not be stored on Public Rights of Way and contractors' vehicles must not be parked on it (it is an offence under s 137 of the Highways Act 1980 to obstruct a public Highway).
 - No alteration to the Footpath's surface is permitted without our consent (it is an offence to damage the surface of a public footpath under s 1 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971).
 - Landowners are reminded that it is their responsibility to maintain boundaries, including trees, hedges and fences adjacent to Public Rights of way, and that any transfer of land should account for any such boundaries (s154 Highways Act 1980).
 - The granting of planning permission does not entitle a developer to obstruct a Public Right of Way (Circular 1/09 para 7.1).
91. **Cambridgeshire County Council Education-** The County Council does not seek contributions for 10 or less dwellings unless we are made aware that the development has a combined gross floor space of over 1000sqm
92. **Affordable Housing Officer -** Affordable Housing (*Proposed Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan July 2013 Policy H/9 (DCP HG/3)*). Policy H/9 requires that all developments that increase the net number of dwellings on a site by 3 or more need to provide 40% affordable housing suitable to address local housing needs. DCP policy HG/3 required the same percentage of affordable housing at a lower threshold of two units or more. The proposed scheme is for 10 dwellings which would trigger an affordable housing requirement of 4 homes.
93. **Tenure Mix Affordable Housing SPD (July 2010)**
 The tenure mix for affordable housing in South Cambridgeshire District is 70% Rented and 30% Intermediate housing. 1 and 2 bed properties are the dwelling types with the

fastest growing demand. The Cambridge sub-region 2013 SHMA states that ‘One person and couple households make up the majority of the household increase from 2011 to 2031 (96% of the change in household numbers’.)

94. **Rented Housing** is defined as Affordable Rented housing let by local authorities or private registered providers of social housing to households who are eligible for social rented housing. Affordable Rented housing is let to households that are unable to purchase Intermediate or Open Market housing (typically those in Band A and B in the table below) and subject to rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80% of the local market rent (including service charges, where applicable)ⁱ. Affordable Rented housing should remain affordable in the longer term. Affordable Rent should not be set higher than the Local Housing Allowance rates for this areaⁱⁱ. As at May 2016 there were a total of **1689** applicants registered on the housing register for South Cambridgeshire. The chart below shows their bedroom requirements and housing need:

bedroom requirements	Band A (urgent need)	Band B (high need)	Band C (medium need)	Band D (low need)	Total
1bed	65	127	449	283	924
2bed	42	144	93	271	550
3bed	12	63	9	84	168
4bed	4	22	3	11	40
5bed	3	2	0	2	7
total	126	358	554	651	1689

95. Intermediate Housing is defined as Shared Ownership, Older Person Shared Ownership (OPSO), Home Ownership for people with Long-Term Disabilities (HOLD), Rent to Buy and Intermediate Rentⁱⁱⁱ. Intermediate Housing is suitable for those who may be able to afford to purchase open market housing, but need assistance in doing so
96. The Council has published an Affordable Housing Glossary which will be updated as and when the statutory definitions, and regulations, including those describing Starter Homes, are available^{iv}.
97. **Types and sizes of affordable homes**
In Major Developments, Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres the type (house, flat, and bungalow) and size (bedrooms) of affordable housing will be based on the need across the district as a whole. Minimum space standards that are recommended for affordable housing are set out in the Nationally Described Space Standards^v. The types and sizes of affordable homes required by this development to meet current district wide affordable housing need is set out in the table below.

Bedroom requirements	Preferred Mix			
	Social Rent	Intermediate	Total	%
1bed	0	0	0	
2bed	2	0	2	50%
3bed	1	1	2	50%

4bed+	0	0	0	
Total	0	0	4	100%

99. The applicant has identified within their Planning Statement that four of the ten proposed dwellings would be for affordable housing. We would encourage them to contact one of the Registered Providers on the published on the Council's website with a view to securing their involvement at an early stage of the development^{vi}.

100. **Lifetime Homes**

Proposed Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan July 2013 Policy H/8 (3) requires 100% of affordable homes to meet the Lifetime Homes standard. The Lifetime Homes standard has been superseded by new Building Regulations. We now advise that across the district there is a requirement for 5% of all affordable housing to be accessible and adaptable that meet Building Regulations Part M4(2). Although this type of housing is more often required for those over the age of 60, we currently have a district wide requirement for 10 affordable homes built to this standard from those in the greatest housing need, not all of whom will be aged over 60. In terms of size, two bedrooms would be required for these applicants to ensure a separate bedroom is available for a live in carer. In this scheme, we would recommend that the 1 no. affordable dwellings are built to this standard, with the remainder of the affordable housing built to Part M4 (1): Category 1 – Visitable dwellings.

101. **5 year land supply**

The site is outside the development framework and would normally be considered an Exception site (DCP HG/5, Proposed Submission Local Plan H/10) requiring all affordable housing in the development to be allocated to applicants with a specific local connection. However as this site is a '5 year land supply' site, which should therefore provide a policy compliant (40%) level of affordable housing. As a starting point for discussions on the requirement for a local connection criteria on 5 year land supply sites:

- The first 8 affordable homes on each 5 year land supply site will be occupied by those with a local connection; the occupation of any additional affordable homes thereafter will be split 50/50 between local connection and on a Districtwide basis.
- If there are no households in the local community in housing need at the stage of letting or selling a property and a local connection applies, it will be made available to other households in need on a cascade basis looking next at adjoining parishes and then to need in the wider district in accordance with the normal lettings policy for affordable housing. The number of homes identified for local people within a scheme will always remain for those with a local connection when properties become available to relet.

102. **Local Housing Need**

The local housing needs for Castle Camps are currently as follows:

Bedroom requirements	Rent	Intermediate
1bed	1	0
2bed	5	0
3bed	3	0
4bed	2	0
Total	11	0

103. In the above table, the Intermediate Housing Need is derived from the applicants on the Help to Buy register living or working in Castle Camps^{vii}. Although there is no identified need for Intermediate Housing in Castle Camps, there is a policy requirement for 30% of the affordable housing to be for Intermediate tenure. The needs for Affordable Rented housing is taken from the Council's annual Housing Statistical Information Leaflet^{viii}. The detailed breakdown is as follows:

Bedroom Requirements	Band A (Urgent Need)	Band B (High Need)	Band C (Medium Need)	Band D (Low need)	Total
Total	0	5	1	5	11

104. **Viability** *Affordable Housing SPD Chapter 5*

There will be a presumption that the development will include full and appropriate provision for affordable housing unless it is demonstrated that it cannot be provided at a rate of 40% or more of the dwellings in a development. The Affordable Housing SPD sets out in Chapter 5 the approach that should be taken by the developer to producing a full economic appraisal. The methodology, underlying assumptions and any software used to undertake this appraisal should be agreed with the Council, with the normal approach being the current methodology endorsed by the Homes and Communities Agency.^{ix}

105. **Commuted sums** *DCP Policy HG/3(5); Affordable Housing SPD*

The Council's priority is to secure the provision of free serviced land for affordable housing as part of market developments. However the Council recognises that there can be exceptional circumstances on certain smaller sites where an alternative to on-site provision may be appropriate. The procedure for calculating commuted sums set out in Chapter 5 of the Affordable Housing SPD is that it is to be considered as part of the determination of the planning application, and to be assessed by an independent valuer (appointed by the Council and paid for by the applicant) on the following basis -

- Land value of the whole site based on the notional scheme without an on-site affordable housing contribution, and
- Land value of the site with an on-site affordable housing contribution, where the amount of free serviced land is based on the notional scheme for the site

106. The commuted sum will be the difference between the two valuations. Commuted sums may be reviewed in the same way as schemes for on site provision of affordable housing.

107. **Representations**

Owners/Occupiers of– 17 letters of representation have been received from third parties (including those received via the Council's website) objecting to the proposals, raising the following concerns:

- Previous planning applications were made were refused consent such as SC/0342/73/O for 5 dwellings due to the undesirable precedent for similar proposals to the detriment of the open and rural character and appearance of the area and undesirable extension of Ribbon development outside the village limits. Planning application S/0599/81/O was refused for similar reasons.

S/1767/78/O for two dwellings was refused due to the site being outside the “Stop Lines” for further residential development, constituting ribbon development and would increase the danger to road users; in a white area where existing uses are expected to remain for the most part undisturbed unless related to a proven and justifiable local or rural need and it would detract from the open and rural appearance and character of the area.

- In 2012/13 South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework carried out a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment July 2012 to create a Site Assessment Proforma for two site at Castle Camps – Site 167 for land south of Homers Land and West of High Street for 50 dwellings – Site 193 Bartlow Road was for 9 dwellings. The Site Assessment conclusion for both sites there was no development potential and the land is not suitable, the reason for refusal included that this would create an undesirable precedent for similar proposals to the detriment of the open and rural character and appearance of the area and constitute an undesirable extension of ribbon development outside village limits. This should apply even though the current version of the Local Plan has not been approved.
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 1989 showed Castle Camps has a range of services and would only allow small groups of houses in the development framework for smaller homes for first time buyers.
- Removal of Grade II agricultural land
- Foul drainage concerns. The existing Pumping Station located on Church Land has had difficulty dealing with the existing flow in the village. On 13th February 2017 there was a serious incident where foul water was in danger of flowing down the road.
- Surface water drainage concerns. The Drainage Strategy should have 40% climate change allowance for greater attenuation, flooding has occurred at Pond Farm, Bartlow Road over 4 occasions due to the outlet pipe taking water from the pond being insufficient
- Highway safety concerns due to the volume of traffic and concerns of the speed of traffic entering the village as well as insufficient parking for the development
- No demand for further houses in the village
- Castle Camps is a small rural village with very limited facilities and a very infrequent bus service meaning travel has to be undertaken outside the village to access facilities for day to day living. Castle Camps does not contain a secondary school and the primary school is located in the catchment area for Linton Village College, Linton and not Haverhill
- Impact on the open countryside due to the land being 2m higher than Bartlow Road
- Concerns insufficient infrastructure capacity
- Insufficient broadband facilities
- Concern about impact on archaeological remains
- Not acceptable to allow any planning application until a new local plan is valid
- Insufficient rubbish collection
- Insufficient housing mix detail
- The School is oversubscribed in years 3 and 5 and the school statistical information provided is inaccurate
- Lack of pavement to allow access to the village
- Vehicle headlights shining directly in to the windows when parked next to the dwellings due to the elevated site level
- The village pond will suffer significant ecological damage as it lies immediately beneath the proposed development
- Impact on setting of the Grade II listed building
- Loss of ecological value of the site

- Detract from character of the village
- Impact on road safety during construction
- Concerns if this application is approved it will set a precedent
- Cause overlooking/ loss of privacy, loss of daylight and overshadowing
- Impact on the setting of the Conservation Area
- Lack of affordable housing
- Loss of trees, landscaping and public visual amenity
- Lack of 5 year housing land supply does not automatically mean proposals for residential development within the open countryside should be permitted as the presumption is still in favour of sustainable development. The development would not amount to sustainable development
- Development is contrary to policy DP/7 of the adopted LDF which only allows for development for agriculture, horticulture, forest, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside as the site is outside the development framework
- Applicants argued the development would go towards serving the housing needs for the village, wherein some 11 affordable homes are required. 'Exception sites' solely for affordable housing can be appropriate (NPPF paragraph 54). However, the proposal is not for solely affordable housing. No Section 106 agreement to secure the affordable housing proposed.
- The development is contrary to policy ST/6 of the Core Strategy DPD which identifies Castle Camps as a Group Village which only allows up to 8 dwellings within the village framework and up to 15 dwellings on a brownfield site
- No formal open space is shown on the plan and no Section 106 agreement in order to detail how this would be provided, retained and maintained.

108. **Site and Proposal**

The site is located to the west of the village of Castle Camps along Bartlow Road and comprises a grass field used as a paddock for horses comprising 0.58 hectares. The site is located outside but adjacent to the village framework on the eastern boundary and therefore in the open countryside. There is post and wire fencing to the north and intermittent native hedgerow with trees along Bartlow Road to the south with dwellings located on the opposite side of Barlow Road on the edge of the village. There is a public footpath and native hedgerow to the western boundary of the site. The site is located opposite Wisteria Cottage, a Grade II listed dwelling and the Conservation Area begins on the eastern boundary of no 1 Barlow Road and on the western boundary of The Garden House, Bartlow Road.

109. The outline application is for development of the land for residential development for up to 10 dwellings with access applied for in detail.

Planning Assessment

Housing Land Supply

110. The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF) requires councils to boost significantly the supply of housing and to identify and maintain a five-year housing land supply with an additional buffer as set out in paragraph 47.
111. The Council accepts that it cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply in the district as required by the NPPF, having a 3.7 year supply using the methodology identified by the Inspector in the Waterbeach appeals in 2014. This shortfall is based on an objectively assessed housing need of 19,500 homes for the period 2011 to 2031 (as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013

and updated by the latest update undertaken for the Council in November 2015 as part of the evidence responding to the Local Plan Inspectors' preliminary conclusions) and the latest assessment of housing delivery (in the housing trajectory November 2016). In these circumstances any adopted or emerging policy which can be considered to restrict the supply of housing land is considered 'out of date' in respect of paragraph 49 of the NPPF.

112. Further guidance as to which policies should be considered as 'relevant policies for the supply of housing' emerged from a 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 as so not to be restricted 'merely to 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. However the Court of Appeal has confirmed 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, amongst other matters to the purpose of the particular policy.
113. In the case of this application, policies which must be considered as potentially influencing the supply of housing land include ST/2 (Housing Provision) and ST/6 (Group Villages) of the adopted Core Strategy and adopted policies DP/1 (Sustainable Development), DP/7 (Development Frameworks), NE/4 (Landscape Character Areas), NE/6 (Biodiversity), CH/2 (Archaeological Sites), CH/4 (Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building), CH/5 (Conservation Areas) and NE/17 (Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land) of the adopted Development Control Policies. Policies S/7 (Development Frameworks), S/10 (Group Villages), NH/2 (Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character), NH/3 (Protecting Agricultural Land), NH/4 (Biodiversity) and NH/14 (Heritage Assets) of the draft Local Plan are also material considerations and considered to be relevant (draft) policies for the supply of housing.
114. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It says that 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, or where specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted (which includes land designated as Green Belt in adopted plans for instance).

Principle of Development

115. The site is located in the open countryside, outside Castle Camps Development Framework, although adjacent on the eastern boundary and the dwellings opposite on the southern boundary are within the village framework. 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. The erection of a residential development of up to 10 dwellings would therefore not under normal circumstances be considered acceptable in principle since it is contrary to this adopted and emerging policy. However, these policies are considered out of date due to the current lack of a 5 year housing land supply as set out above.

It falls to the local planning authority as decision maker to assess the weight, if any, that should be given to the existing policies. The Council considers this assessment should, in the present application, have regard to factors including whether the policies continue to perform a material planning objective and whether it is consistent with the policies of the NPPF. Castle Camps is identified as a Group Village under Policy ST/6 of the LDF and Policy S/10 of the Draft Local Plan, one of four categories of rural settlements.

116. 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. Castle Camps has only relatively limited facilities and services, with no secondary school, and limited easily accessible public transport services than larger settlements.
117. 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.
118. 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.'
119. Whilst the village of Castle Camps was not referenced specifically within the Report, the document did provide criteria used in the assessment of the sustainability of settlements within the district. Castle Camps did not merit consideration for a higher status within the settlement hierarchy, remaining classified as a Group Village.
120. However, the policy objective and the principle of applying a settlement hierarchy have to be considered in light of the 'out of date' status, resulting from the lack of a five year supply of housing land in the District. By proposing up to 10 dwellings, the scheme is only a small increase based on the indicative maximum of 8 on a greenfield site. The principal consideration is that the NPPF requires development to be assessed against the definition of sustainable development. Specifically in relation to the size of development in or on the edge of Group Villages, the Inspector in the recent Over appeal decision (18 January 2017) stated that '...the strict application of the existing settlement hierarchy and blanket restriction on development outside those areas would significantly restrain housing delivery.....this would frustrate the aim of boosting the supply of housing.'
121. In light of the above, it is not appropriate, in the case of all Group Villages, to attach the same weight to policy DP/7 and DP/1(a) in the 'blanket' way. It is necessary to consider the circumstances of each Group Village to establish whether that village can accommodate sustainably (as defined in the NPPF) the development proposed, having regard in particular to the level of services and facilities available to meet the needs of that development.
122. As part of the case the applicant rests on the current five year housing land supply

deficit, the developer is required to demonstrate that the dwellings would be delivered within a 5 year period. Officers are of the view that the applicant has demonstrated that the site can be delivered within a timescale whereby weight can be given to the contribution the proposal could make to the 5 year housing land supply.

123. 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 its irreversible loss 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.
124. Whilst the substantive issues are discussed in detail in the remainder of this report, it is considered that, on balance, the site is considered a sustainable location for residential development on the scale proposed and the fact that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, the need for housing overrides the need to retain the horse paddock which was previously Grade II agricultural land when conducting the planning balance.
125. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF states there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental, which are mutually dependent. These are assessed below in relation to the proposed development.

Economic

126. The proposed development would give rise to employment during the construction phase of the development and has the potential to result in an increase of local services and facilities, both of which will be of benefit to the local economy.

Social

Provision of new housing

127. Chapter 6 of the NPPF relates to 'delivering a wide choice of high quality homes' and seeks to '*boost significantly the supply of housing*' placing importance on widening the choice of high quality homes and ensuring sufficient housing (including affordable housing) is provided to meet the needs of present and future generations.
128. 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.
129. There remains a significant shortage of deliverable housing sites in the district. The development would provide a clear public benefit in helping to meet the current housing shortfall in South Cambridgeshire. The site would deliver up to 10 residential dwellings within 5 years from the date of granting outline permission as detailed in the deliverability statement. Officers are of the view significant weight should be afforded to this benefit in the decision making process. Growth in housing will be important in maintaining the vitality of the village in the future.

Density

130. Housing density Policy HG/1 is applicable in this instance and seeks a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare, unless there are exceptional local circumstances that require different treatment. The site is 0.58 hectares and 10 dwellings constitutes 17 dwellings per hectare. Given the edge of village rural location this density will allow the site to be developed in a manner appropriate to the sensitive location which is also in the setting of a Grade II listed building, Wisteria Cottage and setting of the Conservation Area. The density is therefore considered appropriate for this location.

Mix

131. Under the provisions of policy HG/2, the market housing provision of proposed schemes is required to include a minimum of 40% 1 or 2 bed properties, approx. 25% 3 bedroom properties and approx. 25% 4 bedroom properties. Policy H/8 of the emerging Local Plan is less prescriptive and states that the mix of properties within developments of 10 or more dwellings should achieve at least 30% for each of the 3 categories, with the 10% margin to be applied flexibly across the scheme.
132. The application forms were amended to include x6 market dwellings and x4 social rented. The indicative layout shows a range of housing options with detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. The most eastern dwelling would comprise of x2 one bedroom flats, providing up to 10 dwellings in total.
133. Policy H/8 is being given considerable weight in the determination of planning applications due to the nature of the unresolved objections, in accordance with the guidance within paragraph 216 of the NPPF. As the application is outline only, a condition requiring this mix is recommended to ensure that the scheme is policy compliant.

Affordable Housing

134. Development Control Policy HG/3 of the Development Control Policies DPD July 2007 seeks to secure affordable housing on small developments and there are a growing number of appeals where planning inspectors are giving greater weight to adopted local policies securing affordable housing, even when these policies were not consistent with the WMS. The Council has previously operated a threshold of 2 properties, but has raised this threshold to 3 to encourage more very small scale developments to come forward.
135. On 28 November 2014 The Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Brandon Lewis) issued a Written Ministerial Statement the effect of which was to introduced a national threshold below which affordable housing and tariff style s106 contributions could not be sought. On the same day the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) was updated. A Judicial Review was brought by Reading and West Berkshire Councils in January 2015. The case was heard in the High Court on the 29th and 30th April 2015 by Mr Justice Holgate. His judgement was handed down on 31st July 2015. He found in favour of the challenge by the local authorities and quashed the amendments to the National Planning Practice Guidance. The Government sought leave to appeal the High Court decision and the judgement of the Court of Appeal issued on 11 May 2016 found in favour of Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. All grounds of appeal succeeded. The NPPG was updated on 19 May 2016 reintroducing the principle of the policy albeit with a small number of changes to the text. The decision made by the Court of Appeal has given legal effect to the Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014, which should be taken into account in planning decisions as a material consideration.

136. The WMS made by The Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Brandon Lewis) on 28 Nov 2014 says that “Due to the disproportionate burden of developer contributions on small scale developers, for sites of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of 1,000 square metres, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should not be sought. This will also apply to all residential annexes and extensions”.
137. The National Planning Practice Guidance says that “There are specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development. This follows the order of the Court of Appeal dated 13 May 2016, which give legal effect to the policy set out in the Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014 and should be taken into account.
138. These circumstances are that;
- contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of no more than 1000sqm
 - in designated rural areas, local planning authorities may choose to apply a lower threshold of 5-units or less. No affordable housing or tariff-style contributions should then be sought from these developments. In addition, in a rural area where the lower 5-unit or less threshold is applied, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should be sought from developments of between 6 and 10-units in the form of cash payments which are commuted until after completion of units within the development. This applies to rural areas described under section 157(1) of the Housing Act 1985, which includes National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
 - affordable housing and tariff-style contributions should not be sought from any development consisting only of the construction of a residential annex or extension to an existing home
139. Planning law requires that planning applications shall be in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Written Ministerial Statement is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications but the Minister himself recognises the effect of the new national policy is that although it would normally be inappropriate to require any affordable housing or social infrastructure contributions on sites below the thresholds stated, local circumstances may justify lower (or no) thresholds as an exception to the national policy. It would then be a matter for the decision-maker to decide how much weight to give to lower thresholds justified by local circumstances as compared with the new national policy.
140. Despite the Written Ministerial Statement, a number of Planning Inspectors have issued decisions dismissing appeals where affordable housing was not being provided and allowing them where affordable housing was being provided. South Cambridgeshire District Council has itself successfully defended its position in relation to three appeals (a) 8 dwellings at Kettles Close Oakington, (b) 5 dwellings at Dotterell Hall Farm Balsham and (c) 9 dwellings at Broad Lane Industrial Estate, Cottenham where the Planning Inspector gave greater weight to the adopted Development Plan. The local circumstances to justify securing affordable housing were (a) affordability (b) housing need and (c) viability.
141. Since these appeals the Council has received a letter from the Local Plan Inspectors who have invited further comments from the Council in respect of emerging policy H/9

and the WMS. The Council intends responding in due course and will provide evidence to the Local Plan Inspectors as to why the approach in emerging Policy H/9 is appropriate and a lower threshold for affordable housing than that set out in the WMS should continue to apply given the particular circumstances of South Cambridgeshire. The Local Plan Inspectors can therefore be expected to make a decision in respect of emerging Policy H/9 in due course.

142. Notwithstanding the Local Plan Inspectors letter as set out above, it is the Council's position that local circumstances remain such that the threshold set out in Development Control Policy HG/3, albeit with a threshold of 3 dwellings or more, remain appropriate and should continue to be applied notwithstanding the Written Ministerial Statement. In these circumstances the Council continues to consider that affordable housing threshold should remain unchanged.
143. The proposed development can provide 40% affordable housing with 4 affordable dwellings which is a significant social benefit to the scheme and should be given significant weight in determining the application.
144. The Affordable Housing Officer states the Housing Statistical Information Leaflet 2016 shows there is a requirement for 11 affordable dwellings which contain between 1-4 bedrooms in Castle Camps. The first 8 affordable homes on each 5 year land supply site will be occupied by those with a local connection, the occupation of any additional affordable homes thereafter will be split 50/50 between Local Connection and on a District Wide basis. The final details of the affordable housing, together with their long term management will be detailed in the S106 agreement.
145. The adopted Open Space SPD requires the provision of just over 97 square metres of informal open space for a development on the scale proposed, depending on the final mix, which is to be determined at the reserved matters stage (this figure represents an average based on a policy compliant mix). Given that Castle Camps has an identified short fall in informal open space, the fact that this amount of space can be provided at the density of development indicated is considered to be a significant social benefit of the proposal. The quantum of informal open space and its maintenance will be included in the Section 106 agreement. There is no requirement for formal open space as the development is not for more than 10 dwellings as outlined in the Open Space SPD.

Impact on Services and Facilities

146. The South Cambs 2014 Services and Facilities Study details Castle Camps is served by relatively few services and facilities in the village. These include a: Primary School, a mobile library service on the first Tuesday of the month from Sangers Farm (Camps End) and Claydon Close, a temporary Post Office which operates on a Monday from 12.30-14.30 and on Thursday from 13:30-15:30, a Public House and a Village Hall located at the Recreation Ground. The Recreation Ground has a Local Equipped Area of Play and outdoor sports facilities which include a football pitch and multi-use hard court with floodlights and play area, a separate bowls green and allotment.
147. This relative lack of services and employment opportunities is reflected in Castle Camps 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.

148. 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.
149. The nearest settlement that would offer services and social facilities, including sources of employment and secondary education, to possibly meet day-to-day needs would be the Minor Rural Centre of Linton, located approximately 6 miles to the north west. The market town of Haverhill located in Suffolk is also only approx. 5miles north east which contains a range of services and facilities.
150. There is a bus stop on Bartlow Road near the corner of High Street, approximately 200m from the site. The number 19 bus service connects Castle Camps to Haverhill with one bus from 7.00-9:29, 4 buses from 9:30-16:29 and 1 bus from 16:30-18:59. There are 4 buses from Haverhill between 9:30-16:29 and one bus from 16:30-18:59 Monday-Friday. There is no service on a Saturday or Sunday. The service between the village and Cambridge is extremely limited and would not allow commuting from the proposed development without access to private motor transport.
151. Bartlow Road has a public footpath which commences at 8 Bartlow Road adjacent to the site on the eastern boundary and the footpath on the opposite side of the road commences at the junction with Church Lane. The proposed development includes the installation of a footway along the southern boundary of the site to improve connectivity and this would improve the sustainability of the scheme. Details of the extent of the footpath can be secured by condition at this outline stage.
152. It is acknowledged that occupants of the proposed development would need to make journeys to larger centres, such as Haverhill, to meet day to day needs. However, it is possible to do that journey by public transport from the development and therefore there is an alternative to the use of the private car for these journeys. This would allow access to services and facilities in Haverhill.
153. It is considered that the environmental harm arising from reliance on the private car to access more than basic services would not be substantial enough to outweigh the significant benefits of the proposal, including the provision of affordable housing in relation to the adopted policy requirement.

Environmental

Impact on Landscape, Village and Historic Character

154. Policy NE/4 (Landscape Character Areas) of the LDF and policy NH/2 (Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character) of the draft Local Plan relate to the supply of housing, and are therefore considered as being out date. However, the aims of the policy are to ensure development will only be permitted where it respects and retains or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the individual Landscape Character Area. The importance of the landscape is reflected in the National Planning Policy Framework adopted 2012 (NPPF) which in paragraph 109 states the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscape. This is also echoed through paragraph 17 which recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Therefore existing policy NE/4 which affects the scale and density of new housing can be

afforded considerable weight.

155. Policies DP/2 and DP/3 are not considered to be housing supply policies and are not therefore considered to be out of date. 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.
156. 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.
157. In terms of the landscape character the site is situated at a National Level within the National Landscape Character Area (NCA) 86: South Suffolk and North Essex Clayland. At Regional level the site is situated within the Wooded Village Farmlands as assessed by Landscape East. At local level the site is situated within the A. South East Claylands as assessed by South Cambridgeshire District Council within the District Design Guide SPD March 2010. The site consists of a horse paddock which was previously Grade II agricultural land.
158. The site comprises a raised grass verge with cut back hedging in the south eastern corner along Bartlow Road, this continues with more substantive hedging and trees along the southern boundary further west. There is also a ditch running along the southern boundary and the site slopes up with access into the current paddock to an elevated plateau which gently rises to the north by approx. 2m with post and wire fencing along the northern boundary. To the north the character consists of wooded arable countryside which contains the views with historic irregular field patterns. There is a public footpath and the native hedgerow to the west reduces the impact on the open countryside as you approach the village. There is also a Public Right of Way – 41/16 Public Footpath to the north east of the site which has views of the site.
159. Whilst the proposal would result in encroachment into the countryside outside the existing built up development there are dwellings within the village framework south of the site on the opposite side of Bartlow Road. The southern boundary trees and hedgerows of landscape interest are to be retained and combined with the mitigation and enhancement proposed which includes further trees and hedgerow along the southern boundary, hedgerow planting running along the west boundary and hedgerow and tree planting running along the northern and eastern boundaries will protect the local landscape character and reduce visual harm. Overall in landscape terms the development would result in negligible effects on the wider and local landscape character areas which is also the view of the Landscape Officer. The landscaping proposed will be detailed in the subsequent reserved matters application.
160. The character of the dwellings to the east which abut the site consist of semi-detached painted render dwellings set back from the road with driveways which include tiled roofs and brick chimney stacks. Further east along Barlow Road there are larger brick built detached dwellings with garages to the front. The dwellings opposite the site consist of Wisteria Cottage, a Grade II listed thatched cottage with further cottages set close to the road.
161. The Urban Design Officer has no objection to the principle of development based on the character of the site and the low density will allow the site to be developed in a manner appropriate to the location. The site plan which is for illustrative purposes only showing a row of houses fronting the road, behind a hedgerow is appropriate given the context of the site.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special regard shall be paid to desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

162. Planning policy CH/5 (Conservation Areas) of the LDF and policy NH/14 (Heritage Assets) of the draft Local Plan relate to the supply of housing, and are therefore considered as being out of date. However, the aims of the policy are to ensure development within and impacting the setting of Conservation Areas which consist of areas of special architectural or historic interest and because the overall quality of the area, its mix of uses, historic layout, characteristic materials, scale and detailing of buildings and open spaces preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area.
163. These policies are consistent with the NPPF paragraph 129 which seeks to ensure the significance of the heritage asset is taken into consideration that may be affected to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage assets conservation and any aspect of the proposal. It is also consistent with paragraph 131 of the NPPF which states in determining planning applications local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Therefore existing policy CH/5 which affects the scale and density of new housing can be afforded considerable weight
164. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Listed Building.
165. The *Barnwell* judgement indicates that any harm caused to a listed building via its setting should be given great weight in any such balancing process derived from paragraph 134. This directly stems from S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This places a statutory duty on the decision maker to 'have regard to the desirability of preserving', i.e. keeping from harm.
166. With regard to policy CH/4 (Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building) of the LDF and policy NH/14 (Heritage Assets) of the draft Local Plan relate to the supply of housing, and are therefore considered as being out of date. However, the aims of the policy are to ensure development does not cause adverse harm by dominating the Listed Building or building in its curtilage by scale, form, mass or appearance or harm the visual relationship between the Listed Building and its formal or natural landscape surroundings.
167. These policies are consistent with the NPPF paragraph 129 which seeks to ensure the significance of the heritage asset is taken into consideration that may be affected including development affecting the setting of a heritage asset to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage assets conservation and any aspect of the proposal. Therefore existing policy CH/4 which affects the scale and density of new housing can be afforded considerable weight.
168. Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the assets conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

169. Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
170. This site is located 90 metres from the western edge of Castle Camps Conservation area which begins on the eastern boundary of no 1 Bartlow Road and western boundary of The Garden House. The site is also opposite Wisteria Cottage, a grade II listed thatched cottage.
171. The site is separated from the Conservation area by a row of C20th housing which are set back substantially from the road which detracts from the setting of the Conservation Area. However, the set back nature of these dwellings allows views from the Conservation Area to the open countryside beyond down to the application site. The site plan shows that the new housing will respect the substantial setback which allows the intermittent hedgerow and trees to be retained and enhanced resulting in less than substantial harm to the setting of the Conservation Area.
172. The development of the site will have more impact on the setting of Wisteria Cottage, a Grade II listed building which is located very close to the roadside, opposite the site. The rural setting of the development site does contribute to the setting of the cottage. The land has a ditch on the southern boundary and gently slopes at the access point of up to 2m where it plateaus. The setting of the cottage also includes modern housing to the north east diagonal to the dwelling on the opposite side of the road. Due to the degree of separation through the set back the development will therefore cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II listed building. The detailed design and layout of the houses, including boundary treatments will be subject to assessment at reserved matters stage.
173. Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The harm to the Conservation Area and setting of the Grade II listed building is considered to be less than substantial and therefore is required to be weighed against the public benefits including the optimum viable use of the site. It is considered the development will provide a contribution to the lack of 5 year housing land supply and chronic shortage of affordable housing as well as providing significant economic benefits which will secure the optimum viable use of the site. It is therefore considered the development will not cause significant harm to the landscape, character of the village or heritage assets sufficient to sustain a refusal of the application.
174. Officers are of the view that the site plan which is for illustrative purposes only and housing density demonstrates that the site can accommodate up to 10 dwellings and provide sufficient space for private garden areas, informal open space, parking, landscaping and access.

Ecology, Trees and Hedges

175. The ecological survey provided to inform the application demonstrates that the site is of relatively low ecological value. The site layout shows retention of the existing hedgerow and trees as well as the ditch along the southern boundary. Creation of the site access will bridge the ditch and involve the removal of a small amount of hedgerow which will require compensatory planting and can be achieved as shown on

the site plan.

176. The two ponds to the north of Bartlow Road within 200m of the site were assessed as being of poor suitability for great crested newt (GCN). There is an additional pond which was not identified by the ecological consultants approximately 130m south of the site which was not assessed, however, there is a partial barrier between this pond and the site. The ditch along the southern boundary was dry in November, and therefore is likely to be dry for much of the year and unsuitable to support breeding GCN. On balance, given that there are no records of GCN within 500m, limited optimal terrestrial habitat within the site and few records locally, the species is not considered reasonably likely to be present and impacted. Therefore, no further surveys are required. However, it would be reasonable to attach an informative to make the applicants aware of the law in the unexpected event of GCN being found during works.
177. The Ecology Officer does not have any significant objections to the application and recommends conditions which include ecological mitigation and enhancement and details of external lighting to be provided to achieve compliance with policy NE/6 of the adopted LDF.
178. The Trees Officer has no objections to the application in principle and recommends conditions for any forthcoming reserved matters to include an arboricultural impact assessment and tree protection strategy in accordance with British Standard BS5837 for the approval of the LPA. Prior to commencement, site preparation or the delivery of materials to site the tree protection measures recommended in the approved tree protection strategy shall be erected and remain in position until practical completion of the implementation of the development.

Noise and Lighting

179. The Council's Environmental Health Officer raises no objection to the principle of the development subject to conditions relating to the approval of a management plan relating to traffic and the storage of materials during the construction phase, a limit on the hours of deliveries to the site and the times during which power operated machinery can be used and external lighting. These details can be controlled by way of condition to address the concerns of neighbours. Subject to these conditions, the development would accord with adopted Policies DP/3, NE/14 and NE/15.

Residential Amenity

180. The site is bordered by residential properties to the east and on the southern side of Bartlow Road. The application is only in outline form and therefore the site plan is for illustrative purposes only. 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.
181. The submitted drawing demonstrates that the site could accommodate the amount of development proposed without having an unreasonable impact on residential amenity through overlooking or overbearing impact. Adequate separation distances could be retained to the neighbouring properties to the east and those to the south on the opposite side of Bartlow Road and the retention and enhancement of the hedgerow and 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 and the requirements of the District Design Guide.

The illustrative site plan shows that sufficient garden spaces can be achieved for up to 10 dwellings, although further detail will be required at detailed design stage and can be addressed at reserved matters stage.

Highway Safety and Parking

182. The Highways Authority raises no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of conditions regarding construction of the proposed access and submission of a traffic management plan. The proposal is thereby acceptable in this regard.
183. In terms of the access there is sufficient width to enabled two cars to enter and exit the site. In terms of trade lorries being able to turn within the site, the Traffic Management Plan condition will deal with this during the construction phase and the reserved matters application will ensure there is space for example for the bin lorry to turn as the bins are proposed to be located within the site through the layout and landscaping details.
184. A footpath is proposed to be provided from the access to the development, to join up with the existing footpath which currently ends just east of the site along Bartlow Road which can be secured by condition and in the Section 106 agreement.
185. The Highway Authority will not be seeking to adopt this development in its present format as the internal roads serve no highway function.
186. With regard to parking, 20 spaces are proposed as detailed in the application forms. Given the low density of the site there is sufficient space to achieve 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling and 1 secure cycle space per dwelling in accordance with Policy TR/2. Visitor parking can also be achieved in addition to this which will be detailed at reserved matters stage.

Archaeology

187. The comments of CCC archaeology are acknowledged. A condition requiring a programme of archaeological investigation to be secured prior to the commencement of development is recommended.

Surface Water Drainage and Foul Water Drainage

188. The site lies in Flood Zone 1. The Environment Agency commented , it will be necessary in this instance, for the Council to respond on behalf of the Environment Agency in respect of flood risk and/or surface water drainage issues
189. Due to the geology of the site infiltration of surface water runoff back into the ground is not feasible and the surface water runoff from the development will discharge into the drainage ditch that runs along the front of the site along Barlow Road and into a pond on the northern channel to the west of the site and that the surface water will be able flow into the wider river network. Attenuation will be provided through oversized pipes and underground tanks located under the access roads within the development site. The attenuation calculation has been revised to meet the climate change increase of 40%. It is intended for foul water to discharge from the site to the public foul sewer system to the south from the south eastern corner. An on site pumping station may be needed to make connection to the sewer.
190. The Council's Drainage Manager raises no objection in principle to the proposal,

subject to the imposition of conditions requiring details of the surface water drainage system and foul water drainage.

191. The Lead Local Flood Authority have removed their objection as the proposed development now includes permeable paving which is an improvement over the previous proposal. They recommend additional SUDS features are incorporated into the design which could be addressed at the detailed design stage. The proposed discharge rate has now been reduced to 1.76l/s to match the existing pre-development runoff rate.
192. Anglian Water has confirmed there are no assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within the development site boundary.
193. With regard to wastewater treatment the foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Camps Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows. In terms of the foul sewerage network the development may lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. A drainage strategy will need to be prepared in consultation with Anglian Water to determine mitigation measures, however, this can be dealt with by condition.

Contamination

194. The Contaminated Land Officer stated there are no immediately evident environmental constraints that would attract a contaminated land condition, however, the development proposed use is one which is particularly sensitive to the presence of any contamination and vulnerable receptors should be taken into account. Therefore an informative will be added that if during development contamination not previously identified is found to be present then no further development shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how the unsuspected contamination should be dealt with.

Renewable Energy

195. The scheme will have regard for Policy NE/3 and the requirement of renewable technologies. This can only be resolved at the detailed stage as further design and layout information becomes available.
196. 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.

Waste

197. Very little information is provided in the application on the development's compliance with the RECAP design guide. It is agreed that this is often a detailed design matter and adequate information would need to be provided on operational waste and recycling provision. This can be secured by planning condition.

Developer Contributions

198. With regard to developer contributions development plan policies state that planning permission will only be granted for proposals that have made suitable arrangements towards the provision of infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.

Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations states that a planning obligation may only

constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development of the obligation is: -

- i) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- ii) Directly related to the development; and,
- iii) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

199. The Written Ministerial Statement and NPPG dated November 2014 seeks to limit Section 106 contributions secured from small scale developments of less than 10 no. dwellings or those where the gross floor space would not exceed 1000 square metres. The proposed development is for up to 10 no. dwellings but it would not exceed 1000 square metres and would fall below the threshold. Therefore, no contributions in relation to open space, community facilities, education, libraries and waste could be secured from the development. However, given that the application is currently at outline stage only and no exact details of the size of the dwellings are known, contributions may be required at reserved matters stage if the floor space exceeds the limit.
200. Notwithstanding the above, contributions can be secured towards waste receptacles and monitoring. The RECAP Waste Management Design Guide requires household waste receptacles to be provided for the development. Off-site contributions are required towards the provision to comply with Policy DP/4 of the adopted LDF. The contribution would be £73.50 per dwelling and £150.00 per flat. To ensure the provision and usage of on-site infrastructure, a monitoring fee of £500 is required.

Other Matters

201. Public Footpath No. 12, Castle Camps runs along the eastern boundary of the site. The application proposes screening planting between the Public Footpath and the final plot. Where a Public Right of Way is to be enclosed between fences or boundaries extra land will have to be set aside for the path, for access for maintenance of the route and boundaries, and to ensure that the boundary remains clear of the route. Hedges and other vegetation must be planted at least 2 metres away from the route to ensure that future growth does not obstruct the path. It would be reasonable to condition this to ensure there is access to the footpath.
202. Concern is raised by local neighbours regarding the issue of precedence and that an approval may lead to additional developments in the area and as a result of the site plan which is for illustration purposes only and shows a hammer head design at one end which may lead to future development. However, each application must be determined on its individual merits and this concern does not give rise to significant and demonstrable harm to outweigh the benefits in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

#

203. Concern was also raised about the car headlights leaving the site access which would point to the houses opposite. However, this is not an uncommon situation and the site plan which is for illustrative purposes only combined with the trees and hedgerow would enable a significant degree of separation and would not cause significant harm.

204. Conclusions

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:

ST/6: Group Villages – indicative maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings
DP/1 – Sustainable Development

205. DP/7: Village Frameworks
HG/1: Density
HG/2: Housing Mix
NE/1: Biodiversity
NE/17: Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
CH/2: Archaeological Sites

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.

206. Given the fact that the District cannot currently identify a five year supply of housing land, policies which restrict the supply of housing outside of village frameworks are out of date and should therefore only be afforded limited weight in the decision making process. In accordance with the guidance in paragraph 14 of the NPPF, in balancing all of the material considerations, planning permission should be granted unless the harm arising from the proposal would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits.
207. The proposed development would provide a significant number of dwellings, 4 of which would be affordable. This is a benefit which should be given significant weight in the determination of the planning application. Given the significant shortage of affordable housing in the District and within the Parish of Castle Camps, in line with the policy requirement of a minimum 40% is considered to be a significant social benefit of the development.
208. It is acknowledged that Castle Camps has a limited number of services and facilities and that travel to larger centres, such as Haverhill, is required to meet basic day to day needs and sources of employment. However, there is a bus service which would allow commuting to Haverhill which serves bus stops within a short walk of the development. This would provide an alternative means of transport to access a broader range of services and facilities without relying on the private car. The environmental impact of the proposal in terms of trip generation and the social impact in relation to the capacity of services and facilities would therefore be reduced.
209. Whilst there would be some harm arising from the need to travel from the development to access facilities such as shops, a doctor's surgery, places of education and employment, this is considered not to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposals, within the context of the lack of a five year housing land supply.
210. There are no objections from statutory consultees and the proposal would not result in significant harm to the character of the landscape, allowing for the retention of the hedgerow and trees and further hedgerow and tree planting on the boundaries. This will enable a sense of containment and reduce the impact of the development on the character of the wider landscape to an acceptable degree.
211. In terms of the impact on the Conservation Area and setting of the Grade II listed building the development would be on land that has a ditch along the southern boundary and rises gently to a plateau approx. 2m higher than Bartlow Road. The dwellings are shown as being set back by approx. 15 metres from the site edged red
212. on the site plan which is for illustrative purposes only which will respect the linear character of the dwellings along Bartlow Road. This shows up to 10 dwellings can be accommodated on the site will cause less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area and setting of the Grade II listed building. Officers are therefore of the view that

the harm resulting from the proposal is considered to represent less than substantial harm and in accordance with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework has been assessed with regard to the public benefits of the development and its optimum viable use.

213. It is considered the public benefits of providing housing to meet the significant deficit in five year housing land supply and chronic shortage of affordable housing outweigh the harm to the heritage assets. Overall it is considered the development does not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and as a result, in line with the guidance in paragraph 14 of the NPPF, the recommendation is to grant planning permission.
214. This leads officers to conclude that this application should be recommended for approval. None of the disbenefits arising from the proposals are considered to result in significant and demonstrable harm when balanced against the positive elements and therefore, it is considered that the proposal achieves the definition of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.

Recommendation

215. Officers are recommended that the Committee approve the application subject to a Section 106 agreement including:
- a) Affordable Housing – 4 dwellings on site
 - b) Waste Receptacles – contribution of £888.00 and £500 monitoring fee
 - c) Informal open space provision on site including management and maintenance
 - d) Drainage Maintenance

Conditions

- (a) Approval of the details of the layout of the site, the scale and appearance of buildings and landscaping (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.
(Reason - The application is in outline only.)
- (b) Application for the approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission.
(Reason - The application is in outline only.)
- (c) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
(Reason - The application is in outline only.)
- (d) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan 1:1250 and drawing number 2016-F-056-003
(Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)
- (e) The submission of reserved matters in accordance with the details required in condition (a) shall include a plan showing the finished floor levels of the proposed buildings in relation to the existing and proposed ground levels of the surrounding land. No development shall take place until this submitted plan is

approved by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved plan.

(Reason: To ensure the development is properly assimilated into the area in accordance with policies CH/4, CH/5, DP/2 and DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- (f) Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the implementation programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage and to prevent the increased risk of flooding in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- (g) Details for the long term maintenance arrangements for any parts of the surface water drainage system which will not be adopted (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted. The submitted details should identify run-off sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structure, flow routes and outfalls. In addition the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.
(Reason: To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of unadopted drainage systems in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 103 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.)
- (h) Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the implementation programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To reduce the risk of pollution to the water environment and to ensure a satisfactory method of foul water drainage in accordance with Policy NE/10 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- (i) No development shall take place on the application site until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To secure the provision of archaeological excavation and the subsequent recording of the remains in accordance with Policy CH/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- (j) No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:
 - (i) Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted highway)
 - (ii) Contractor parking, for both phases all such parking shall be within the curtilage of the site and not on street
 - (iii) Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading shall

be undertaken off the adopted public highway)

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

Development shall commence in accordance with the approved details.

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

(k) No development including demolition or enabling works shall take place until a Site Waste Management Plan for the construction phases has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan shall be implemented in full.

(Reason - To ensure that waste arising from the development is minimised and that which produced is handled in such a way that maximises opportunities for re-use or recycling in accordance with Policy DP/6 of the adopted Local Framework 2007.)

(l) No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the development is occupied in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained. (Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the site does not detract from the character of the area in accordance with Policy DP/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

(m) Prior to commencement, site preparation or the delivery of materials to site the applicant shall submit an arboricultural impact assessment and tree protection strategy in accordance with British Standard BS5837 for the approval of the Local Planning Authority.

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

(n) Prior to commencement, site preparation or the delivery of materials to site the tree protection measures recommended in the approved tree protection strategy shall be erected and remain in position until practical completion of the implementation of the development.

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

(o) No development shall commence until a scheme for ecological enhancement including a location plan and specification for establishment and management of native planting and in-built features for nesting birds and roosting bats has been provided to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

(Reason: To provide habitat for wildlife and enhance the site for biodiversity in accordance with the NPPF, the NERC Act 2006 and Policy NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.

(p) All development must proceed in strict accordance with the

recommendations detailed in Section 6 of the *Preliminary Ecological Appraisal* report (Naturally Wild, December 2016). This shall include avoidance and mitigation measures for features of ecological interest, nesting birds and bats. If any amendments to the recommendations as set out in the reports are required, the revisions shall be submitted in writing to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority before works commence.

(Reasons: To minimise disturbance, harm or potential impact on protected species in accordance with Policies DP/1, DP/3 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

(q) No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision of on-site renewable energy to meet 25% reduction in the projected carbon emissions from the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented and thereafter retained in operation.

(Reason: To ensure the development provides renewable energy in accordance with policy NE/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

(r) No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust (including the consideration of wheel washing and dust suppression provisions) from the site during the construction period or relevant phase of development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details / scheme unless the local planning authority approves the variation of any detail in advance and in writing.

(Reason – To protect the amenities of nearby residential properties in accordance with South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies 2007, Policy NE/15-Noise Pollution, NE/16-Emissions & DP/6- Construction Methods.)

(s) As part of any reserved matters application a lighting scheme (to maximise energy efficiency and minimise lighting pollution) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of any external lighting of the site and a Lighting Spill Plan. The Artificial Lighting Scheme shall have regard for the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light – GN01:2011 (or as superseded). The lighting scheme will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason -To minimise the effects of light pollution on the surrounding area in accordance with Policy NE/6 and NE/14 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

(t) As part of any reserved matter application details of the housing mix (including both market and affordable housing) shall be provided in accordance with local planning policy or demonstration that the housing mix meets local need shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall commence in accordance with the approved details

(Reason: To ensure an appropriate level of housing mix, both market and affordable housing in accordance with policies H/8 and H/9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission July 2013)

(u) All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with

the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years from the date of the planting, or replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

(Reason - To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity in accordance with Policies DP/2 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

(v) During the period of construction, no power operated machinery shall be operated on the site, and there shall be no construction related deliveries taken at or dispatched from the site, before 0800 hours and after 1800 hours on weekdays and before 0800 hours and after 1300 hours on Saturdays, nor at any time on Sundays and Bank Holidays, unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

(Reason - To minimise noise disturbance for adjoining residents in accordance with Policy NE/15 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

(w) The proposed access hereby approved shall be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the highway and shall be constructed from a bound material for the first 5m to prevent displacement of materials onto the highway. The development shall be retained as such thereafter.

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

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

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

(y) No planting shall be placed on or within 2 meters from the boundary of Public Footpath No. 12, Castle Camps.

(Reason: In the interests of the amenity in accordance with policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

Informatives

- (a) The granting of planning permission does not constitute a permission or licence to a developer to carry out any works within, or disturbance of, or interference with, the Public Highway, and that a separate permission must be sought from the Highway Authority for such works.
- (b) The applicant should take all relevant precautions to minimise the potential for disturbance to neighbouring residents in terms of noise and dust during the construction phases of development. This should include the use of water suppression for any stone or brick cutting and advising neighbours in advance of any particularly noisy works. The granting of this planning permission does

not indemnify against statutory nuisance action being taken should substantiated noise or dust complaints be received. For further information please contact the Environmental Health Service.

- (c) There shall be no burning of any waste or other materials on the site, without prior consent from the Environmental Health Department to ensure nuisance is not caused to local residents.
- (d) Should driven pile foundations be proposed, then before works commence, a statement of the method of construction of these foundations shall be submitted and agreed by the District Environmental Health Officer so that noise and vibration can be controlled.
- (e) Great Crested Newts are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). In the unlikely event of great crested newt being discovered during works, all activity must cease and a qualified ecologist and/or Natural England must be contacted for advice. It is a criminal offence to kill, injure or disturb great crested newts or to damage or destroy their habitats.
- (f) If during development contamination not previously identified is found to be present then no further development shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how the unsuspected contamination should be dealt with.
- (g) Public Footpath No. 12, Castle Camps must remain open and unobstructed at all times. Building materials must not be stored on Public Rights of Way and contractors' vehicles must not be parked on it (it is an offence under s 137 of the Highways Act 1980 to obstruct a public Highway).
- (h) No alteration to the Footpath's surface is permitted without consent (it is an offence to damage the surface of a public footpath under s 1 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971).
- (i) Landowners are reminded that it is their responsibility to maintain boundaries, including trees, hedges and fences adjacent to Public Rights of way, and that any transfer of land should account for any such boundaries (s154 Highways Act 1980).
- (j) The granting of planning permission does not entitle a developer to obstruct a Public Right of Way (Circular 1/09 para 7.1).

Background Papers:

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted January 2007)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policy DPD (adopted July 2007)
- Planning File Ref: S/0415/17/OL

Report Author:

Lydia Pravin
Telephone Number:

Senior Planning Officer
01954 713020
