Application Number: S/4418/19/RM

Parish(es): Linton

Proposal: Approval of matters reserved for access appearance landscaping layout and scale following outline planning permission S/2553/16/OL for the erection of 42 dwellings including the provision of 0.45ha for allotments

Site address: Land South Of Wheatsheaf Barn Horseheath Road Linton Cambs

Applicant(s): Croudace House

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Key material considerations:
- Compliance with the Outline Planning Permission
- Housing Provision (including affordable housing)
- Open Space Provision
- Reserved Matters:
  - Access
  - Layout
  - Scale
  - Appearance
  - Landscaping
- Biodiversity
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Highway Safety, Management of Roads and Parking
- Residential Amenity
- Heritage Assets
- Other matters

Committee Site Visit: No

Departure Application: Yes (advertised 15 January 2020)

Presenting Officer: Michael Sexton, Principal Planner

Application brought to Committee because: The officer recommendation of approval conflicts with the recommendation of Linton Parish Council

Date by which decision due: 01 July 2020 (extension of time agreed)
Executive Summary

1. Outline planning permission was granted at appeal on 14 March 2018 for the development of up to 50 dwellings and not less than 0.45ha of allotments at Horseheath Road, Linton.

2. Condition 5 of the outline consent restricted the development to no more than 42 (forty-two) dwellings while condition 6 stated that the total area of allotments to be provided shall not be less than 0.45 hectares. Both conditions are adhered to.

3. Although not required by conditions on the outline consent, all 42 properties within the development would meet or exceed national space standards, 10% of the market housing would be constructed to accessible and adaptable dwellings M4(2) standard (plots 16, 17, 19, 30 and 31) while all 17 affordable units would be constructed to accessible and adaptable dwellings M4(2) standard.

4. Officers consider the reserved matters including the access, layout, scale, appearance and associated landscaping to be acceptable. The proposal would provide a high-quality scheme which would make a positive contribution to the local and wider context of the site and the character of the area, responsive to its edge of village location.

5. The scheme has therefore been recommended for approval subject to planning conditions.

Site History

6. Pre-application PRE/0333/19 – Erection of 42 dwellings, access, appearance, layout, scale and landscaping including the provision of 0.45 Ha for allotments. Including Design Workshop, presentation to the Design Enabling Panel and youth engagement at Linton Heights Junior School.

7. S/3405/17/OL – Outline planning application with all matters reserved for up to 42 dwellings and not less than 0.4ha of allotments with associated open space and sustainable drainage – Withdrawn.

8. S/2553/16/OL – Outline planning application with all matters reserved for up to 50 dwellings and allotments (not less than 0.45 hectares) – Appeal Allowed.

National Guidance

   National Planning Practice Guidance 2018
   National Design Guide 2019

Development Plan Policies

10. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
    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/9 – Minor Rural Centres
    CC/1 – Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change
11. **South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):**

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020
Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016
Health Impact Assessment SPD – Adopted March 2011
Affordable Housing SPD – Adopted March 2010
District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010
Landscape in New Developments SPD - Adopted March 2010
Biodiversity SPD - Adopted July 2009
Open Space in New Developments SPD - Adopted January 2009
Trees & Development Sites SPD - Adopted January 2009

**Consultation**

12. **Linton Parish Council** – Objection, refers the application to Planning Committee.

The comments of Linton Parish Council are detailed below. In summary the following concerns have been raised:
- OL approved was for no more than 42 houses, not 42, incorrect description.
- Ransom Strip within the site owned by SCDC, applications have not followed due process to reflect ownership and potential conflict of interest.
- Boundary treatments and landscape impact.
- Impact on neighbouring properties.
- Traffic, connectivity and highway safety.
- Drainage and flood risk
- Impact on heritage, including matters of archaeology.
- Design, including screening of site and external materials.
- Biodiversity impact.
- Sustainability, including access to services.

**Comments received 23 January 2020**

*Please see appendix 1 for a full copy of the comments received from Linton Parish Council on 23 January 2020 which contains supporting ‘reports’ to the comments.*

Linton lies in a river valley, almost hidden until the village edge is reached, allowing appreciation of the natural landscape and the vista across open fields. Housing here will result in the loss of rolling fields, distinctive to the landscape setting of the village; these make an important contribution to the chalkland landscape character setting of the village. The current housing, particularly to the south of the site is set low, so that it minimises the landscape impact to the approach to Linton. The landscape character and setting of Linton would indeed be affected by this development, as well as the long views over Character Chalk landscape. This is confirmed in the Liz Lake Landscape Assessment and the sensitivity is reflected in the confirmation of Valued Landscape.

However, we appreciate that the developer has engaged with LPC and residents, and has listened to our concerns, unlike other developers whose plans would be much more harmful.

- The OL approval was for no more than 42 houses – not 42 – so the description is not correct.
- There is no Archaeological Report, no Heritage Report (the Wheatsheaf group opposite and the valued landscape are heritage assets), the Reptile survey is incomplete, nor is there a suitable Flood and Drainage Scheme.
- The drainage and water management aspects are incomplete and described by neighbours as “a potential disaster” for them.
- The drawings and documents conflict with one another, including inconsistent descriptions of materials, boundaries and hedges.
- The sections and elevations do not show the boundaries of the site and do not show the proposals in relation to the existing homes.
- These sections are critical because neighbouring houses north and south of the site are bungalows and this part of Linton is on a considerable slope.
- Residents in Lonsdale and Harefield Rise are aware of the sloping site and are concerned regarding overlooking, overshadowing, loss of privacy and the effects of the proposed boundary treatments.
- As the application is incomplete and inconsistent, consideration is premature.

**Boundaries**
- The location plan is incorrect as it includes a strip of land at the eastern edge behind Lonsdale which is owned by SCDC (referred to as the SCDC “Ransom Strip” in the D&A).
- The strip has been used since Lonsdale was built (1983?) as an access route for maintaining hedges/fences and as a permissive pathway. It is now shown as being enclosed within the gardens of plots abutting Lonsdale.
- As that strip of land in question is marked on plans of SCDC assets, the applicant does not own the whole are bounded by the red-line and that part is, in fact, owned by SCDC. At the time of the OL and planning appeal, SCDC denied ownership but following correspondence regarding easement, LPC has written confirmation that the strip is owned by SCDC.
- Any application that includes this strip of land should follow due process to reflect this ownership and potential conflict of interest.
- Now that we know the redline boundary is incorrect, we are aware that there is
a substantial and material discrepancy in the planning permission given. The
development has not been carried out; the planning certificate is incorrect and
should be quashed.
- The development will be prominent in the landscape and without suitable
screening will be a hard edge at the sensitive village entrance. Landscape
trees and screening hedges take time to establish and grow (even the
proposed "Elvedon Instant Hedging"), especially with current very dry seasons
punctuated by downpours. It is unlikely that this screening could be preserved
in the surroundings of a housing estate. Conditioning is not readily enforced in
these circumstances, especially un-enforceable after 5 years.
- The OL scheme had a 6 metre buffer on the eastern boundaries, this no longer
appears but would be necessary for suitable depth of screening.
- The loss of mature hedging along Horseheath Road is likely to involve the loss
of a Protected hedge (as it is in the Map dated 1600). Its loss would be
damaging to the landscape and ecology and it is important to provide
screening and reduce the impact of the taller houses. The status of the hedge
should be properly assessed before a decision is made about it.
- The current high native screening hedge alongside Lonsdale is also on the
1600 Map so is also likely to be protected. It is shown as being within
proposed gardens so would not be protected even by conditioning. It is better
incorporated with the open space and SuDs scheme meadow.
- Houses along the southern edge are bungalows, set low and unobtrusive.
Dimensions and sections showing relative heights and impacts need to be
clearly shown and suitable natural screening is needed to retain their privacy
and rural outlook. The hedge and buffer zone was originally proposed 3m
wide, and this should be clearly shown.
- The site slopes to the south and west, falling around 8m from top to bottom.
Below the southern border are houses which sit below a sheer drop of almost
2m from the edge of the field. The boundary treatment of a 1.8m close
boarded fence might cause overshadowing. Suitably boundary treatment is
needed for their privacy, outlook and quality of life.
- There are similar issues regarding boundary treatments along Lonsdale
where the Enclosure boundary hedge is a well-tended feature and must not be
lost.

Traffic and Connectivity
- The entrance is within the 60mph zone, with concomitant safety issues.
- The site entrance is directly opposite the access for Wheatsheaf Barn, where
the road is very narrow and the buildings are heritage assets. This is a busy
access for residents (including the Vet) and the house already suffers damage
from lorries manoeuvring in the roadway. The refuse lorry tracking plan
appears to be rather hopeful (relying on advanced driving skills) and needs
review, particularly with sightlines as the road curves here.
- The Renewable Energy and Water Conservation Statement, section 7, states
there is a bus stop within 25m/2 minutes of the site. This is not so. The nearest
stop is on Bartlow Road, not directly accessible from the site – there is no path
past Beggars Roost. The nearest stops are near Parsonage Way/Fire Station
around 700m away.
- The Design and Access Statement, page 40, para 3, also refers to proximity of
bus stops although there is no route through to Bartlow Road.
- The Design and Access Statement, page 40, para 3, refers to the proximity to
village facilities. The distances have been measured to significant sites and all
are outside of the recommended sustainability distances. See separate report.
- Apart from the exit to Horseheath Road, there is no connectivity to the village.
- A footway towards Linton would be alongside a busy through-route in the
60mph zone.

- Should a suitably wide pathway be built, this would impact on the roots and affect the viability of the established hedge next to Horseheath Road, with a loss of its screening. If a replacement hedge is planted it would reduce the area that could be developed.

- If building work is permitted, then delivery lorries, heavy plant and site traffic should not access the site via Back Road (to preserve the protected verges) or through the village (to protect the listed buildings and Conservation Area).

**Drainage**

- There is no effective drainage plan. The surface water drainage strategy depends upon permeable surfaces and an attenuation basin only at the SW corner. It is known that surface water flows from the rising ground and Horseheath Road over the site.

- As this is a site that floods and slopes it should be demonstrated that the layout and design will not cause flooding of existing and proposed areas. There should be a sequence of flood protection / basins in order to be a SuDs scheme, and this should start dealing with flooding on entry to the site and preventing overflow beyond the site. The EA surface water flood map shows that flood water enters the eastern edge of the site at the valley (which is located wrongly on the D&A slopes diagram and OL proposal).

- The OL application shows a bund and ditch to hold the surface water flow, although this shared the space with screening tree planting: it would not have been feasible to have both in the same space. The bund does not appear in the RM, leaving the housing vulnerable to flooding in storms.

- According to the Environment Agency, flooding of the village is likely to be a one-in-a-hundred-year event. We have had already had serious floods in 1918, 1947, 1969, 2001 and 2014 with surface water adding to river flooding. Climate Change has not been taken into account.

- The infiltration/porosity testing was done on 29/11/19 following a prolonged period of drought and readings are not typical for the area. The methodology is not clear as being suitable for the chalk conditions.

- We have tangible evidence of the problems caused by surface water flooding. This was particularly noted as coming from the land off Horseheath Road, affecting Martins Lane, Bakers Lane, the adjacent Lonsdale, Harefield Rise, Bartlow Road and buildings off these.

- The site slopes to the south and west, with a natural gully running across the site directing flood water towards current housing and roads. The site falls around 8m from top to bottom. Below the southern border are housing which sit below a sheer drop of about 5-6ft from the edge of the field. These houses are particularly at risk, but 1 times of intense rainfall, we have seen how surface water run-off from there reaches much further.

- The layout of the development shows a spine road, again directing water towards Harefield Rise, Martins Lane, Bakers Lane and Bartlow Road. This spine road would be roughly parallel to that of Lonsdale, which in storms runs "like a river", flooding gardens, garages and into houses at its southern end, in Bakers Lane and Bartlow Road. It is likely that the same would happen at the end of the spine road on the proposed development. Loss of soakaway provided by the open field of the site would add to the rainwater reaching neighbouring housing; we doubt that the proposed reliance on permeable surfaces and infiltration pond would give sufficient protection.

- We see for ourselves, during heavy rains, that water from the surrounding rising ground comes as a sudden deluge – a type of weather that we are told to expect more frequently. Having no outflow to a natural watercourse, the SUDS pool would simply overflow down towards Bartlow Road, and further.
Martins Lane would become, in effect, the watercourse.
- Any storm water run-off going into the foul drains could again overwhelm them. The current housing and core of the village will be placed at unacceptable risk.

_Archaeology and Heritage Assets_
- The scheme has not demonstrated it will preserve heritage assets. As highlighted by Kasia Gdaniec, the County Archaeologist, the allotments are located where the burials would be dug up. The applicant needs to be is alerted and should deal with this by full investigation and preservation as appropriate.
- There is no Archaeology Report, and the Historic and Archaeological significance of the site, the valued landscape and Wheatsheaf group have not been appropriately taken into account.
- An initial Phase 1 desk-based and trial-hole study has been carried out, the findings include inhumations, the Cursus and Round Barrow.
- The cursus is one of only 5 in this region and 120 nationally on the Heritage Database. As such, it is of substantial importance.
- The cursus was considered to be small in size, but this is likely not to be the case. The aerial photos of March 2018 published by Google Earth show a substantial feature crossing the site perpendicular to the cursus. It has not been excavated and at its crossing point, it is likely to result in the anomalies described as the terminations of the Cursus. Instead, if the Cursus follows typical characteristics, it is likely to continue across this perpendicular feature into areas of the site that were not surveyed.
- Extensive flint fids were considered to indicate an industrial centre close by, which was of sufficient importance to the inhabitants for them to bury collections of the worked flint with the bodies in the Barrow.
- The industrial site has been found on the Bartlow Road site, less than 200 metres from the Horseheath road flint finds. Initial flint working finds at Bartlow Road, complete with Mesolithic hearth, are now being attributed National importance.
- The recent Bartlow Road site excavations at Bartlow Road have also established that there is a greater connection between the Horseheath Road site and those sites to its south than previously considered.
- The Bartlow Road site with its Anglo Saxon village is less that 150 metres away and is linked to it by a spur leading from the Roman road.
- The Anglo Saxon village found on the Bartlow Road site is only 150 metres away from the Horseheath Road Barrow and its Anglo Saxon burials, with another (now-destroyed) round barrow / Anglo Saxon cemetery linking the group.
- The proximity of these two sites, the link spur road and their related finds, show these two sites are complementary and should be considered together. As complementary sites, they also have added cumulative significance.
- There is no mention of a full archaeological survey, which is merited by the finding of the cursus along, nor of any preservation or commemoration of the significant findings.

_Designs_
- We appreciate that the developer has engaged with LPC regarding design.
- They have kept to maximum 2-storey houses, knowing the effect of taller housing on skyline and wider landscape; roof designs do not allow dormer additions.
- There are issues because the larger houses have less screening in the landscape than described at OL stage.
- The developer has provided a few much-needed bungalows but not enough
for village needs now and in future.
- In discussions, the character of the village housing has been noted and revisions made.
- It would appear the buildings with flint have been lost. This was a welcome local feature linking the estate to the Wheatsheaf Barn and others in the village. When flint is done nicely it looks really good, and we request that the flint is restored in the materials and designs.
- We had not expected the rendering colours illustrated. These might be present in some modern paint schemes, but blue in particular is not characteristic of vernacular walling as it was very difficult to create in lime wash and before C/19/C20.
- The roof tiles seem to be pale red, not typical of very local clay, and which relies on the colouring of a sand colouring glued onto it which comes off in the rain. Some illustrations on the internet show very little sand colouring left a few years later. A revised material is needed for the roofs.
- The D&A proposes photovoltaic panels on roofs which should be shown on drawings.
- It also appears that all pedestrian connections other than main road have been omitted, so is less sustainable than originally proposed.

Landscape and Environment
- The visual effect on the landscape and the sensitive entrance to the historic village has not yet been fully addressed.
- The reduced screening makes the development more prominent in the landscape.
- The submission has not demonstrated that ecology is adequately assessed and would be preserved in this layout and design. The (likely) protected hedges plotted on maps of 1600 and their habitats are likely to be substantially lost.
- The reptile survey was carried out over one month, rather than the season-long timing required by regulations. This was following a prolonged dry period when reptiles would have avoided open areas.
- It is surprising that the damp area near Beggars Roost and the area at the SE of Lonsdale did not yield evidence of reptiles, as they have often been seen by residents here. This should be investigated properly with DNA / English Nature approved study at the correct time of year and in more normal weather conditions before the application is decided.
- The Ecology and Enhancement strategy 2.5 and 2.6 refers to there being no ponds on the site. This was after prolonged period of drought. The SW corner of the site is usually damp and ponded (as are the adjacent Lonsdale gardens) and standing water is commonly seen remaining long after rainfall. This was noted by the Planning Inspector at the site visit.
- The south west corner was omitted from the OL plan, without explanation; it may be because the original developer found news in the boggy area there. A full reptile survey in current (rainfall) conditions is necessary to meet regulations.

Other Issues
- The sewage pumping station is very close to the infiltration pond with the possibility of pollution.
- The sewage pumping station is close to housing – there are concerns that it is insufficiently screened both visually and for noise.
- The slope of the site raises issues of accessibility, particularly for the less able or less mobile.
- The slope means that soil depths vary, so the quality/quantity of soil for
- We request that Cambridge Water is a statutory consultee, regarding issues of water supply to the site. We are aware that water supply in this area is limited and there are issues of sufficiency of water in the aquifers.
- The schools are filled with the current population. Additional infill housing has added to the numbers wishing to be educated in Linton. With yet more housing in the planning pipeline (Cambridge Road flats, Paynes Meadow social housing, Bartlow Road, 1, Horseheath Road, and others) there could be another 100 dwellings in the near future, not including this application. There is no provision for school places, nor any s106 to cover this.
- The additional screening, buffer zones, the ponds and bunds needed for the drainage scheme, the land not owned by the developer etc. reduces the developable area. This brings into question the deliverability of the stated number of houses. The OL permission is for no more than 42 houses, not the proposed 42.

Comments received 15 April 2020

We welcome the amendments and that the developer is trying to meet the concerns of LPC. We also welcome the input of the Youth Engagement exercise to the design of the LEAP, and public spaces. The input of the design team is welcomed, and that the developer has made amendments following their response.

The drainage proposals are still a cause for concern, especially following the recent rain (moderate rainfall following 3 years of drought resulted in standing water for many days). Does the scheme take into account the revised guidelines for climate change, with suitable excess (this was lacking in the OL assessment)?

Does the scheme demonstrate that the proposed SUDs would be a suitable way of handling the expected surface water flooding on site and not add to flooding off-site to the wider village? This will be affected by the proposals for the Bartlow Road sites, which use the same infiltration area.

The SUDs system should take into account the potential overflow from the pond. The recommendations are that this should be to an existing watercourse, which does not exist. Overflow would be towards Lonsdale houses or past Beggars Roost onto Bartlow Road (as is the current situation).

The spine road is marked as being of impermeable material and would lead surface water down towards housing on site. Water currently diverts from Horseheath Road straight down Lonsdale. This water would presumably divert down the new road due to the contours, significantly impacting the amount of water to be collect on site. After that a private road leads water towards on-site houses, Beggars Roost and Bartlow Road - this is a permeable surface, but would it absorb water sufficiently when we have downpours?

The site of the foul water pump should be reviewed as it is close to the infiltration basin – above the aquifer, our fresh water supply.

A major concern is the lack of Archaeological assessment or a schedule for this. This is a site where there are known important finds (Barrows, inhumations, etc). A rare Cursus (processional way)is present and with the known nearby finds including the Saxon burial site on Linton Heath there is probably much more to be found (see the comments of the County Archaeologist and LPC at OL and Appeal).
Should highly significant findings be revealed, we would hope that these could be fully investigated, preserved and the site re-configured to reflect and preserve the important history of this area. It is part of significant historic and ritual landscape which needs thorough investigation and should not be lost. Please send details of the intended investigations as this is too important to be left to conditioning.

The loss of the rural hedge along Horseheath Road is regretted and LPC would like this to be reconsidered, being an ancient boundary hedge, species rich and would soften the effect of the new estate at the edge of the village, in sensitive landscape. LPC understand the loss of part of the hedge due to visibility splays but not all of it is necessary.

The management of the hedges and trees must be part of a management scheme to preserve these, and written into deeds, such that the site retains a rural rather than urban atmosphere.

The connectivity is only by one path and entrance off Horseheath Road. We appreciate that the developer is trying to make further connections, especially to the bus stops on Bartlow Road, which would help sustainable travel options. This is marked in the D+A, page 30, but has not been achieved.

However, the potential loss of privacy for residents of Harefield Rise from footpaths along their boundary, especially for allotment holders need to be considered. This is not to be allowed to develop into a permissive right of way, should the connectivity with Martins Lane be achieved. The exact position of the southern boundary might be from the edge of headland that has been tended by residents for many years, and now considered to be part of their own property, which is 1m from residents hedge line. Also the OL indicated a 6m buffer zone, which now appears reduced to 3m.

Also, there remains the issue of land ownership and the legality of SCDC making a planning decision on an area including land that itself owns (the strip of land at the western edge, marked in the D+A page 7 as the SCDC Ransom Strip). This was commented on previously and also at the planning appeal, when it was stated that all the land belonged to the Diocese - this was inaccurate.

In the OL application, Certificate B is incomplete and inaccurate as there is no mention of SCDC ownership of land. We question whether planning law has been complied with, and whether there has been due diligence on this aspect of the application. If not, then planning law has not been complied with.

The loss of privacy for residents from Harefield rise is a concern. To ensure that no permissive right of way occurs, should the connectivity with Martins Lane be achieved.

The exact position of the boundary might be from the edge of the headland which has been tended by the residents for many years and considered to be their own property.

Linton Parish Council Decision:

Objects and does refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee.

The Committee registers this objection with some regret, in view of the co-operation extended by the developer to the community

Comments received 22 May 2020
Linton Parish Council appreciates that the developer has tried to take into account the comments made by LPC.

The plans appear to have been adjusted in line with the Parish Council comments.

Whilst we appreciate that the plans have been adjusted to a considerable extent, Linton Parish Council wishes to continue with its objections as it does not feel that surface water drainage issues have been fully addressed, nor has the legality of the decision made by SCDC in regard to the SCDC ownership of the ransom strip.

LPC Decision: Object and refer this to the District Council Full Planning Committee

13. **Affordable Housing Officer** – Support.

**Affordable Housing**

The applicant has proposed the following mix:

Affordable rented
3 X 2 Bed Bungalows
4 x 2 Bed Houses
5 x 3 Bed Houses

Shared Ownership
2 x 2 Bed Houses
3 x 3 Bed Houses

**District & Local Housing Need**

There are currently around 1,300 applicants registered on Home-Link in South Cambs who are in need of good quality affordable rented accommodation. The largest need is for 1- and 2-bedroom accommodation.

There are in the region of 500 applicants in South Cambs who are registered on the ‘Help to Buy’ register for shared ownership. The biggest demand for this tenure is for 2- and 3-bedroom properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Village Local Connection</th>
<th>Bedroom Requirements for applicants aged under 60</th>
<th>Bedroom Requirements for applicants aged 60+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Comparison to 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 bed</td>
<td>2 bed</td>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>4+ bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linton</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Housing Statistical Information Leaflet – December 2019)*

We have had discussions with the developer about the affordable housing mix and would have preferred some 1-bedroom properties to be provided on this scheme, as we have a high demand for this both locally and district wide.

**Allocations Policy**

As the site was granted permission on the basis of it being a 5-year land supply site, the allocations of the affordable housing should carry out as detailed below.
5-year land supply
The site is outside the development framework and would normally be considered an Exception site, 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 complaint (40%) level of affordable housing. As a starting point for discussions on the requirement for a local connection criterion 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 re-let.

Policy H/12
The properties should be built in accordance with ‘Nationally Described Space Standards’

In the developers planning statement, they have advised that the properties will be built in compliance with this policy and that all of the affordable housing will be built to Part M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings.

Site Layout
The affordable housing is not clustered in one corner of the site and looks to be integrated within the site.

Registered Provider
The developer should appoint a Registered Provider to ensure the development of the affordable housing on this site. We would request that we are informed when a registered provider is appointed so that we can communicate with them over the delivery of the affordable housing

14. Air Quality Officer – No objection.

In accordance with Policy SC/12 Air Quality of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and the supporting Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020, major developments should include preventative measures to minimise deterioration of local air quality.

Recommends conditions for sustainable transport measures and low emission boilers and Combined Heat and Power.

Renewables and Low Carbon Energy, Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Air Quality are also recommended requirements.
15. **Anglian Water** – No objection.

We have reviewed the applicant’s submitted foul drainage strategy and flood risk documentation) and consider that the impacts on the public foul sewerage network are acceptable to Anglian Water at this stage.

We have reviewed the applicant’s submitted surface water drainage information (Flood Risk Assessment/Drainage Strategy) and consider that the impacts on Anglian Water’s public surface water sewerage network are acceptable and have been adequately addressed at this stage.

16. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue** – No objection, request that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants, which may be by way of Section 106 agreement or a planning condition.

17. **Conservation Section** – No objection; there are no material conservation issues with this application.

18. **Contaminated Land Officer** – No objection.

No condition relating to contaminated land was required on the corresponding outline consent and I have no further comments or objections to this reserved matters application.

19. **Designing Out Crime Officer** – No objection.

This appears to be an appropriate layout in relation to crime prevention and the fear of crime providing reasonable levels of natural surveillance from neighbour’s properties with many of the homes facing each other and some overlooking the public open space, LEAP and allotments. Pedestrian and vehicle routes are aligned together, well overlooked and pedestrian safety has been considered. Permeability on the whole has been limited to essential areas/routes only, which should provide some level of territoriality amongst residents. Vehicle parking is mostly in-curtilage between and to the sides of properties. Most homes have back to back protected rear gardens which reduces the risk and vulnerability to crime and have been provided with the potential for some defensible space where possible to their front.

20. **Ecology Officer** – No objection, following submission of revised plans/information.

The applicant has revised landscaping and enclosure plans to include greater hedgehog connectivity, and additional bat and bird boxes. A Landscape Strategy has also been included and is acceptable. These are sufficient to remove my previous concerns; therefore I can see no reason why this application should not proceed to determination without ecology being of further concern.

21. **Environment Agency** – No objection,

We have no objection, in principle, to the proposal provided that all pre-commencement conditions are discharged prior to development.

22. **Environmental Health Officer** – No objection, recommends conditions for hours of works, hours of deliveries and collection, and burning of waste. Informatives for minimising the potential disturbance to neighbouring residents during construction and air source heat pumps are also suggested.
23. **Historic Environment Team** – No objection, recommend a condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.

24. **Landscape Officer** – No objections subject to conditions.


**Access** – Supportive

**Appearance** – Supportive

**Landscaping**

Hard landscaping – Surface materials acceptable. Applicant to confirm edging kerbs. Non-adopted roads to be conservation kerb or equivalent.

Soft landscaping – Landscape specification to be provided.

Furniture – Broxap, Derby E Litter Bin/ Derby Double Recycling Bin is too urban. This is a rural location and a timber bin is required. Applicant to amend

Boundary treatment – Single and double leaf gates into allotment to be confirmed (ideally field gates due to rural location).

**LEAP and Open Space** – Applicant to confirm the following

- Safety surface
- Basis Floor trampoline – is this fire resistant? Suggest replace with another piece of equipment.

**Drainage** – Supportive

**Layout** – Supportive

**Scale** – Supportive

Recommends conditions for landscape specification, allotment gates, details of LEAP & public open space and details of attenuation basin.

25. **Lead Local Flood Authority** – No objection.

The submitted documents demonstrate that surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the use of permeable paving with sub-base attenuation and an infiltration basin to allow water to infiltrate into the ground.

Hydraulic calculations have been provided to show that the system will be sized so that no flooding will occur during storm events up to and including a 1 in 100 year event plus a 40% allowance for climate change.

Recommends conditions for a surface water drainage scheme for the site and details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system.
26. **Local Highways Authority** – No objection.

The Highway Authority can confirm that they will not be adopting any part of this development in its present format for the following reasons:

- The applicant has shown on drawing Ref: DES/035/104/B the use of permeable block paving within areas which the developer will be offering for adoption. The Local Highway Authority can confirm that they do not adopt permeable block paving.
- The Local Highway Authority would seek that the proposed turning head in the vicinity of Plots: 08/20 and 31 not be block paved as shown but would be required to be constructed in a bituminous material (shown as Tarmac on key of the submitted drawing).
- The Local Highway Authority will not seek to adopt the proposed development until the required information has been submitted and approved by the Local Highway Authority the proposed SUDs features will need to be managed by either the Parish Council or another body with a successor. The Highway Authority will not accept the use of a Management Company to maintain apparatus that directly relates to the drainage of surface water.
- So that no user has priority and to enable vulnerable groups to use the proposed shared surfaces without feeling threatened by motor vehicles the shared surfaces will need to be 6m in width with 500mm hard paved strips either side Traditional construction will be required to be 5m carriageway with 2m footway both sides of the development.
- The vehicular access (for 8 units or below i.e. 1/2 and 41/42) should be constructed using dropped kerbs rather than the radii ones as shown. The use of dropped kerbs reinforces the message that pedestrians have the right of way over the access and that vehicles entering or leaving the property should give way.

Recommends conditions for the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development, inter vehicle visibility splays as shown on drawing number DES/035/109/C, pedestrian visibility as shown on drawing number DES/035/109/C, driveway falls and levels, driveway bound material and a traffic management plan. An informative relating to works to or within the public highway is also requested.

27. **Natural England** – No comments to make.

28. **Sport England** – No comments to make.

29. **Sustainable Drainage Engineer** – No objection, subject to conditions for infiltration testing, a surface drainage strategy and location of foul pump (location to be reviewed as siting of foul pump adjacent to the infiltration basis is not supported) and clarification on who will maintain the basin.

With regards to the relocation of the pump there appears to be two separate issues.

Issue 1 - we don’t have final details of the proposed infiltration basin therefore the final basin length may differ from what is currently shown.

Issue 2 - with reference to the Engineering Layout on page 20 of the drainage statement referenced DES/035/405/B, the minimum distance of the foul pump to any habitable buildings appear to be less than 5m and sewers for adoption guidance indicates 15m may be more appropriate to minimise the risk of odour, noise and nuisance.
Is it possible to keep some form of condition with regards to the foul pump location so that a more informed decision can be made once final details of the infiltration basin is known?

With regards to my request for clarification on who will maintain the basin, as long as the condition requiring details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system also covers management, this is fine.

30. **Transport Assessment Team** – No objection, notes that the Parking Strategy Plan does not show any garage or cycle parking storage dimensions to show compliance with policy TI/3.

31. **Trees Officer** – No arboricultural or hedgerow objections.

32. **Urban Design Officer** – Support.

The application has been subject to several rounds of formal consultation, seeking to address consultation responses at each stage including comments from the Council’s Urban Design Officer. The comments of the Urban Design Officer at each stage of the application are summarised below:

**Comments received 01 June 2020**

**Summary**

Urban design officers consider that the amendments made to the scheme in this submission have satisfactorily addressed the three concerns raised previously about residential amenity (points 4, 8 and 9, please see below) by officers. Urban design officers support this application.

**Residential amenity**

The labelling for the sides of the dwelling on revised 'Floor plans and elevations' drawing for the dwelling at plot 15 has been amended and no longer shows a bedroom window at the side of the house and now accurately matches the side of the house shown in the elevation on the same drawing.

The table in the appendix at the end of the revised ‘Planning statement’ has been corrected to indicate that the bungalows at plots 10-13 do have 2 bedrooms and 3 bed spaces matching the floor plans. The gross internal area of these bungalows exceeds the minimum amount specified.

The floor plans of the houses at plots 33 and 40 have been amended to show just a double bed and a single bed and now match the information about plots 33 & 40 in the table of the appendix at the end of the revised ‘Planning statement’. The gross internal area of these houses exceeds the minimum amount specified.

**Comments received 15 April 2020**

**Layout**

The blank elevation for the sides of plots 1 and 4, which visitors will view as they enter the site, have both been revised with additional ground floor fenestration and first floor architectural motifs to activate these elevations satisfactorily.

The blank elevation for the side of plot 39 has been revised to now include one ground floor window and one first floor window to activate this elevation satisfactorily.
There have been no revisions to the blank side elevations of the dwellings at plots 17, 33 or 40 which will be visually prominent from the street.

The revised site layout drawing indicates that the street and footway kink in front of the dwelling at plot 8 has been removed and the curved footpath from the front door of plot 8 has been straightened. The front edges of the parking drives for plots 15 to 19 and 25 to 29 have also been straightened satisfactorily to improve the appearance of this area of the site.

**Residential amenity**

The house types at plots 2 and 42 have not been revised and so the dwelling at plot 2 has 1st floor bedroom windows on its west side which are only 11m distance from the side elevation of the dwelling at plot 42! this would not be meeting guidance in paragraph 6.68 in the ‘District Design Guide’ (2010)

The rear elevation of the dwellings at plot 8 has been revised to blank out the window to a habitable room on the first floor and this satisfactorily addresses concern about overlooking of the dwelling at plot 6.

The rear elevation of the dwellings at plot 18 has been revised to blank out first floor window to a habitable room as there is only a 4m distance from the blank side elevation of the dwelling at plot 19 which it faces. This is a satisfactory response to ensure residential amenity.

The side elevation of plot 15 which faces the garage at plot 16, has been revised to blank out the first floor window to a habitable room which is a satisfactory response to concerns that this would give the new residents a poor outlook of the garage. Officers comment that this revised drawing shows incorrect labels for the B and D elevations.

On the revised site layout, officers calculate the rear garden of the 3-bedroom dwelling at plot 24 to be 80m2 which satisfactorily meets the minimum standards for garden sizes in paragraph 6.74 of the ‘District Design Guide’.

On the revised site layout, the form of the rear garden of plot 35 has been amended to be rectangular rather than L shaped. Although the width of the rear gardens of both plots 35 and 38 are still rather narrow, overall this is a satisfactory response.

The revised Refuse Tracking Strategy indicates where the 3 types of refuse bins are to be located for each plot and this is a satisfactory response.

The revised ‘Planning Statement’ now includes a table in the appendix showing the Gross internal Area and bedroom sizes for each of the plots. Officers query that for plots 10 to 13, the table indicates that these bungalows have 2 bedrooms with 4 bed spaces and have been allocated 65.6 m2 of gross internal floor area which would be less than the minimum amount to comply with residential space standards.

For plots 33 and 40, the table in the appendix of the ‘Planning Statement’ indicates that these dwellings have 2 bedrooms with 3 bed spaces and have been allocated 72 m2 of gross internal floor area which would exceed the minimum amount to comply with policy H/12 in the Local Plan (70m2). However officers query whether it is truly 3 bed spaces as the house floor plans for both plots 33 and 40 would indicate 2 double beds in both dwellings i.e. for 4 people in total. Officers request that clarity is provided in this respect.

The revised ‘Garages sheet’ drawing shows the 3 types of garages with sufficiently
sized dimensions for their lengths and widths and a 1.2 meter width line on the floor plans showing the area marked for bicycles to be stored within the garages which is a satisfactory response.

**Public Open Space**
The newly submitted ‘Play equipment details’ shows 6 pieces of play equipment proposed for the LEAP and provides details of the materials, dimensions and features and these 6 pieces are also shown on the ‘Site layout’ drawing. These play equipment reflects the results of the youth engagement with students from Linton Heights Primary School, led by the LPA and the applicant. This is a satisfactory response.

**Appearance**
The design of the dwellings for plots 33 and 40 has not been revised and so the arrangement of the door and fenestration on the front elevations still has an unbalanced, asymmetrical appearance.

The revised ‘Surface materials plan’ drawing provides clarity by indicating that the surface materials for the raised tables will be Omega flow permeable block paving, which is satisfactory.

**Comments received 04 February 2020**

**Summary**
Officers welcome the amendments made to the scheme during the pre-application stage. However, officers have concerns and consider that further improvements can be made to several aspects of the scheme and further information is required before it can be fully supported:
- several blank elevations on dwellings which will be visible from the spine road to mean a loss of activity for the public realm.
- the street and footway form a kink where they meet the raised table in front of the dwelling at plot 8 which looks messy and the curved footpath from the front door of plot 8 also adds to the impression of this area of the layout having a clumsy, distorted appearance.
- the minimum distances for back to back and back to side of dwellings are not meeting guidance in the ‘South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide’ to achieve privacy for residents in 3 instances.
- the small size of the rear garden for the 3-bedroom dwelling at plot 24 is not meeting the minimum standards for garden sizes in the ‘South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide’.
- concern about the small size of the dwellings at plots 33 and 40 and the asymmetrical appearance of the doors and openings on the front elevations of these houses.
- further information is required about the sizes of the house across the scheme, garage dimensions for bike storage, what will be the surface materials for the raised tables and bin locations.

Officers provide advice and make some suggestions for improvements to better meet the objectives of paragraph 133 of the ‘National Planning Policy Framework’ (2019) (NPPF), policy HQ/1 of the ‘South Cambridgeshire Local Plan’ (2018) and guidance in the South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide’ (2010).

**Design Code**
Officers welcome the submitted ‘Design Code’ in particularly for the detailed information about the proposed character areas, housing typologies, materials palette and architectural details of the porches, windows and brick banding which it provides.
Layout

Officers have no objections to the general principles of the layout with the vehicular access from Horseheath Road; the screening of the new houses at the front of the site provided by trees and hedgerows to be replanted; a long, tree-lined spine road leading to a perimeter block of housing; and the generous provision of Public Open Space (POS) and Locally Equipped Area of Play and the suitable locations for the POS and the allotments.

Officers welcome improvements that have been made to the layout during the preapplication stage.

Officers have concerns about the blank side elevation of the dwelling at plot 1 and the blank elevation of the side elevation of the dwelling at plot 41 as both these facades will be viewed by visitors as they enter the site. Officers also have concerns about the blank side elevations of the dwellings at plots 17, 33, 39 and 40 which will all be visually prominent from the new street. Officers request that the applicant redesigns these facades with fenestration to better activate the public realm.

The street and footway form a kink where they meet the raised table in front of the dwelling at plot 8 which looks messy and the curved footpath from the front door of plot 8 also adds to the impression of this area of the layout having a clumsy, distorted appearance. The front edges of the parking drives for plots 15 to 19 and 25 to 29 have also been given curves. The ‘Design Code’ (DES/035/406) states that this area of the site is a transition to character area 2 (rural edge) and forms an informal route and so this is the rationale for all these curved features but officers consider that these do look messy and request that all these features are straightened.

Housing mix and density

42 dwellings (2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses and bungalows at 1, 1.5 and 2 storeys) are proposed on the 2.5ha site which yields a density of 17dph although this includes the allotments and when these allotments are excluded from the density equation, there is a higher density of 20.5 dph. 17 of the dwellings (40%) will be affordable.

Residential amenity

The dwelling at plot 2 has 1st floor bedroom windows on its west side which are only 11m distance from the side elevation of the dwelling at plot 42 which it faces and which also has 1st floor bedroom windows. The dwelling at plot 6 has 1st floor bedroom windows (on its rear elevation) which are only 19m distance from the rear elevation of the dwelling at plot 8 which it faces and which also has 1st floor bedroom windows. These distances would not be in compliance with paragraph 6.68 of the ‘South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide’ (DDG) (2010) for preventing the overlooking.

The dwelling at plot 18 has 1st floor bedroom windows (on its rear elevation) which are only 4m distance from the side elevation of the dwelling at plot 19 which it faces and which has a blank elevation. This would not be in compliance with paragraph 6.68 of the DDG.

For the dwelling at plot 15, it would appear that the view from the 1st floor bedroom windows will be obscured by the top of the garage of plot 16 which lies only 2m distance away and will give these new residents a poor outlook. Officers request that the garage to plot 16 is moved back to improve the outlook to bedroom 2 of plot 15.

Officers calculate that the size of the rear garden for the 3-bedroom dwelling at plot 24
is only 75m2. This is not meeting the minimum standards for garden sizes in paragraph 6.74 of the DDG.

Officers comment that rear garden of plot 35 is in the form of a L-shape and will not present a very usable, coherent space for the new residents. The width of the rear gardens of both plots 35 and 38 is too narrow. It should be widened.

3 types of refuse bins should be provided per plot with collection points within unadopted area. Officers request that a site layout drawing is submitted indicating where the storage areas for the 3 bins for each plot are to be located.

The ‘Planning statement’ is missing the table in appendix 1 which should be showing the size of the living space for each of the 42 dwellings. Officers request that this table is submitted to confirm that the 42 dwellings are meeting policy H/12 of the ‘South Cambridgeshire District Local Plan’ (2018).

The drawing key of the ‘Parking strategy plan’ states that stores will be provided for 2 bicycles in a garage or in a secure shed. However the floor plans and elevations drawing for the 3 garage types do not show any cycle parking storage dimensions. Officers request that the drawings of the garages with car and cycle parking are revised to include these cycle parking dimensions.

Public Open Space
Officers support the locations and size of the public open spaces and LEAP. The ‘Allotments and open spaces assessment’ outlines that 397.5 sqm of LEAP space, 553.7 sqm of informal play space and 553.7 sqm of informal open space is proposed. For the mix of 2 to 5 dwellings, officers calculate that this complies with guidance about the minimum amount of space in the ‘Open Spaces in new developments’ (2009) SPD. Officers are satisfied that the two main areas of public space will be overlooked by the front elevations of new dwellings to provide sufficient informal surveillance of these areas including the LEAP.

Pages 15-16 of the ‘Design and Access’ (ref. DES/035/406) writes about an impressive youth engagement exercise that the applicant has carried out with children at the local primary school for determining the type of play equipment at the LEAP. The applicant has not submitted a drawing for the precise items of play equipment and so officers recommend that this is conditioned.

The ‘Site layout’ and ‘Allotment arrangement’ drawings indicate that the allotments in the scheme do provide the minimum requirement of allotment space (0.45ha) established in the appeal decision which is satisfactory.

Appearance
Page 9 of the ‘Design & Access Statement’ provides some precedents of local vernacular and the ‘Design Code’ provides some brief narrative about proposals for brickwork, black weatherboard and render building surface materials, a variety of bays, oriel windows, entrance porches and a mix of plain tile and slate roofs. The three street scenes drawings provide drawings of the front elevations of rows of dwellings at the site and officers have no objections to the general appearance of the traditional architecture proposed.

Officers are concerned about the arrangement of the door and fenestration on the front elevations of plots 33 and 40 which has an unbalanced, asymmetrical appearance and recommend that this is redesigned.
The ‘Design Code’ does not write about window casements but the photographs in the Design Code of other homes designed by the applicant show white uPVC casements for the windows. Officers recommend using wooden window frames instead as a more sustainable material than uPVC and recommend that it is conditioned that uPVC shall not used for the window frames.

It is unclear what will be the surface materials for the raised tables indicated in the ‘Surface materials plan’ and so officers request that this drawing is resubmitted with this information included.

Connectivity
A single point of vehicular and pedestrian access is proposed from Horseheath Road to a new spine road going south to a loop road. At pre-application stage, both officers and the DEP encouraged the applicant to explore the possibility of creating footpaths to both the south and west of the site to improve connectivity. However, it is understood that the applicant has not been able to come to any agreement to secure this.

Representations

33. 18 representations have been received raising objection to the proposed development. Full redacted versions of these comments can be found on the Council’s website. In summary the following concerns have been raised:
- 3m buffer along southern boundary essential if it means that the strip cannot be used by other people (protect privacy)
- Concern for an unauthorised pathway along the buffer between Martins Lane and the allotments.
- Drainage / flooding concern, including matters of surface water.
- Edge of village location will encourage and increase car and bus traffic.
- Evidence of reptiles.
- Footpath between plots 33 and 34 joining to Lonsdale will encourage parking on Lonsdale by residents of the development.
- Highway safety, access is on a busy road with 60mph limit.
- Impact on residential amenity, loss of privacy, overbearing impact.
- Impact on village infrastructure, amenities, schools, services, roads and traffic.
- Insufficient detail has been provided as to how the allotments will function in terms of access, water supply and storage.
- Insufficient new technical data for surface water drainage and foul water drainage.
- Lack of written notice of the consultation process and deadlines.
- Land ownership on western boundary.
- Loss of property value.
- Loss of views.
- Massing of rooflines.
- No Anglian Water letter to accept foul water drainage solution.
- Plans submitted 18th Dec show proposed 1.8m close board fence boundary to be inside my property and west of the existing (boundary) ancient hedge.
- Protection of hedge on western boundary.
- Sloping site which sits above neighbouring properties to the south.
- Suitability of the land allocated for allotments since test pits showed a thin layer of soil over a pure chalk bed on a slope.
- The current proposal ignores the requirement to provide space for car charging points.
- The proposed footpath link between Lonsdale and the new development would not be needed is a footpath was included along Horseheath road.
- The pumping station will be an eye sore and a noise nuisance.
- Use of Lonsdale for overflow parking.
- Why are car ports needed?

Site and Surroundings

34. The site is located outside of the development framework boundary of Linton and in the countryside. The site abuts the development framework boundary on its western and southern boundaries. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). The nearest listed building is no. 28 Horseheath Road, a grade II listed building located approximately 130 metres west of the site. The eastern edge of Linton conservation area is located over 500 metres from the western boundary of the site.

35. The site is situated to the east of the village and forms an L-shaped parcel of agricultural land that measures approximately 2.8 hectares in area. The topography of the site slopes gradually down to the south-west away from Horseheath Road. Residential developments lie to the south on Harefield Drive and Martins Lane and to the west on Lonsdale. Two properties lie to the north of the site, Wheatsheaf and no.21 Horrsheath Road. A narrow hedgerow runs along the western boundary of the site. There is a public footpath approximately 200 metres from the easternmost boundary of the site, beyond the adjacent hedgerow, running in a north-east to south-west direction linking Horseheath Road and Bartlow Road. To the east of the public right of way is open agricultural and the A1307 road beyond.

Proposal

36. This application seeks approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale following outline planning permission S/2553/16/OL for the erection of 42 dwellings including the provision of 0.45ha for allotments.

Planning Assessment

37. The application comprises the submission of the matters for approval that were reserved when outline planning permission for the development of the site was granted. Those matters that were reserved are set out in condition 1 of outline consent S/2553/16/OL and form:
   - Details of the access to the site.
   - Details of the layout of the site.
   - Details of the scale of buildings.
   - Details of the appearance of buildings.
   - Details of landscaping.

38. The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 provides a definition of what each of the above matters means in practice:

   “access” means the accessibility to and within the site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding access network.

   “layout” means the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces within the development are provided, situated and orientated in relation to each other and to buildings and spaces outside the development.

   “scale” means the height, width and length of each building proposed within the development in relation to its surroundings.
“appearance” means the aspects of a building or place within the development which determines the visual impression the building or place makes, including the external built form of the development, its architecture, materials, decoration, lighting, colour and texture.

“landscaping” means the treatment of land (other than buildings) for the purpose of enhancing or protecting the amenities of the site and the area in which it is situated and includes: (a) screening by fences, walls or other means; (b) the planting of trees, hedges, shrubs or grass; (c) the formation of banks, terraces or other earthworks; (d) the laying out or provision of gardens, courts, squares, water features, sculpture or public art; and (e) the provision of other amenity features.

Principle of Development

39. The principle of residential development for up to 50 dwellings and allotments (not less than 0.45 hectares) was established on the site under outline planning consent S/2553/16/OL, although condition 5 of the outline consent restricted the number of dwellings to come forward to no more than 42 dwellings. Condition 4 of the outline consent, the approved plans condition, included a single approved plan, drawing number 0178/001 ‘Location Plan’.

40. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are therefore compliance with the outline planning permission, housing provision (including affordable housing), the reserved matters (access, layout, scale, appearance, landscaping), biodiversity, flood risk and drainage, highway safety, parking and management of roads, residential amenity, heritage assets and other matters.

Compliance with the Outline Planning Permission

42. Several conditions were imposed on the decision for the outline consent which require compliance at the reserved matters stage.

43. Condition 5 of the outline consent states that the development shall comprise no more than 42 (forty-two) dwellings.

44. Condition 6 of the outline consent states that the total area of allotments to be provided shall not be less than 0.45 hectares.

45. Condition 7 of the outline consent states that the reserved matters shall be accompanied by a design code to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and setting out overall guiding principles for the character and appearance of the development and its relationship to the surrounding countryside.

46. The reserved matters application is for the development of 42 residential dwellings and provides for 0.45 hectares of allotment space.

47. The application therefore complies with conditions 5 and 6 of the outline consent.

48. The reserved matters application is supported by a Design Code (DES/035/406 and DES/035/406/A) which sets out the design, architectural language and features that are proposed within the development, how these take account of the local vernacular and architecture and how the development relates with the existing village and surrounding countryside.
49. The application therefore complies with condition 7 of the outline consent.

**Housing Provision**

50. The reserved matters application proposes the erection of 42 residential dwellings. The Section 106 agreement secured at outline stage requires that 40% of the dwellings shall be constructed for affordable housing. The application therefore provides for 25 market dwellings and 17 affordable dwellings (40%).

**Housing Density**

51. Policy H/8 of the Local Plan details that housing developments will achieve an average net density of 30 dwellings per hectare in Minor Rural Centre villages but that the net density on a site may vary from the above where justified by the character of the locality, the scale of the development, or other local circumstances.

52. The overall site measures approximately 2.8 hectares in area. Within the site 0.45 hectares is designated to provide allotment space, in line with the conditions of the outline consent. The residential element of the development would therefore be provided within approximately 2.35 hectares and comprises the erection of 42 dwellings, in line with the conditions of the outline consent. The development of 42 dwellings on this area would equate to a density of approximately 18 dwellings per hectare.

53. The density of development on the site would be below the requirement of an average net density of 30 dwellings per hectare. However, the density has already been accepted through the outline planning permission and its various restriction (i.e. conditions 5 and 6) and is thus considered acceptable, particularly considering the sensitive edge of the village location.

54. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy H/8 of the Local Plan.

**Market Housing Mix**

55. The outline consent, which was allowed at appeal in January 2018, did not impose a condition relating to the mix of market housing required on the site. Furthermore, the appeal was allowed prior to the adoption of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (September 2018). Nonetheless, consideration is given to the market housing mix proposed on the site in relation to current adopted policy.

56. Policy H/9 of the Local Plan states that a wide choice, type and mix of housing will be provided to meet the needs of different groups in the community including families with children, older people, those seeking starter homes, people wishing to build their own homes, people seeking private rented sector housing, and people with disabilities. The market homes in developments of 10 or more homes will consist of (a) at least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes, (b) at least 30% 3 bedroom homes, (c) at least 30% 4 or more bedroom homes, (d) with a 10% flexibility allowance that can be added to any of the above categories taking account of local circumstances.

57. The application proposes the development of 25 market dwellings in the form of 8x2-bedroom properties, 8x3-bedroom properties, 7x4-bedroom properties and 2x5-bedroom properties. This equates to a market housing mix of 8x2-bedroom properties (32%), 8x3-bedroom properties (32%) and 9x4 or more bedroom properties (36%).

58. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development would provide for an appropriate
market mix of housing on the site, noting that the mix would accord with policy H/9 of the Local Plan.

59. Officers acknowledge that 10% of the market properties will be built to accessible and adaptable dwellings M4(2) standard (plots 16, 17, 19, 30 and 31); not a requirement secured by condition on the outline consent.

Affordable Housing

60. The outline consent did not impose a condition relating to affordable housing while the Section 106 secured the provision of 40% affordable housing on the site, which would be delivered as part of this reserved matters application (17 affordable properties). Again, while not an adopted policy at the time of the appeal decision, consideration is given to the affordable housing proposed on the site in relation to current adopted policy.

61. Policy H/10 of the Local Plan states that all developments of 11 dwellings or more will provide affordable housing (a) to provide that 40% of the homes on site will be affordable, (b) to address evidence of housing need; an agreed mix of affordable house tenures will be determined by local circumstances at the time of granting planning permission and (c) in small groups or clusters distributed through the site

62. The application proposes the development of 17 affordable properties in the form of 7x2-bedroom properties and 5x3-bedroom properties for affordable rented (70%) and 2x2-bedroom properties and 3x3-bedroom properties for shared ownership (30%).

63. The Council’s Affordable Housing Team has confirmed their support for the mix, tenure and layout of affordable housing proposed.

64. The layout of the affordable properties in relation to ‘clustering’ / distribution within the site is considered later in this report (paragraphs 94 to 97).

65. Officers consider the provision of affordable housing to be acceptable.

66. Officers acknowledge that all affordable dwellings on the site will be built to accessible and adaptable dwellings M4(2) standard; not a requirement secured by condition on the outline consent.

Residential Space Standards

67. Policy H/12 of the Local Plan states that new residential units will be permitted where their gross internal floor areas meet or exceed the Government’s Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015) or successor document.

68. Given that the outline planning consent did not require the dwellings to be built to meet the residential space standards and this matter does not fall under the definition of the reserved matters for layout, appearance or scale, the development would not need to accord with national space standards.

69. However, officers acknowledge that all 42 properties within the development would meet or exceed national space standards and would therefore accord with policy H/12 of the Local Plan.
Open Space Provision

70. The Section 106 for the development requires the following areas of open space to be delivered on site, based on the number of dwellings of each type (by bedrooms) provided on the site:
   - 394sqm LEAP.
   - 394sqm Informal Play Space.
   - 394sqm Informal Open Space.

71. The application is supported by an Allotments and Open Spaces Assessment which details that the development delivers the required open space established in the Section 106 agreement. The provision of open space is further illustrated on a Parameter Land Use Plan (DES/035/111/B).

72. The assessment details that central public open space totals approximately 1,482sqm of which approximately 397.5sqm is designated as the LEAP, 553.7sqm is Informal Play Space and 553.7sqm is Informal Open Space. The assessment also notes that these open spaces are calculated based on the main central open space located opposite to plots 34-39 and does not include the open space located in the south-western corner of the site.

73. Officers are satisfied that the open space requirements of the Section 106 have been met, noting that the areas exceed the minimum requirements.

Reserved Matters

74. The application is supported by a Design Code which sets out the overall guiding principles for the character and appearance of the development and its relationship to the surrounding countryside, justifying the design rationale and informing the reserved matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.

75. The application has also been through extensive pre-application discussions, including engagement with the Council’s Design Workshop and Design Enabling Panel, along with youth engagement with children at Linton Heights Junior School to inform pieces of equipment on the LEAP. This process is set out and summarised in the Design and Access Statement which supports the application.

Access

76. The site will be accessed by a single point of access on Horseheath Road, serving as the entrance point for both vehicles and pedestrians.

77. The layout of the site, discussed in more detail below, does facilitate a potential pedestrian link through to Martins Lane in the south west corner of the site. However, as this would cross third party land it is not a formal point of access to consider as part of this application.

78. Officers acknowledge the concerns expressed by Linton Parish Council and local residents as to the suitability of the access onto Horseheath Road, noting that the access is on a 60mph stretch of road, with the 30mph limit located approximately 50 metres to the west of the access.

79. Although a matter reserved at outline stage, consideration was given to the potential vehicular access for the site, which would have had to come from Horseheath Road outside of the 30mph area limit given the boundaries of the site. A ‘possible site access’ plan was submitted at with the outline application which demonstrated this. At
outline stage, paragraph 65 of the Inspectors Report notes:

“From the evidence presented, I am satisfied that, in principle, a suitable vehicular access could be designed at the junction with Horseheath Road, that appropriate provision would be made for pedestrian access...”

80. The reserved matters application is supported by a Site Layout Plan (DES/035/101/B) and a Proposed Site Access Plan (DES/035/102/A) and has been subject to formal consultation with the Local Highways Authority, who raise no objection to the proposed access on Horseheath Road. The application has demonstrated that the site can achieve the required visibility splays and as such is not considered to result in significant harm to highway safety and to provide an appropriate point of access.

81. Officers consider that the proposed access to the development would accord with policies HQ/1 and TI/2 of the Local Plan and paragraphs 108 and 110 of the NPPF.

Layout

82. The layout of the site has been designed to provide a landscaped frontage, with properties set back from Horseheath Road and a green corridor either side of the access road. The access is in the centre of the northern boundary and creates a symmetrical frontage with gateway buildings either side and feature trees. The Green, the large area of open space containing the LEAP, has been designed to be at the heart of the layout with properties fronting onto it to the north, west and south. A secondary area of open space is located in the south-western corner of the site to provide both a SuDS feature and enhancements to landscape and biodiversity. The allotments are situated on the eastern portion of the site to create a buffer between the build development and the open countryside beyond. A six-metre landscape buffer is incorporated on the eastern boundary of the site to provide screening to the development from the surrounding countryside.

83. Aside from the focus on a large central area of open space, the layout of the site is informed by two key routes within the development. The first is the primary route which forms the main spine road through the site, leading from the entrance of the site to a central node where ‘vista buildings’ are strategically positioned to terminate views in each direction as a key focal point within the site (plots 8, 20 and 31). From this node the secondary route creates a more informal loop road within the southern portion of the site.

84. The primary route has dedicated footpaths on either side of the road to enhance connectivity and does not incorporate any designated on-street parking to reduce the dominance of vehicles. The secondary route becomes more informal and rural where footpaths are removed and replaced with a narrow verge, with designated on-street parking again excluded.

85. The Design Code sets out that the development is divided up into three character areas. The use of materials helps to define each character area; these are considered in more detail later in this report under ‘appearance’.

86. The first character area forms the main spine road into the development. This area comprises new two storey properties focused around a large area of open space with landscaped frontages to create a green corridor either side of the access road. The properties themselves draw on the styles and features found in the centre of Linton.

87. The central node and it’s key ‘vista buildings’ characterised by larger detached plots is designed to create a transition into character area 2, moving into a more rural setting.
88. The second character area is formed by a 'lane' that loops around the southern portion of the site to create a more rural character, replacing footpaths with narrow verges. The properties form a mix of two storey and single storey dwellings, with some one and a half storey elements, and a continuous frontage with buildings which respond to the corners of the loop road through their dual aspects. Plots 10-13 on the north-eastern edge of this character area form bungalows to reduce the visual impact of the development and retain view out towards the open countryside to the east. A secondary area of open space is located to the west of this area while the allotments lie to the east, enhancing a more open and rural character.

89. The third character area forms a second portion of the more rural character of the southern half of the site. These properties form five bungalows which are sited closer together to create a more intimate rural character with symmetry between them, and a one and a half storey property, all sited to reduce impact on neighbouring properties to the south.

90. The movement through the site has been designed to create a legible hierarchy of roads with footpaths provided on either side of the spine road and a more informal secondary loop road; the central green space is readily accessible on foot. The layout makes provisions to facilitate a potential pedestrian link through to Martins Lane in the south west corner of the site to enhance permeability through the site and stronger integration with its surroundings. Raised tables have been incorporated into the road layout to reduce driver speeds through the development.

91. Off-road parking is provided for each dwelling on the site on private driveways and in most cases also in garages or car ports. Typically, parking is incorporated between properties with minimal parking to the front of buildings, integrating parking into the development in a convenient and accessible manner that does not dominate the development and its surroundings.

92. The application has been reviewed extensively in consultation with the Council’s Urban Design Officer and while generally supportive of the scheme and its layout throughout, opportunities have been taken to further enhance the scheme. These changes have included additional fenestration detailing to properties to create more active elevations and minor alterations to the layout of some footpaths.

93. The overall layout of the development is considered, in consultation with specialist officers, to be of a high-quality design which would make positive contribution to the local and wider context of the site in accordance with policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan.

94. In terms of the layout of the 17 affordable units, both policy H/10 of the Local Plan and the Affordable Housing SPD require affordable homes to be in small groups or clusters distributed through the site; small groups or clusters will typically be of 6 to 8 units.

95. The layout of the site creates four separate groups of affordable units: 1) plots 3-5, a two storey terrace of three shared ownership units in the north-eastern portion of the site fronting the central area of open space; 2) plots 34-39, two separate terraces each comprising three rented units on the western edge of the site fronting the adjacent central area of open space; 3) plots 10-14, two pairs of single storey semi-detached properties, one pair rented and one pair shared ownership, sited towards the eastern edge of the site adjacent the allotments; 4) plots 21-24, two sets of rented two storey semi-detached properties enclosed by the lane that loops around the southern portion of the site.
96. The layout of the affordable units is supported in the comments of the Council’s Affordable Housing Officer.

97. Officers consider that the distribution of the affordable units would accord with policy H/10 of the Local Plan and the Affordable Housing SPD.

**Scale**

98. The scale and character of the existing residential development near to the site presents a mixture of two storey, one and a half storey and single storey properties, with two storeys being the prevailing scale of development. These properties are also typically good-sized detached properties.

99. The properties immediately to the north of the site on Horseheath Road, where land levels gradually rise away from the site, are two storey and single storey buildings within the ‘Wheatsheaf group’, with the single storey Wheatsheaf Barn abutting the public highway. To the west of the ‘Wheatsheaf group’, and to the north west of the application site, are two storey properties accessed via Hollybush, properties which are evident in street scene views along Horseheath Road.

100. To the west of the site is Lonsdale, a residential street comprising two storey detached properties, with occasional one and a half storey elements and single storey detached and adjoining garages.

101. The properties to the south of the site on Martins Lane and Harefield Rise, where land levels fall away from the site, are detached single storey residential properties.

102. The proposed development incorporates a range of heights which are set out to respond to the individual street characters within the development and the wider context and surroundings of the site. The development includes two storey, one and a half storey and single storey properties, along with single storey garages and car ports.

103. The prevailing scale of development within the site are two storey properties, with 32 of the 42 properties being two storeys in height. The two storey properties are generally located on either side of the spine road into the site (the primary route) and then within a group that is enclosed by the lane that loops around the southern portion of the site (the secondary route). Four single storey properties are located on the north-eastern side of the loop road (plots 10-13), softening the edge of the development on this part of the site.

104. The six properties sited on the southern boundary of the site comprise five single storey properties (plots 25-29) and a one and a half storey property (plot 30). This is a positive design response to the topography of the site to reduce visual impact and to the proximity of these plots to existing properties to the south on Martins Lane and Harefield Rose.

105. Overall, the scale of the proposed development is in keeping with the existing scale of development and character of the area. As such the buildings would not dramatically change the overall visual character of the village edge with the development providing a suitable design response in reflecting the height of the adjacent neighbouring dwellings and its rural setting.

106. Officers consider that the proposed scale of the development would accord with policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan.
Appearance

107. Both the Design and Access Statement and Design Code set out the rationale to the varied material palette, which is to be incorporated into the development, drawing on materials which are present throughout Linton.

108. The Design Code also details the ‘architectural language’ of the development and again draws on existing architectural detailing within the village. This includes precise details of porches and canopies, window detailing, bay windows, dormer windows, brick banding and additional detailing within important elevations (e.g. protruding brick and creasing tile detail particular to vista buildings, red brick circle detail within flint) and to which plot each detail relates.

109. The material specifications for the proposed development include red and yellow facing brickwork, coloured render, flint, slate and plain tiled roofs. These materials can be found throughout the village.

110. As noted above, each character area within the development are further defined by their architectural style and use of materials.

111. The first character area is to include architectural features including sash full bar windows, timber post canopies, brick porches and square bay windows with materials including yellow brick with some feature brick, render and plain tiles and slates.

112. The ‘node’ properties (plots 8, 20 and 31) which make the transition between the first and second character areas will also include full sash bar windows, brick porches and square bay windows but with material finishes including flint and red brick with roofs of natural slates.

113. The second character area will include architectural details of cottage style windows, timber post canopies with brick porches on larger plots, use of flemish bond and square bay windows and be finished in red brick with some feature banding, ivory render and roofs of red tiles and natural slate.

114. The third character area will include cottage style windows, timber post canopies and hipped roofs as architectural features, finished in red brick and ivory coloured render with natural slate tiled roofs.

115. Officers note that the affordable properties within the site are to benefit from the same quality of materials and architectural characteristics of the market housing, further integrating these units within the site.

116. The overall appearance and detailing of the proposed dwellings are acceptable and include a variety of interest within the development, which draws on the context of its location. Officers consider that the materials palette and architectural detailing includes variety and interest within a coherent, place-responsive design, which is legible and creates a positive sense of place and identity whilst also responding to the local context and respecting local distinctiveness.

117. Officers acknowledge the comments of Linton Parish Council with regards to materials, where concern has been raised that flint has been lost from earlier design concepts, the rendering colours illustrated had not been expected and the colour of roof tiles appearing a pale red, not typical of very local clay.

118. Offers are broadly supportive of the material palette for the development and their distribution throughout the site as shown on the Materials Plan (DES/035/103B),
which does include elevations of flint. Nonetheless, noting the concerns of Linton Parish Council and the use of the phrase ‘or similar’ on some materials specified on the Materials Plan, officers consider it reasonable to impose a condition requiring details of materials to be submitted, to ensure that the quality of development is taken through to completion in a manner which is fully compatible with its location.

119. Overall, and subject to the recommended condition, the appearance of the development would accord with policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan.

Landscaping

120. Both the Design and Access Statement and Design Code set out the landscape strategy for the development and identify several key objectives for the development. These objectives include respecting the distinctiveness of the landscape character area, conserving and enhancing biodiversity, integrating biodiversity into the built environment and reinforcing a green buffer to create new green infrastructure.

121. Officers acknowledge the concerns of Linton Parish Council and residents in terms of the developments visual effect on the landscape and the entrance to the village.

122. Officers also acknowledge the comments of the Planning Inspector in their decision on the outline consent with respect to landscaping and the location of the site on the village edge, with paragraphs 28 to 31 of the report stating:

Lonsdale provides a long and dominant boundary of distinctly urban character and not distinctive of the wider rural setting. The edge of Lonsdale offers a fairly random and unbroken configuration of rear boundaries to dwellings set hard up against the appeal site and behind relatively low hedgerows. The boundary creates a jarring visual presence relative to the rural openness of the appeal site itself.

Furthermore, Lonsdale itself appears to be of a fairly ubiquitous residential form and not of any obviously local vernacular design. Its form does not readily display any intended relationship to the rural sensitivities of its wider setting, or to the Horseheath Road approach to Linton or, more particularly, to the adjacent appeal site itself.

The adjacent properties in Harefield Rise are mainly single storey and set on lower ground such that the boundary is broadly seen to comprise an extensive presence of modern rooftops set behind hedgerows, but still distinctly urban in character.

In this regard, I concur with the assessment of the local planning authority’s Landscape Design Officer in recognising the harsh edge the adjacent urban forms provide to the village. I also note how the Officer further acknowledges how possible development represents a potential opportunity to improve the edge of the village if handled sensitively.

123. The application therefore presents an opportunity to enhance the landscaping in this part of the village to one which is more responsive to its rural context and sensitive village edge.

124. In terms of strategic landscaping to address the edge of village location, the development incorporates a landscape buffer of approximately 5 to 6 metres in width along the eastern boundaries of the site in an L-shaped arrangement (predominately 6 metres) with the edge of the allotments with hedgerows forming the other part of the
soft eastern boundary. The buffer is to be planted with several species of trees and native hedgerows, with the planting of trees more intense against boundaries of built development and more relaxed adjacent to the central area of open space. The use of the allotments and hedgerows as the second part of the eastern boundary sets the built development in the southern portion of the site approximately 45 metres into the site away from the eastern boundary.

125. Officers consider that the landscape treatments on the eastern edge of the site are appropriate for the development, providing suitable screening to the built form and creating a soft and responsive rural edge to both the site and the village, delivering a positive overall enhancement.

126. Along the southern boundary of the site a landscape buffer of approximately 3 metres has been included to help separate and soften the developments relationship with the existing properties to the south of the site. This area is excluded from the curtilage of residential properties and would be retained as a buffer.

127. The western edge of the site contains a large hedgerow, which is shown to be retained as part of the development and is again located outside of residential curtilages, forming a softer edge between the proposed development and existing development on Lonsdale. Officers agree with the views of Linton Parish Council and residents that this hedgerow should be retained, however a condition is not deemed necessary as part of the reserved matters application.

128. Condition 14 of the outline consent requires the submission of a survey of all existing trees and hedges within the site and a scheme identifying all existing trees and hedges to be retained, and arrangements for their future maintenance and management and the protection of retained trees and hedges during the course of the works.

129. Officers are satisfied that condition 14 of the outline consent provides appropriate protection of the hedgerow on the western boundary, alongside its illustration as a retained hedge on the plans submitted with the reserved matters application.

130. In terms of other soft landscaping in and around the site, as noted in the ‘layout’ section above, the site incorporates a meaningful landscape frontage with the buildings set back from Horseheath Road. Trees are planted to the frontage of the site adjacent to Horseheath Road while green corridors line either side of the access road with further planting on either side, leading to the central area of open space which is then defined by a mixture of trees and hedges that are at the perimeter of this space. The south-west corner of the site contains a second area of open space which contains the SuDS feature along with areas laid to grass with tree planting. Further tree planting is present on the western edge of the allotments.

131. The Council’s Landscape Officer recommended a condition for soft landscape specifications to be provided, however such a document has been submitted during the course of the application negating the need for such a condition and can be listed as an approved document.

132. The application is supported by indicative and likely details of the LEAP equipment, following engagement with Linton Heights Junior School. The comments of the Council’s Landscape Officer regarding the LEAP are noted. The Section 106 secured at outline stage covers the specific details of the LEAP, therefore officers do not consider it necessary to impose a condition requiring any further details of equipment.
133. Each property would have its own private garden area with several properties also benefitting from small front gardens of soft landscaping and hedgerows.

134. In terms of hardstanding, the proposed materials for public and private spaces are detailed on the Surface Materials Plan (DES/035/104/B) and incorporate the use of tarmac, non-permeable and permeable block paving, granite sets and hoggins (a mix of gravel, sand and clay to be used in the allotments and open space in the south west corner of the site). The Council’s Landscape Officer requested confirmation of edging kerbs, which have been confirmed as to be conservation kerbs, to the satisfaction of officers. The agent has confirmed that the type of bin has been agreed in consultation with Linton Parish Council, and therefore officers consider the details acceptable.

135. The boundary treatments for the site, as detailed on the Enclosures Plan (DES/035/105/B), would include a mix of 1.5 and 1.8 metre high brick walls and close board fences, some with a 0.3 metre trellis elements on top, 1.2 metre and 1.8 metre hedgerows (with a chain linked fence incorporated on the northern and western boundaries of the allotment). Typically, the close boarded fences are used to enclose private garden areas while brick walls and hedgerows address the public realm.

136. Details of the gated access to the allotments have not been provided. Officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring the submission of details of the position, design, materials and type of access gates to the allotments to be erected, to ensure that the appearance is appropriate with the context of the site.

137. The landscape scheme for the site has evolved to address comments from the Council’s Ecology Officer, Landscape Officer and Trees Officer and has the support of all three technical consultees. Officers consider that the proposed soft landscaping is appropriate and would enhance biodiversity the landscape character.

138. The outline consent did not impose a landscape compliance condition; therefore, officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition as part of the reserved matters application to ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity.

139. Officers consider that the proposed landscaping would accor with policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan, which seeks to secure high quality landscaping and public spaces that would integrate the development in with the surroundings.

**Biodiversity**

140. The application is supported by a Technical Note regarding habitats within the site boundary (James Blake Associates, December 2019), a Badger Survey (James Blake Associates, October 2019), a Reptile Survey (James Blake Associates, September 2019), an Ecological Enhancement Strategy (James Blake Associates, November 2019) and a Landscape Strategy Plan (DES/305/500B)

141. The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council’s Ecology Officer who has reviewed the details and is in general agreement with the details. The Ecology Officer notes that the reptile and badger surveys conclude that neither species are present within the site; however, some avoidance mitigation was recommended regarding badgers which they agree with. The technical note submitted surmised that there had been no significant changes in habitat since the 2015 and 2017 Phase 1 surveys as the site was still under arable production. These three
reports are considered acceptable as an update to the 2015 surveys and the Ecology Officer notes that no further surveys are required at this time.

142. The comments of Linton Parish Council and residents in relation to reptiles are noted. However, the Council’s Ecology Officer has commented the details submitted in support of the reserved matters application are acceptable.

143. Condition 16 of the outline consent requires badger and common reptile surveys prior to commencement on site to be carried out and reports of the findings, and including suitable mitigation strategies if required to be submitted for approval, with works to then be carried out in accordance with the approved details. A discharge of conditions application is required to deal with these matters formally, they cannot be formally approved as part of this reserved matters application.

144. Condition 17 of the outline consent requires the submission of a scheme for ecological enhancement consistent with the recommendations of the Updated Phase 1 Habitat Survey (James Blake Associates, May 2015). Again, a discharge of conditions application is required to deal with these matters formally, they cannot be formally approved as part of this reserved matters application.

145. Officers consider that the proposal would accord with policy NH/4 of the Local Plan and paragraphs 170, 174, and 175 of the NPPF which requires development to enhance, restore and add to biodiversity with opportunities should be taken to achieve a net gain in biodiversity through the form and design of development.

**Flood Risk and Drainage**

146. The application is supported by a Drainage Statement (December 2019). The application site is in Flood Zone 1 and therefore is considered as having low probability of flooding.

147. The Drainage Statement details that the development will incorporate permeable paving and that surface water will be discharged into the attenuation basin in the corner of the site; attenuation has been provided on site within the SuDS components. Foul water will be collected via soil vent pipes and sub stacks and will be directed through drains to a private foul water pumping station which will then convey the foul water through a rising main in the estate road into the existing foul water sewer in the Lonsdale estate.

148. The application has been subject to formal consultation with Anglian Water, the Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority, and the Sustainable Drainage Engineer with none of these technical consultees raising objection to the details of the reserved matters application.

149. Officers acknowledge the concerns of Linton Parish Council and residents in relation to foul and surface water drainage, noting that the topography of the site has enhanced these concerns.

150. In their response the Lead Local Flood Authority recommends two conditions be imposed as part of any consent regarding surface water drainage. The first would require a surface water drainage scheme for the site based on the submitted Drainage Statement (December 2019). The second would require the submission of details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features). The response of the Sustainable Drainage Engineer also recommends conditions for a surface water and drainage strategy.
Drainage is largely a matter dealt with at outline stage when establishing the principal of development, with reserved matters applications requiring supporting details to demonstrate that drainage can be dealt appropriately within the layout of the site. Reserved Matters applications would typically only impose a condition for the maintenance arrangements for surface water drainage.

Condition 11 of the outline consent requires the submission of a scheme for surface water drainage, including arrangements for subsequent management, reflecting the principles set out in the surface water drainage strategy prepared by Thomas Consulting, with appropriate flood mitigation measures.

Condition 12 of the outline consent requires the submission of a scheme for foul water Drainage, including arrangements for subsequent management.

In this instance, condition 11 of the outline consent has covered both the surface water drainage scheme and its maintenance. Nonetheless, officers note that the details set out within the conditions put forward by the Lead Local Flood Authority are more detailed than the outline consent condition. Officers therefore consider it appropriate to include informatives to set out the more precise details of the Lead Local Flood Authority to fully inform a discharge of conditions application to formally deal with matters of surface water drainage, its scheme, maintenance and management.

In terms of foul water drainage, the Sustainable Drainage Engineer has raised concern over the siting of the foul pump, noting that the final details of the proposed infiltration basis are absent at this stage so its final length may differ from the plans submitted and its required siting relative to residential properties. Officers acknowledge that Linton Parish Council has raised similar concerns. Considering these comments’ officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring details of the foul pump and its location to be submitted and agreed.

Concern has been raised locally that the application does not include a letter from Anglian Water to accept foul water drainage solution. Such a letter is not required as part of the reserved matter application; the foul water drainage condition on the outline consent will be subject to consultation with Anglian Water upon submission of a discharge of conditions application where formal agreement would then be reached.

In consultation with the Anglian Water, the Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority, and the Sustainable Drainage Engineer the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of flood risk and drainage.

The proposal would accord with policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 of the Local Plan which requires developments to have an appropriate sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems and minimise flood risk.

**Highway Safety, Management of Roads and Parking**

The Local Highways Authority has considered the access of the site from Horseheath Road and found it to be acceptable.

The Local Highway Authority has also considered the layout of the site and found it acceptable in highway safety terms, with drawing number DES/035/109/C (Potential Adoption and Visibility Splays Plan) demonstrating appropriate pedestrian and visibility splays within the site and recommended several conditions as part of any consent.
The Local Highways Authority has stated that they would not seek to adopt the any part of this development in the formal presented as it would not meet their specifications/requirement for adoption for several reasons including the use of permeable block paving, absence of details to confirm management of SuDS features, road dimensions and the use of radii kerbs. However, the fact that the Local Highways Authority will not adopt the layout is not a highway safety issue, this arrangement not unusual for schemes of this nature.

Officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose conditions for details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets, visibility splays as shown on drawing number DES/035/109/C and driveway falls, levels and materials. The request for a traffic management plan is not necessary as this is matter for outline and one which covered by condition 9 of the outline consent which requires the submission of a construction management plan.

Subject to the recommended conditions, officers are satisfied that the development is acceptable in highway safety terms and would accord with policies HQ/1 and TI/2 of the Local Plan and paragraphs 108 and 110 of the NPPF.

In terms of car and cycle parking provision, each property would benefit from at least two off-road parking spaces, which would accord with policy TI/3 of the Local Plan. Each property would also benefit secure cycle parking either in the form of a garage or a cycle store in their private gardens. The provision would accord with policy TI/3 of the Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

Neighbouring Properties

The properties to the west of the site on Lonsdale with the greatest potential for impact from the proposed development are nos.3, 5 and 7 Lonsdale whose property boundaries abut the western boundary of the site.

Plot 41 is sited approximately 4.5 metres from the western boundary of the site, a boundary shared with no.3 Lonsdale, and approximately 11.5 metres from the side elevation of no.3. The two properties would have a side to side relationship, although slightly off-set with plot 41 sited slightly further north. The western boundary of the site includes a hedgerow and trees which would provide a degree of screening between the two properties. Their relationship, together with the orientation of the site, is such that the plot 41 is not considered to result in a significant overbearing impact or loss of light to no.3 Lonsdale.

Plot 41 does not feature a first floor window on the western elevation of its gable projection, rather a false brick window is present. This detail is considered appropriate to mitigate the potential direct overlooking of the private amenity area of no.3. Once occupied, permitted development rights for first floor windows would protect the amenities of no.3. Plot 41 does include a first floor window on the western elevation of its rear projecting gable facing the side elevation of no.3. However, this window serves a bathroom and therefore would be obscure glazed, secured by condition, mitigating any significant loss of privacy to no.3 Lonsdale.

Plots 37-40 are located to the east of no.5 Lonsdale. Plots 37-39, a two storey terrace, are sited approximately 16 metres from the western boundary of the site and approximately 23 metres from the rear elevation of no.5 at their closest point. The western boundary of the site contains a large hedgerow which would provide a degree of screening between the properties.
169. Paragraph 6.68 of the Council's District Design Guide details that to prevent the overlooking of habitable rooms to the rear of residential properties and rear private gardens, it is preferable that a minimum distance of 15 metres is provided between the windows and the property boundary; for two storey residential properties, a minimum distance of 25 metres should be provided between rear or side building faces containing habitable rooms.

170. Plots 37-49 achieve a 16-metre separation between their rear windows and the property boundary and close to the 23 metre separation between facing elevations, noting that no.5 is at an angle to the proposed development.

171. Plot 40, a detached two storey property is sited approximately 20.5 metres from the western boundary of the site and approximately 22 metres from the side elevation of no.3 Lonsdale.

172. Overall, officers are satisfied that the plots 37-40 would not result in significant harm to the amenities of no.5 Lonsdale through a significant loss of privacy, loss of light or overbearing impact.

173. Plots 31 and 32 are located to the east of no.7 Lonsdale.

174. Plot 31, a two storey detached property, is sited approximately 15.5 metres from the western boundary of the site when taking its two storey element and approximately 21.5 metres from the rear elevation of no.7. The western boundary of the site contains a large hedgerow which would provide a degree of screening between the properties. Officers also note that no.7 is orientated at a 45-degree angle to plot 31 further mitigating potential impacts.

175. Plot 32, a two storey detached property, is sited approximately 15 metres from the western boundary at its nearest point, although no first floor window is present on the projecting rear gable. The rear first floor windows on plot 32 are approximately 19.5 metres from the western boundary of the site and 21.5 metres from the side elevation of no.7.

176. Overall, officers are satisfied that the plots 31 and 32 would not result in significant harm to the amenities of no.7 Lonsdale through a significant loss of privacy, loss of light or overbearing impact.

177. The properties to the south of the site on Martins Land and Harefield Rise with the greatest potential for impact from the proposed development are Beggars Roost (Martins Lane) and nos.3, 4 and 5 Harefield Rise whose property boundaries abut the southern boundary of the site.

178. Plots 25-29, single storey properties, are sited approximately 10.5 metres from the southern boundary of the site and approximately 15 metres from nos.3 to 5 Harefield Rise at their closest point. This separation includes a 3 metre landscape buffer which results in the private amenity areas of plots 25-29 being stepped away from the southern boundary of the site, to enhance the protection given to the amenities of nos.3 to 5 Harefield Rise, with the boundary treatment being a 1.8 metre close boarded fence with a 0.3 metre trellis on top.

179. Officers acknowledge the topography of the site which slopes south down towards Harefield Rise, where these existing properties are sited at a lower ground level than the site. This is illustrated in the section plan submitted in support of the application (DES/035/303/A). Given the single storey nature of plots 25-29 and the 3 metre
landscape strip which has been incorporated on the southern boundary of the site, the development is not considered to result in significant harm to the amenities of nos.3, 4 and 5 Harefield Rise through a significant loss of privacy, loss of light or overbearing impact.

180. Plot 30, a detached one and a half storey property, is sited approximately 12 metres from the southern boundary of the site, adjacent to the boundaries of Beggars Roost and no.3 Harefield Rise. A detached single storey garage is located between plot 30 and the southern boundary of the site. Plot 30 is orientated with its side elevation facing south, an elevation containing one first floor window serving a bathroom. To protect the amenities of the properties to the south of plot 30 officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition that this window is obscure glazed.

181. Given the scale and siting of plot 30 relative to properties to the south and the presence of a 3-metre landscape strip on the southern boundary of the site, subject to the recommended condition, the development is not considered to result in significant harm to the amenities of Beggars Roost and no.3 Harefield Rise through a significant loss of privacy, loss of light or overbearing impact.

182. The proposed development is not considered to result in significant harm to the amenities of properties to the north of the site given the degree of separation between them which is over 25 metres.

183. The proposed development has been assessed in terms of loss of privacy, loss of light and overbearing impact and is not considered to result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties, subject to the recommended conditions.

Future Occupiers
184. Consideration is also given to the amenities of the future occupiers of the site.

185. Each property would benefit from a private garden area which would accord with the recommendations of the Council's District Design Guide, paragraph 6.75, which details that ideally residential units should be provided with access private amenity space with one or two bedroom house having 40sqm in urban settings and 50sqm in rural settings whilst each house with 3 bedrooms or more should have a private garden space of 50sqm in urban settings and 80sqm in rural settings.

186. The internal layout of the site is such that it is not considered to significantly compromise the quality of amenity afforded to each property, nor would the existing properties to the west on Lonsdale or to the south on Martins Lane and Harefield Rise.

187. In terms of residential space standards, the outline planning consent did not require the dwellings to be built to meet the residential space standards. However, officers acknowledge that all 42 properties within the development would meet or exceed national space standards.

Conclusion
188. The proposal is considered to accord with policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan which required development to protect the health and amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses from development that is overlooking, overbearing or results in a loss of daylight.

Heritage Assets
189. The nearest listed building to the site is no. 28 Horseheath Road, a grade II listed
A building located approximately 130 metres west of the site. The eastern edge of Linton conservation area is located over 500 metres from the western boundary of the site. Given the degree of separation the proposed development is not considered to have a direct impact on the setting of these heritage assets. The Council’s Conservation Section has commented that there are no material conservation issues with this application.

190. Officers acknowledge the comments of Linton Parish Council in respect of heritage assets, particularly archaeology and the request of the Historic Environment Team to impose a condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.

191. Archaeology was a matter for consideration at outline stage and was dealt with accordingly. Condition 10 of the outline consent requires the applicant to provide a full and detailed scheme for preserving the archaeological significance of the site prior to the commencement of development.

192. Officers consider that the development accords with policy NH/14 of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

Air Quality Officer

193. The comments of the Council’s Air Quality Officer are noted, who requests conditions for sustainable transport measures, low emission boilers and Combined Heat and Power, Renewables and Low Carbon Energy, Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Air Quality.

194. These points are all details for the outline stage rather than reserved matters, but officers note that certain relevant conditions have been imposed, namely conditions 9 (construction method statement), 22 (water consumption), 23 (renewables) and 24 (electric charging points), covering most of the points raised by the Council’s Air Quality Officer.

Application Description

195. Concern has been raised by Linton Parish Council to the accuracy of the description of the reserved matters application. The application has been described as follows:

Approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/2553/16/OL for the erection of 42 dwellings including the provision of 0.45ha for allotments.

196. Officers acknowledge that the description of the outline application, reference S/2553/16/OL, was:

Outline planning application with all matters reserved for up to 50 dwellings and allotments (not less than 0.45 hectares).

197. Therefore, the description for the reserved matters application, if it had followed the precise wording of the outline description would read:

Approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale following outline planning permission S/2553/16/OL for up to 50 dwellings and allotments (not less than 0.45 hectares).

198. Condition 5 of the outline consent restricted the development to no more than 42 dwellings by stating “The development hereby permitted shall comprise no more than
42 (forty-two) dwellings”. The quantum of development to come forward at reserved matters stage was therefore set at a maximum of 42 dwellings.

199. The description of the reserved matters application is, if anything, more restrictive than the 'up to 50' description on the outline application and in accordance with the maximum quantum of development that was permitted at outline stage, being a maximum of 42 dwellings controlled and specified by condition.

200. Officers are therefore of the view that the description of the application is not misleading or misplaced, despite not matching the outline description word for word, and has not prejudiced the consultation, assessment and determination of the application.

Fire Hydrants

201. The comments of Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue are noted. Condition 20 of the outline consent secures the submission of details of arrangements for fire hydrants.

Land Ownership

202. Linton Parish Council and third-party comments raise concern over the land ownership within the site and the lack of formal notice to the District Council, who own a ransom strip on the western boundary of the site.

203. This matter was raised at outline stage and reflected in paragraph 94 of the Inspectors Report:

A plan was submitted to the Inquiry by the Parish Council suggesting that not all the land subject to the application was owned by the Diocese. There would appear to be some issue of dispute in relation to a very narrow strip of land extending along the boundary adjacent to Lonsdale. In response, the appellant confirmed that it considered it had possessory title to the appeal site. Any such dispute would appear to have no implications for matters of planning merit and would instead remain to be resolved as a civil matter between the relevant parties should the appeal be allowed and the scheme proceed.

204. Officers have engaged with the Council’s Lands and Contracts Surveyor as part of this reserved matters application who has confirmed that the Council owns a 3-foot strip measured from the middle of the existing hedgerow (plan shown in appendix 2) within the redline boundary established at outline stage.

205. On the evidence available officers acknowledge that at outline stage The Council should have been sent formal notice as a landowner of the outline application. However, the outline permission has been granted and is now outside of the period for any Judicial Review (42 days). A key consideration is therefore were the parties put to prejudice by the lack of notification to the Council as landowner and would the Council as a landowner have objected to the application or would the substance of the application have been changed in any way.

206. Given the extent of the land owned by the Council that is within the redline boundary, a very narrow strip occupied by a hedgerow, officers do not consider that substance of the application, being at the time for the erection of up to 50 dwellings and allotments, would have been changed in any way through formal notification to the Council. Furthermore, as detailed in the following paragraphs, the view of Council officers is that the hedgerow should be retained as part of the development and providing that is the case, no objection is raised.
207. In considering the details of the reserved matters application, the Council’s Lands and Contracts Surveyor initially expressed concern to the original plans when this hedgerow was encompassed within the residential curtilage of several properties within the site. However, following the submission of amended plans and the exclusion of the ransom strip from within residential curtilages with fencing moved to the eastern side of the hedge, the officer has confirmed that they have no objection to the plans, providing the hedge is retained and protected (renewed if damaged).

208. As noted above, condition 14 of the outline consent deals with a survey and protection of trees and hedges to be retained and officers are satisfied that this provides appropriate protection of the hedgerow on the western boundary, alongside its illustration as a retained hedge on the plans submitted with the reserved matters application, for the purposes of this application.

209. Based on the details above, officers are satisfied with the legalities of the outline consent and the details of the reserved matters application.

Permitted Development Rights

210. The impact of the proposed development on the character of the area and the amenities of neighbouring properties has been considered to be acceptable. However, to ensure that these matters are adequately protected, officers consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition removing permitted development rights for Classes A (extensions), B (roof extensions), C (rooflights) and D (Porches) of Part 1 of Schedule 2. Without such a restriction, extensions, dormer windows, rooflights and porches could be constructed for each plot without formal consent which may result in harm to the aforementioned considerations.

Sustainability (including access and impact to services)

211. Linton Parish Council and third-party comments refer to the sustainability of the site in terms of its proximity to services, including bus stops, and the impact of the development on village infrastructure, amenities, schools, services, roads, and traffic.

212. Matters relating to the sustainability of the site were dealt with at outline stage and are not details for consideration the reserved matters stage.

Third Party Comments

213. The comments made in third-party representations are noted, with many points already considered in the report. The remaining matters raised are considered below.

214. Comments have been made that the 3-metre buffer along the southern boundary is essential to protect privacy of neighbouring residents but concern expressed that an unauthorised pathway could be created to between Martins Lane and the allotments. The 3-metre buffer would be secured through the approved plans condition and maintained as a landscape strip, no footpath is proposed and boundary treatments would preclude access to the allotments along this strip – the allotments can only be accessed through its formal entrance.

215. Concern has been expressed that a footpath between plots 33 and 34 joining to Lonsdale will encourage parking on Lonsdale by residents. The application has not, and does not, propose a footpath link between plots 33 and 34 onto Lonsdale. The footpath serves the rear amenity areas of these plots but does not extend through the hedgerow, which is to be retained, and onto Lonsdale. Off road parking to the required policy standards is provided within the site and therefore residents would not be dependant on parking on Lonsdale.
216. Comments have raised concern over the lack of detail as to how the allotments will function and suitability of the allotments given likely soil conditions. The provision of the allotments accords with the provisions of the outline consent and their location within the site considered appropriate in terms of layout; these are the details to consider as part of the reserved matters application. Condition 8 of the outline consent requires the submission of details of the proposed allotments details of their form, design, and arrangements for management which would address the concerns expressed locally.

217. One representation expresses concern to the lack of written notice of the consultation process and deadlines. Officers are satisfied that all statutory consultations have been undertaken, with neighbouring properties who adjoin the red line boundary having been formally notified, along with the display of a site notice and advertisement in the local press.

218. Concern has been raised on a loss of property value and loss of views because of the development. These are not material planning considerations that can be attached weight in the assessment and determination of the application.

219. Comments note that plans submitted on 18th December show a proposed 1.8 metre close boarded fence inside a neighbouring boundary on the western edge of the site enclosing an existing hedgerow. The application has since been amended and the hedgerow excluded from the residential curtilages of the proposed development.

220. Concern that the current proposal ignores the requirement to provide space for car charging points has been raised. Condition 24 of the outline consent requires the submission of a scheme for electric vehicle charging prior to occupation. Officers are satisfied that the proposed arrangements of the site would be able to accommodate charging points, but the precise details are to be dealt with through a discharge of conditions application.

Conclusion and Recommendation

221. Officers consider the reserved matters including the access, layout, scale, appearance and associated landscaping to be acceptable. The proposal would provide a high-quality scheme which would make a positive contribution to the local and wider context of the site and the character of the area, responsive to its edge of village location.

222. For the reasons set out in this report, officers consider the reserved matters to be acceptable in accordance with the relevant policies in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. Subject to conditions the application is recommended for approval.

Conditions

223. a) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing numbers:

Location & Layout Plans
DES/035/100 (Site Location Plan)
DES/035/101/B (Site Layout)

Access & Visibility Splays Plans
DES/035/102/A (Proposed Site Access)
DES/035/109/C (Potential Adoption and Visibility Splays Plan)
### Floor Plans & Elevations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/200/A</td>
<td>(Plot 01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/201</td>
<td>(Plot 02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/202</td>
<td>(Plots 03-05 Floor Plans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/203</td>
<td>(Plots 03-05 Elevations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/204</td>
<td>(Plot 06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/205</td>
<td>(Plot 07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/206/A</td>
<td>(Plot 08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/207</td>
<td>(Plot 09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/208</td>
<td>(Plots 10-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/209</td>
<td>(Plot 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/210/B</td>
<td>(Plot 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/211</td>
<td>(Plot 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/212</td>
<td>(Plots 17 &amp; 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/213/A</td>
<td>(Plot 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/214</td>
<td>(Plot 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/215</td>
<td>(Plots 21-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/216</td>
<td>(Plots 23-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/217/A</td>
<td>(Plot 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/218/A</td>
<td>(Plots 26-29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/219</td>
<td>(Plot 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/220</td>
<td>(Plot 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/221</td>
<td>(Plot 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/222/A</td>
<td>(Plots 33 &amp; 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/223/A</td>
<td>(Plots 34-36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/224/A</td>
<td>(Plots 37-39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/225/B</td>
<td>(Plot 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/226</td>
<td>(Plot 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/227/A</td>
<td>(Garages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/228/A</td>
<td>(Carports &amp; Cycle Stores)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Landscape Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/104/B</td>
<td>(Surface Materials Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/105/B</td>
<td>(Enclosure Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/500B</td>
<td>(Landscape Strategy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/502B</td>
<td>(Soft Landscape Strategy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/503</td>
<td>(Landscape Management/Maintenance Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES/035/507/A</td>
<td>(Planting Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035/057</td>
<td>(Private Road Construction Details)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)

b) No development above slab level shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings and brick screen wall boundary treatments hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018).

c) No development above slab level shall take place until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets
within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as a Private Management and Maintenance Company has been established).

(Reason - To ensure satisfactory development of the site and to ensure estate roads are managed and maintained thereafter to a suitable and safe standard in accordance with policies HQ/1 and TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and paragraphs 108 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework).

d) Notwithstanding the approved plans, no development above slab level shall take place until details of foul pump, including its location and design (including details of any enclosure), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018).

e) Prior to the first occupation of the development a plan indicating the position, design, materials and type of access gates to the allotments to be erected, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the site does not detract from the character of the area in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.)

f) Prior to the first occupation of each dwelling, the inter vehicle visibility splays for all accesses serving more than one dwelling and pedestrian visibility splays measuring 2 metres x 2 metres as shown on drawing number DES/035/109/C shall be provided. The splays shall thereafter be maintained free from any obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the highway in perpetuity.

(Reason – To ensure the safe and effective operation of the highway in accordance with policy TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and paragraphs 108 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.)

g) All accesses including driveways shall be constructed so that their fall and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway (the use of permeable paving does not give the Highway Authority sufficient comfort that in future years water will not drain onto or across the adopted public highway and physical measures to prevent the same must be provided).

(Reason – To ensure the safe and effective operation of the highway in accordance with policy TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and paragraphs 108 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.)

h) All accesses including driveways shall be constructed using a bound material to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway.

(Reason – To ensure the safe and effective operation of the highway in accordance with policy TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and paragraphs 108 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.)

i) 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 HQ/1, NH/4 and NH/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018).

j) Apart from any top hung vent, the proposed first floor window in the southern elevation of Plot 30 serving a bathroom and the western elevation of Plot 41 serving a bathroom, hereby permitted, shall be fitted with obscured glazing (meeting as a minimum Pilkington Standard level 3 in obscurity) and shall be permanently fixed shut unless the opening section is at least 1.7 metres above finished floor level. The development shall be retained as such thereafter. (Reason - To prevent overlooking of the adjoining properties in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)

k) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development within Classes A, B, C and D of Part 1 of Schedule 2 shall take place unless expressly authorised by planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority in that behalf. (Reason - In the interests of protecting the character of the area and amenities of neighbouring residents in accordance with policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018).

Informatives

224. a) Condition 11 of the outline consent S/2553/16/OL requires the submission of a scheme for surface water drainage, including arrangements for subsequent management. The Lead Local Flood Authority, in response to this reserved matters application, has provided a more detailed condition for surface water drainage, the details of which should be considered as part of any discharge of conditions application relating to condition 11 of outline consent S/2553/16/OL. For the information of the applicant, these details are provided below.

Surface Water Drainage Scheme
The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Drainage Statement prepared by Croudace Homes (ref: DES/035/405) dated December 2019 and shall also include:

- a. Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the 1 in 1, 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 year storm events (as well as the 1 in 100 year event 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;
- b. Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers;
- c. Full details of the proposed attenuation;
- d. Site Investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;
- 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

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

*Long term maintenance arrangements*

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

b) Pollution Control

Surface water and groundwater bodies are highly vulnerable to pollution and the impact of construction activities. It is essential that the risk of pollution (particularly during the construction phase) is considered and mitigated appropriately. It is important to remember that flow within the watercourse is likely to vary by season and it could be dry at certain times throughout the year. Dry watercourses should not be overlooked as these watercourses may flow or even flood following heavy rainfall.

**Background Papers:**

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
- South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)
- Planning File References: S/4418/19/RM, S/3405/17/OL and S/2553/16/OL.
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