

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

8 July 2020

AUTHOR/S: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

Application Number:	S/3835/19/RM / Reserved Matters
Parish(es):	Highfields Caldecote
Proposal:	Approval of Reserved Matters for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following Outline Planning permission (S/2764/16/OL) for residential development of up to 58 dwellings with associated infrastructure, landscaping and public open space
Site address:	Land to the West of Grafton Drive
Applicant(s):	Michael Walker, Balfour Beatty Homes
Recommendation:	Approval
Key material considerations:	Housing Density Affordable Housing Provision Housing Mix The Reserved Matters; Layout Scale Appearance Landscape
Committee Site Visit:	No
Departure Application:	Yes
Presenting Officer:	Katie Christodoulides, Principal Planner
Application brought to Committee because:	Caldecote Parish Council requests the application is determined by Planning Committee
Date by which decision due:	10 th July 2020 (Extension of Time Agreed)

Executive Summary

1. This application seeks reserved matters approval for the appearance, layout, scale of buildings and landscaping following the principle of residential development of the site for up to 58 dwellings being established under outline planning consent S/2764/16/OL which was allowed at appeal under (APP/W0530/W/17/3172541).
2. The application has been amended by the applicants following consultee comments. The amendments comprise changes to the design, layout, parking

layout, mix, drainage, landscaping and dispersion of affordable dwellings.

3. The amendments are considered to further improve the quality of the scheme to ensure that it preserves the character and appearance of the area and fits comfortably within its rural context.
4. The reserved matters details for appearance, layout, scale of the development and landscaping are considered acceptable by officers and the application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Planning History

5. S/2764/16/OL- Outline planning permission for the residential development of up to 58 dwellings with associated infrastructure, landscaping, and public open space. All matters reserved except for access- Appealed for Non Determination, APP/W0530/W/17/3172541- Appeal Allowed
6. S/1144/17/OL- Residential development of up to 58 dwellings with associated infrastructure, landscaping, and public open space. All matters reserved except for access-Refused.
7. S/2768/16/E1- EIA Screening Opinion- No Objections

Planning Policies

National Guidance

- 8 National Planning Policy Framework 2019
National Planning Practice Guidance
National Design Guide 2019

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018

9. 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/6 The Development Strategy
S/7 Development Frameworks
S/10 Group Villages
HQ/1 Design Principles
H/8 Housing Density
H/9 Housing Mix
H/10 Affordable Housing
H/12 Residential Space Standards
NH/2 Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
NH/3 Protecting Agricultural Land
NH/4 Biodiversity
CC/3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments
CC/4 Sustainable Design and Construction
CC/9 Managing Flood Risk
SC/6 Indoor Community Facilities
SC/7 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments
SC/8 Open Space Standards
SC/12 Contaminated Land

T1/2 Planning for Sustainable Travel
T1/3 Parking Provision
T1/8 Infrastructure and New Developments

South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

10. Open Space in New Developments SPD - Adopted January 2009
Biodiversity SPD - Adopted July 2009
Trees & Development Sites SPD - Adopted January 2009
Landscape in New Developments SPD - Adopted March 2010
Affordable Housing SPD - Adopted March 2010
District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010
Public Art SPD- Adopted 2009
Health Impact Assessment SPD – March 2011
Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document- Adopted January 2020
11. Caldecote Village Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document Adopted January 2020

Consultation

12. **Affordable Housing Officer-** Final comments following amended plans- Supports the proposal and has no outstanding points with the affordable housing on this scheme.

Previous comments following amended plans- Unable to support as only one of the flats is M4(2) compliant. The amendments are seeking to provide 2 affordable dwellings which are M4(2) compliant and two private dwellings. One of the flats proposed is on the first floor and there is no lift therefore the flat is not M4(2) compliant.

Previous comments following amended plans- We are pleased the developer has considered our comments and revised the mix to include a couple of 1 bed properties. The revised plans show that the affordable housing is now distributed in 4 clusters rather than being in one corner of the site and is now much more connected and integrated within the rest of the development. The revised schedule shows that the affordable dwellings meet the 'Nationally Described Space Standards' (2015). Policy H/9 – 5% properties should be built to adaptable and accessible standards M4(2). The revised plans show that 4 properties are being built to this standard, however they are all private dwellings and not affordable.

Comments on original application- not in support of the application. The developers proposed mix is not reflective of the local housing need in Caldecote, and the district of South Cambs, as there are no 1 bed included in the mix.

This matter has been discussed with the developer's agent directly. We advised them that they should be including some 1 beds for rent. Our preferred mix would be to replace 2 x 3 Beds for rent with 2 x 1 Beds. There is a local need for 1 bed in Caldecote.

The majority, of the affordable dwellings are located close together in one corner of the site, this conflicts with Policy H/10 of the South Cambs Local Plan, which states

that the affordable should be: 'distributed in small groups or clusters throughout the site'

Concentration of the affordable housing in one location, does not allow the integration of tenures in the development, and allow for sustainable communities.

It appears some of the affordable dwellings do not meet the 'Nationally Described Space Standards.'

Policy H/9 – 5% properties should be built to adaptable and accessible standards M4(2). At least 3 dwellings should be built to this standard.

13.

Air Quality Officer- No comments received (out of time).

14.

Anglian Water- Assets Affected- there are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adopted agreement within or close to the development boundary that may be affected by the layout of the site. Anglian Water would ask that informatives are added in regard to assets affected.

Wastewater Treatment- The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Bourn Water Recycling Centre that will have capacity for these flows.

Used Water Network- The impacts on the public foul sewerage network have been Adequately addressed at this stage. Requests consultation on the discharge of Condition 8 of the outline consent.

Surface Water Disposal- The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDs) with connection to a sewer seen as the last option. Having reviewed the proposed submitted surface water drainage, the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Waters operated assets. The Lead Local Flood Authority and Internal Drainage Board should be consulted.

15.

Archaeology Officer- Final comments following amended plans-The amendments do not alter the previous advice, namely that we have no objections or requirements for this development as proposed.

Previous comments-No objections or requirements for this development.

16.

Cam Cycle- No comments received (out of time).

17.

Contaminated Land Officer- A previous memo dated 4th November 2016 reviewed the initial Wardell Armstrong 'Phase I Desk Study – Land Contamination Assessment' as part of the outline application (S/2764/16/OL) and agreed with its findings that a confirmatory site investigation should be undertaken. No further information has been provided since this time and therefore the condition regarding a written scheme for investigation and recording of contamination and remediation remains outstanding.

18.

Caldecote Parish Council- Final comments on amended plans- Objects to the application and comments that the play area is too close to the entrance and does not demonstrate any safety precautions, the houses are too close to the existing boundaries of the adjacent houses and gardens. There is still a lack of off street parking and requests that this proposal is considered by the Planning Committee.

Comments on original application-Objects to the application and comments the Council recognises this is a Reserved Matters Application. The Parish requests that The application be referred to the District Council Planning Committee as the garages are too small, grouping of social, low cost homes and parking. Request full Cdm Planning: Traffic/Banksman/Delivery.

19. **Cllr Hawkins-** Objects to the proposal. The proposed layout is different to the layout presented at Outline Planning stage in look and feel. The proposal is cramped on the eastern side close to existing properties. It presents a hard, crowded vista on entry to the new development and detrimental effect on the amenity of the existing community. The proposal causes significant harm to existing properties and to amenity of new and existing communities. The house designs are poor, with no indication that they have considered the Village Design Guide (VDG) in detail. The use of fore court parking presents a hard concrete look to the development, the appearance will look very cluttered when cars are parked up. The hard landscaping means that there will be a lot of surface water runoff, which has an impact on the type of drainage system provision and how prone the site will be to causing flooding. The landscape is not green enough with poor views to the surrounding and external links as per the Village Design Guide. The affordable housing is all clustered on the eastern side of the site. The developers have included the private access road of Grafton Drive into their red line boundary. The Traffic Management Plan has not been presented and concerns are raised regarding the narrowness of Grafton Drive and existing residents. Comments that there was no consultation with the Local Member or local residents.
20. **County Footpaths Team-**No comments received (out of time).
21. **Designing Out Crime Officer-** Final comments on amended plans- no further comments.

Previous comments- Having reviewed all documents in regards to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale with this Reserved Matters application. I am happy to support the proposal as I consider that community safety and vulnerability to crimes should be addressed. My final comment would be that should the applicant be considering a Secured by Design application with this development I welcome the opportunity to work with them.

22. **Drainage Officer-** Final comments on amended plans- no objections and the information is acceptable from a drainage perspective.

Following amended plans- the proposal is unacceptable as 25129-02-020-02-Engineering layout – The drawing does not clarify most of the issues raised on the sustainable engineer comments (21/03/2020), only the sediment areas. No details of low flow channels, including dimensions and it is not clear how this will work with gabion weir in place. A section on drawing 25129_02-050-03 shows also the low flows being perpendicular to the inlet and outlet and area of reed planting location which conflicts with the area shown on the plan, needs clarification. The pond would also benefit from a more natural appearance.

Calculations – The hydraulic model provided only shows results for 1 in 100 year period without Climate Change. Confirmation is needed that the ponds were designed to attenuate surface water for the 1 in 100 year plus 40% allowance for Climate Change.

The management maintenance plan is generic and not specific for the site.

Comments on the original application- The development proposal is unacceptable and

should be refused as There are issues with the proposed surface water drainage concept plan and these are: 1. Pond 1 appears to be offline and yet the design and planting is appropriate for online ponds only. The feature will be dry for most of the time and it is unlikely that a permanent wet area will be retained as indicated. The proposed area of reed bed planting, low flow channel and sediment forebay is also inappropriate for a dry feature that will be an integral part of the public open space. At what return period the pond will receive water should be clarified. 2. Pond 2 also has inappropriate features within the design. A sediment area is only applicable at inlets and not outlets. Details of the low flow channels should be provided and it is not clear how these will work with the gabion weir in place. The reed bed planting is in an inappropriate location. The pond would benefit from a more natural appearance. 3. Calculations should be provided. 4. A management and maintenance plan should be provided.

23. **Ecology Officer-** Final comments following amended plans-The applicant has increased the number of bat and bird boxes considerably which is welcome, and landscaping plans have been amended. My concerns have been dealt with satisfactorily and I am able to recommend the application moves to determination without Ecology being of further material concern.

Comments on original application-Condition 15 of permission S/2764/16/OL states: *“No development shall commence until an ecological method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The survey shall include:*

- i. An updated survey recording badger activity on the site (including the woodland area to the west). The survey shall include appropriate mitigation measures to be approved by the local planning authority. No development shall be undertaken except in full accordance with the approved scheme of mitigation; and*
 - ii. Details of measures for encouraging biodiversity within the site.*
- The works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved measures.”*

The applicant has submitted an Ecological Method Statement (RSK ADAS Ltd, June 2019) in support of the reserved matters application and to discharge condition 15. In general agreement with the document; however there are two points, require further amendments/submissions prior to providing my recommendations.

Firstly section 3.2 lists a total of 17 bat and bird boxes to be installed within the redline boundary of the application site. These are welcomed but fall short of the requirements set out by the South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity SPD (2009), which require 50% of all new dwellings to have integrated bat and bird boxes installed. Therefore a further 12 bat and bird boxes will need to be installed within dwellings. This will require a resubmission of the document and product details of the integrated boxes along with a plan of their locations.

Secondly, welcome the information and recommendations for pond construction, uncertain that these recommendations have been fully resolved within the Detailed Landscape Proposals (Figure GL1203 01A). The marginal plants proposed on the plan do not match those that have been recommended, and propose three different reed species which are likely to out complete all other marginal species if not kept under close management. In addition, the surface water drainage shown in the Concept General Arrangement (Drawing no. 25129_02_010_02 rev C) shows both permanent water features are fed by surface water run off, however not sure how the marginal areas (noted as reed beds) in the drawing are provided with adequate water to maintain the optimum habitat.

24. **Environmental Health Officer-** Final comments on amended plans-There are no objections to make from an environmental health standpoint concerning the approval of reserved matters.

The information provided in the noise modelling note is satisfactory and the condition relating to noise mitigation can be discharged.

25. **Environment Agency-** Final comments on amended plans-Please refer to previous comments.

Comments on original application - No objection in principle to the proposal provided that all outstanding pre commencement conditions are discharged prior to development.

26. **Historic Buildings Officer-** It is considered that there are no material conservation issues with this proposal.

27. **Landscape Officer-** Final comments on amended plans, unsupportive and existing comments still to be addressed:

Appearance

Alexander planning plans & elevations PH323.1 – does not reflect layout of plots 8, 9, 15. Applicant to amend.

Plot 22 northern elevation is blank and an unattractive elevation upon the main access road. Applicant to revisit.

Plot 28 northern elevation is blank and an unattractive elevation upon the main access road. Applicant to revisit.

Plot 41 western elevation is blank and an unattractive outlook for plot 31. Applicant to revisit.

Landscaping Existing vegetation and protection – Supportive.

As per decision notice - Additional planting along the boundaries of the site, including specification of trees, hedges, and shrub planting, including details of species, density and size of stock – This has not been addressed by the applicant. There is sufficient space to include a native hedgerow along the northern boundary whilst allowing gaps for views leading out of the site. Applicant to revisit.

Boundary treatment Hard Landscaping Zoning Plan & Boundary Treatments GL1203 02D – My concerns have been addressed. Supportive.

Hard works – Woodland play trail – My concerns have been addressed. Supportive.

Soft works – Trees – Applicant has included more trees within the site. Supportive.

Tree planting pit detail to be included. New trees fail due to lack of soil and water. In particular, sufficient root space for all trees surrounded with a high ratio of hardstanding above their rooting area must be provided. Applicant to provide structural soils or 3D cellular confinement systems to ensure they have the best rooting environment in this harsh location.

Details required and location of structural soils to be indicated upon a plan.

Trees in open grass areas are to be provided with strimmer guards and 3 or 4

1.5m high timber stakes to prevent vandalism.

More mixed native hedgerows to be included within the site, open spaces and its boundaries to create and link with existing green infrastructures. Ecologist report indicated 100m of new hedgerow. Applicant to provide evidence of 100m and amend areas.

Hedgerow to the north of Plots 8-9 and PRULU adjacent to access road to be replaced with mixed native hedgerow. Boundary to the north of plot 58. PRULU to be replaced with mixed native hedgerow. Boundary to the west of plot 52. PRULU to be replaced with mixed native hedgerow.

Bulbs – I welcome additional bulbs.

Open Space and pond planting (Central Area) - My concerns have been addressed. Supportive.

Grass mix – My concerns have been addressed. Supportive.

Gateway posts to be more defined – Supportive Benches & Litter bin – Supportive

Lighting – Supportive

Layout – Parking Sizes – Supportive Garage – If garages do not comply with Policy TI/3 applicant to include a shed within rear gardens. Applicant to indicate upon overall layout.

Parking provision – Due to site constraints and minor landscape amendments I am supportive of provision.

Visitor parking – Disappointing to see that visitor parking to the north of the open space has not been addressed by the applicant. Applicant to relocate.

LEAP - My concerns have been addressed. Supportive.

Ponds layout – my concerns have been addressed.

Headwalls and culverts – Applicant to consider green alternatives or natural stone headwall structures rather than precast concrete and other in-situ solutions. Details to be provided.

Following amended plans, previous comments still apply.

Following amended plans, minor amendments to the planting proposals required.

Following comments on the original application, amendments and further information required.

28. **Local Highways Authority-** Final comments on amended plans-The Highway Authority is not in a position to adopt this site as Grafton Drive is a private street and all adopted public highway must be contiguous and therefore, the entire site will remain private.

For future reference (if Grafton Drive is ever brought forward for adoption) the proposed layout as shown is unacceptable to the highway.

Following original plans- The Highway Authority is not in a position to adopt this site as Grafton Drive is a private street and all adopted public highway must be contiguous and therefore, the entire site will remain private.

For future reference (if Grafton Drive is ever brought forward for adoption) the proposed layout as shown is unacceptable to the highway.

29. **Lead Local Flood Authority-** Final comments on amended plans-Do not object to the application. In respect of our objection points, the applicant has introduced water butts to some properties. The discharge rate has been reduced back down to 5.1 l/s (as approved in the outline application) and updated calculations have been provided in respect of the attenuation basins.

Previous comments on amended application- Object to the grant of planning permission for the following reasons:

1.No Source Control Section 6.3.7 of the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD states that source control methods must be implemented across sites to provide effective pre-treatment of surface water. The applicant has not demonstrated that source control methods will be used on site, nor have they provided evidence of why they would be inappropriate. As outlined in Section 6 of the Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document the variety of source control techniques available means that virtually any development should be able to include a scheme based around these principles. The presence of low permeability soils, some forms of contamination and flat topography will not be accepted as reasons not to include source control.

In addition to this, policy CC/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan require that "Maximum use has been made of low land take drainage measures, such as rain water recycling, green roofs, permeable surfaces and water butts;"

The present submission does not comply with this. The outline application indicated that permeable paving, water butts and rainwater harvesting would be implemented wherever possible, however the present submission does not include these and has not provided evidence for why they are inappropriate.

2. Inappropriate Discharge Rates As outlined in policy CC/9 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan, and paragraph 6.3.6 of the SPD, all new developments on greenfield land are required to discharge the runoff from impermeable areas at the same greenfield runoff rate, or less than, if locally agreed with an appropriate authority or as detailed within the local planning policies of District and City councils. The outline application (S/2764/16/OL) proposed to discharge surface water at a controlled rate of 5.1l/s, however the present submission proposes to discharge at a rate of higher rate of 7.5l/s with no justification. The applicant has not demonstrated that the peak discharge rate for all events up to and including the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) critical storm event, including an appropriate allowance for climate change, will not exceed that of the existing site. This may increase the flood risk on site and in surrounding areas.

3. Attenuation Pond Design Whilst the applicant has provided cross sections and long sections of the proposed ponds, updated calculations are still required as per my previous letter dated November 25th 2019. This is to confirm that the ponds are designed to attenuate the surface water for the 1 in 100 year +40% climate change scenario, without posing an increase in flood risk to properties on or off site.

Side slopes should not exceed 1:3 unless special site and/or safety arrangements allow for steeper slopes. The proposed design still indicates that some side slopes will be 1:2 with no justification, and does not indicate the side slopes of proposed low flow channel in pond two.

The temporary storage depth above the permanent pool of water in pond two is 1.014m which is too deep, as per my previous letter this should be limited to 0.5m.

The ponds should include a minimum of 0.3m freeboard as per section 23.4.5 of the CIRIA SuDS manual C753. Pond two does not include this and therefore presents a potentially unacceptable health and safety risk.

Comments on the original application- object to the grant of planning permission for the following reasons:

1. No Source Control Section 6.3.7 of the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD states that source control methods must be implemented across sites to provide effective pre-treatment of surface water. The applicant has not demonstrated that source control methods will be used on site, nor have they provided evidence of why they would be inappropriate.

As outlined in Section 6 of the Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document the variety of source control techniques available means that virtually any development should be able to include a scheme based around these principles. The presence of low permeability soils, some forms of contamination and flat topography will not be accepted as reasons not to include source control.

2. Inappropriate discharge rate As outlined in paragraph 6.3.6 of the SPD, all new developments on greenfield land are required to discharge the runoff from impermeable areas at the same greenfield runoff rate, or less than, if locally agreed with an appropriate authority or as detailed within the local planning policies of District and City councils.

The outline application (S/2764/16/OL) proposed to discharge surface water at a controlled rate of 5.1l/s, however the present submission proposes to discharge at a rate of 7.5l/s.

The applicant has not demonstrated that the peak discharge rate for all events up to and including the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) critical storm event, including an appropriate allowance for climate change, will not exceed that of the existing site. This may increase the flood risk on site and in surrounding areas.

3. Attenuation pond design The design of the ponds is not in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753 for the following reasons: a) It would appear Pond one is offline and pond two is online. Without calculations, it is not possible to know whether they have been designed appropriately and whether their capacity is adequate. b) The present submission indicates that the combined volume of the two ponds is 1249m³ however the calculations submitted at the outline stage show a maximum volume of 1443m³. c) Side slopes should not exceed 1:3 unless special site and/or safety arrangements allow for steeper slopes. The proposed design shows side slopes of 1:2 with no justification. d) The present submission gives no indication of the temporary storage depth above the permanent pool of water in the pond; Limiting this to 0.5m is usually appropriate for small to medium sized ponds Where water is accessible, the edge gradient above and below the water line and the depth profile of the water are important. A level dry bench should be provided

before the basin, slopes should be no greater than 1:3 and a level wet bench (minimum of 1.5 m wide) at or just below the normal water surface level should be provided.e) The ponds should include a minimum of 0.3m freeboard as per section 23.4.5 of the CIRIA SuDS manual C753. Pond two does not include this and therefore presents a potentially unacceptable health and safety risk.

The LLFA requests calculations for the 100% (1 in 1yr) 3.3% (1 in 30yr) and 1% (1 in 100 year) storm events, along with the 1% (1 in 100yr) + 40% climate change scenario. This is to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk on or off site.

We will also require cross sections of the ponds indicating side slopes, along with water the permanent water and 1 in 100 year +40% climate change.

30. **Natural England-** No comments to make on the amendment of the application.

31. **Sport England-** No further comment to make on this particular application.

32. **Sustainability Officer-**The applicant provides very limited information in relation to energy use, carbon emissions reduction and water use, but the Design and Access Statement states that "There will be a fabric first approach to energy efficiency, creating highly sealed & thermally insulated building envelope to ensure minimum heat loss and therefore reduce heating and energy requirements."

This is an approach that SCDC support in relation to energy use and carbon reduction but the applicant must be aware that the associated condition requires energy and carbon emissions reduction using renewables or low/zero carbon technology.

A full energy and carbon reduction strategy (with full SAP calculations per dwelling type) will need to be submitted so that the associated energy/carbon reduction condition is fully discharged prior to development.

33. **Transport Assessment Team-** Final comments on amended plans- the proposed secure cycle shed dimensions of 2m long and 1.5m wide is considered to be adequate to park 2 cycles or alternatively 2.2m long and 2m wide to park 3 cycles. However, the applicant is requested to provide cycle parking provision for at least 1 cycle space per bedroom to comply with the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan standards.

In terms of cycle parking provision, the applicant states that all properties will be provided with secure bike storage within the gardens as the garage dimensions will not allow for storage of cycles with cars.

As per submitted Bin Carry & Shed Location drawing no. 1266-BIN_Rev.B, it is noted that a lockable shed will be provided within the private garden of each dwelling. However, the applicant is requested to provide cycle parking provision for at least 1 cycle space per bedroom to comply with the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan standards and the details of the dimensions of the lockable garden sheds to ensure that the policy has been applied as requested.

34. **Tree Officer –** Final comments on amended plans- Please refer to previous comments.

Previous comments amended plans- P3405.1.4- AIA NO PLANS, P3405-1-001_4 TREECONSTRAINTS REV(1) and P3405-1-005_8D TREE PROTECTION Plan can

be listed as an approved document.

The centre green does not have a landmark, long lived, large stature tree. The Landscape Management Plan does not include OPM checks on planted oak trees. To tie in with the recommendations on page 5 of the Ecological Method Statement which identifies a minimum of 18 watering visits throughout the year, the watering season needs to be from March to mid October. South Cambs is arid and hot and rain cannot be relied upon.

Please do not list the lighting layout as an approved document as plot 22 or road 1 LP04 conflicts with the adjacent proposed tree, please move the lamp post away from the tree.

Previous comments-Raises a holding objection. Insufficient and inappropriate information provided. The trees on or adjacent to the site have legal protection through Tree Preservation Order and have no statutory protection. From a quick desk study it is likely that hedgerows on or adjacent site to the site may qualify as important hedgerows under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997.

Condition 5i) All trees and hedgerows on the land and details of those to be retained and how they will be protected during construction: Not supplied. Although this has crossover with condition 7, this information is necessary to determine the appropriateness of the reserved matters and proposed planting.

5xii) An external lighting strategy to ensure adequate illumination of roads and paths and to avoid unnecessary light pollution: Proposed tree and light column conflict - move lamp posts at Plot 1 and 22.

Further Comments:

5ii) Additional planting along the boundaries of the site, including specification of trees, hedges, and shrub planting, including details of species, density and size of stock: Plan provided but insufficient - will escalate to an objection if not amended. Detailed Landscape Proposals (GL1203 01A):

-Use of Betula and mountain ash inappropriate – Cambridgeshire too hot and too dry – exchange,

-Use of Prunus Plena inappropriate – no forage for pollinators – use Prunus avium,

-Over use of Rosaceae – a diverse tree population is a more robust population,

-3 x mystery trees, symbols without labels – near Plot 24, opposite Plot 26, and Plot 56,

Schedule trees Tt3, Tt6 and Tt9 are not used in the scheme – is this correct?

-Schedule Tt4 there are labels on the plan with no associated tree symbol,

-Very few long-lived species utilised across the scheme. Greater number needed in two open spaces/SUDs areas.

-Lack of landmark trees provided at end of vistas and road junctions.

Would suggest species but not clear on soil PH here. End of vista trees include end of primary vista and adj Plot 24. Junction trees (please do not site too close to road) opp Plot 15, opp Plot 13, adj Plot 8, opp Plot 1, opp Plot 42. Landmark trees should be long lived, large stature and different species to others used on site.

-More potential canopy cover required. Trees in rear gardens will have to be utilised.

35. **Urban Design Officer-** Final comments on Amended Plans- Officers do not object to the proposals. Officers comment in detail (below) on whether the urban design issues previously raised have been addressed by the applicant in the resubmission. Since

the previous submission, the 'Caldecote village design guide' became a Supplementary Planning Document in January 2020 and this needs to be taken into account. Officers welcome that the application is complying with guidance about maximum heights for the dwellings and that most of the dwellings have been allocated front of plot gardens and that most parking drives are to the side of the dwellings. These aspects comply with the village design guidance where it writes:

"New development should reflect the distinctive pattern of Highfields where off-street parking and generous front gardens mean that cars do not dominate the appearance of roads and building frontages".

In their assessment, officers consider that further improvements can be made to the scheme and also suggest some planning conditions (below). These requests and recommendations include:

- Improvements to the parking arrangements to better comply with guidance in paragraph 6.82 of the 'District Design Guide'. - Reducing the length of some excessively long parking driveways proposed at plots 2, 8, 9, 12, 13-16, 21-23, 31-33, 45 and 56. - Officers request that the position of parking bays or the position of the dwellings are amended for plots 3-7, 29-30, 35-37 and 52-55 to provide a wider distance of 3m between these parking spaces and the front of houses. - Improvements to the elevational treatment of some of the dwellings to improve the street scene and better address the public realm.

Such improvements will enable the scheme to better meet the requirements of paragraph 127 of the 'National Planning Policy Framework' (2019), policy HQ/1 (a), (c) and (d) of the 'South Cambridgeshire Local Plan' (2018), paragraphs 6.68, 6.82 and 6.83 of the 'District Design Guide' (2010) and the 'Caldecote village design guide' (2020).

Layout Parking 1. The revised 'Planning layout' drawing (ref. 1266-004 rev J) indicates the same arrangement of the parking court of 12 parking spaces serving plots 52 to 57 as in the previous layout drawing. Six trees and a strip of landscaping are proposed in this parking court which will contribute to lessening the visual impacts of the parked cars on the public realm. Officers do not object to this and accept that given the scale of development, a mix of different parking approaches are included taking into account the site constraints. A considerable number of dwellings have been provided with parking spaces to the sides of the houses and this would help meet paragraph 6.82 of the 'District Design Guide' (2010) which is that:

"Parked cars should not be allowed to dominate the street scene; they should preferably be accommodated within, beneath, or at the side or rear of buildings".

2. Officers are still concerned that the double garages would not be large enough to accommodate 2 cars together with cycle storage, some degree of other storage and room to pass garaged cars with wheeled bins. The revised drawing submitted for the 'double store' ref. G201.1.1 shows that windows have been removed and is still 5.84m * 5.84m in size which is not meeting guidance in paragraph 6.83 of the 'District Design Guide' (DDG) (2010) for garage sizes. Officers had previously commented that the double garages (drawing ref. G202.1.2) which are 5.84m * 6.11m in size, are also too small to meet guidance in paragraph 6.83 of the 'DDG'. Officers advise that an alternative solution to this issue of cycle storage garages would be the provision of bicycle sheds in the rear gardens for all the houses. Officers would advise conditioning that this would be subject to satisfactory drawings showing details of size, materials of bicycle sheds and their location on the layout.

3. Some excessively long parking driveways are still proposed at plots 2, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 21-23, 31-33, 45 and 56. Officers recommend that these driveways are reduced in length and that garages are brought further forward to be closer to the street which these front onto. Officers advise that the length of residential parking drives should be divisible by 5m and be a maximum of 10m to provide adequate space for parked motor vehicles. Reducing the lengths of these driveways and bringing forward the position of the garages would have the merit of allowing more space for more regular rectangular shaped rear garden sizes at the west end of the layout.

4. The revised 'proposed street elevations' drawing (ref. 1266-005 rev A) for plots 25-28 still indicates the positioning of a single garage next to a double garage which produces a long row of inactive frontage. This arrangement of an unbroken row of single / double garages is also still repeated for plots 23 and 24. Officers had previously commented that the transition between these different garage roof types looks incongruous. The applicant has responded to amend the 'proposed street elevations' drawing to show that both the single and double garages will have gables at the front which would be an improvement.

Affordable housing clustering • The revised 'tenure mix plan' drawing (ref. 1266-TM rev B) indicates that 2 of the affordable dwellings have been relocated from the north of the site to the south of the spine road instead. This is an improvement in the proposal to mean that there is less of a concentration of one tenure type in one particular area of the site.

Boundary treatments • Officers welcome that the revised 'Hard Landscaping Zoning Plan & Boundary Treatments' drawing (ref. GL1203 02D) provides clearer layers showing the trees, soft landscape, street surface materials, screen walls and hedgerows. Block paved ramps are now being proposed instead of rumble strips on the transitions between roads and officers have no objections to this.

Housing density • 58 houses of one, two, three and four bedrooms are proposed (with 23 affordable – 40% of the total) and all these will all be two storeys in height. In terms of density, 58 residential dwellings are proposed on this 3.56-hectare site which includes generous amounts of open space. The development site is only 1.8 hectares in size which equates to a density of 32 dwellings per hectare (excluding the public open space to the west of the site, of which if included would result in an even lower density scheme).

Residential amenity 1. Officers had previous concerns about the protection of privacy and avoidance of overlooking for residents at some of the new dwellings. Reviewing the revised 'plans and elevations' drawings, improvements have been made for most of the incidents of overlooking which officers listed previously.

The revised 'Planning layout' drawing (ref. 1266-004 rev J) indicates that a tree has been added at the end of the rear garden of the dwelling at plot 17 which is only 23m distance from the rear elevation of the dwelling at plot 12 to contribute to screening the views from overlooking of habitable rooms and so officers would accept this. A tree has been added in-between the end of the rear gardens of the dwellings at plot 18 and 21 for which there is only 22m distance between the rear elevations of these dwellings to contribute to screening the view from overlooking of habitable rooms which is at an oblique angle and so officers would accept this.

The revised 'Planning layout' drawing (ref. 1266-004 rev J) indicates that a tree has been added at the end of the rear garden of plot 25 which is only 24m distance from

the rear elevations of the dwellings at plots 34 and 35 to contribute to screening the views from overlooking of habitable rooms and so officers would accept this.

The revised 'Planning layout' drawing (ref. 1266-004 rev J) indicates that a tree has been added at the end of the rear garden of plot 48 which is only 23m distance from the rear elevations of the dwellings at plots 38 and 39 to contribute to screening the views from overlooking of habitable rooms and so officers would accept this.

For the dwelling at plot 26, the rear elevation is only 23m distance from the rear elevation of the dwelling at plot 33. Officers would recommend considering relocating the dwelling at plot 26 further forward by 2m to meet the guidance in paragraph 6.68 of the 'District Design Guide' (DDG) (2010)

- For the dwelling at plot 7, the rear elevation is only 22m distance from the rear elevation of the dwelling at plot 10. - For the dwelling at plot 6, the rear elevation is only 22m distance from the rear elevation of the dwelling at plot 11. - For the dwelling at plot 40, the rear elevations are only 23m distance from the rear elevation of the dwelling at plot 47.

Officers are concerned that these last 4 instances do not meet the minimum distances for avoiding overlooking of habitable rooms stipulated in guidance in paragraph 6.68 of the 'District Design Guide' (2010) which is that:

"For two storey residential properties, a minimum distance of 25m should be provided between rear or side building faces containing habitable rooms; where blank walls are proposed opposite the windows to habitable rooms, this distance can be reduced further, with a minimum of 12m between the wall and any neighbouring windows that are directly opposite".

In recognition of the site constraints, for the last 3 instances, officers would recommend that trees are included at the ends of the rear gardens of these plots to provide screening.

2. Officers consider that the minimum rear garden space has been provided for all the dwellings in this application which are now in compliance with paragraph 6.75 of the 'DDG'. As mentioned earlier, there are some odd shaped rear gardens to the west of the site Officers recommend that the instances of excessively long driveways are reduced in length and that garages are brought further forward to be closer to the street to enable more regular shaped rear garden that will prove more usable for the residents.

3. For this revised submission, officers express concern about the proximity of the front of plot parking spaces of plots 3-7, 29-30, 35-37 and 52-55 to the dwellings which is still less than 2m. Officers request that the position of parking bays or the position of the dwellings are amended to provide a wider distance of 3m between these parking spaces and the front of houses and that this is conditioned. The amendment would help reduce the impact of car headlights and engine noises impacting on the residential amenity of these houses and it would improve the residential outlook from these dwellings.

Public Open Space • Officers understand that a Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) is not required as part of the section 106 Agreement. It is disappointing that a LEAP is not being provided but at least there is a locally equipped children's play area within Caldecote recreation ground off Strympole Way. This play area is 500m from the site at the end of Grafton Drive and comprises a large fenced off play area with grass and a

rubberised safety surface with a large range of equipment. In the latest submission, the applicant has submitted drawings for a woodland play trail to be positioned at the west end of the site. This is a satisfactory response but these drawings do not provide sufficient detail about the size, materials and specification of the individual items and officers recommend that this is conditioned.

Appearance 1. Officers are pleased that the applicants have taken the advice given at the Design Enabling Panel meeting on 19th December 2019 in respect of adding hipped roofs to revised house types for plots 46 and 52-58 at the north east edge of the site to reduce the visual impact and improve the outlook from existing adjacent dwellings.

2. Officers are also pleased that the applicants have taken the advice given at the Design Enabling Panel meeting on 19th December 2019 in respect of simplifying / rationalising the windows which should not be mixed within individual dwellings. There is no longer fenestration with excessive numbers of horizontal and vertical window bars throughout the scheme and windows are not mixed within individual dwellings and are much improved as a result.

3. Officers are disappointed that the projecting bay windows for the 'Alexander', 'Attingham', 'Chartwell', 'Waddesden', 'Whitmill' house types, have been replaced in the revised house types with conventional ground floor windows as these were attractive features and positive characteristics for the appearance at key locations on the streets.

4. Officers are disappointed that the revised The 'Attingham' house type drawing (ref. PH320.1 rev A), features just one 1st floor window and two ground floor windows on its side elevation which means poor symmetry for the fenestration on this elevation and also the attractive projecting bay window feature on this side elevation (in previous drawing ref. PH320.1) has been replaced with a conventional window. As the dwellings at plots 31 and 56 (both 'Attingham' house type) are at the corners of streets facing the spine road with the front doors not facing the spine road, officers would have preferred a better arrangement of the fenestration to activate the public realm.

Officers request that the 'Chartwell' house type dwellings at plots 22 and 28, the 'Attingham' house type at plots 31 and 56 and the 'Whitmill' house type at plot 46 are redesigned with projecting bay windows on the side elevations to better activate the spine road at these key locations and that this is conditioned.5. Officers do not object to the revisions to the door canopies and window headers for the revised 'Coughton', 'HA2B' 'Newstead', and 'Osborne' house types. 6. The Osborne house type (drawing ref. PH220.1.41 rev A) at plot 41 has been amended to provide a window (rather than a blank facade) on the side elevation facing the side road which is welcome.

7. The revised 'Materials proposals' drawing (ref. 1266-005 rev B) indicates that just two external materials for the facing bricks (golden buff brick and red brick) of all the 58 dwellings. Officers do not object to this but considering the size of the scheme, officers would recommend considering adding some timber weather boarding for some of the dwellings to better adhere to the 'Caldecote village design guide' which advises that; "timber or brick are characteristic external materials in the village, render should be avoided".

8. Officers are disappointed that drawings have not been provided (plans and elevations) for the garden sheds shown on the 'Bin carry and shed location' drawing

(ref. 1266-BIN rev C) to enable an assessment of the size, colour and materials for these and recommend that this is conditioned.

9. Meter cupboards are shown on the front elevations in the drawings for the 'Attingham', 'Chartwell', 'Waddesden', 'Whitmill' and HA1B housetypes. Officers recommend that meter cupboards should be located either out of site on flank elevations or in purpose-made joinery designed to fit the pattern of apertures on the elevation to avoid visual impacts on the street scene and that this should be conditioned. This is to ensure compliance with the District Design guide paragraph 6.89.

10. Section 4.9 (Materials) of the revised 'Design and Access Statement' indicates that casement windows in off white Upvc is proposed throughout the scheme. Officers would prefer to see a more sustainable material such as timber used for the window frames and would recommend that the colour and material of all the window frames are conditioned.

11. Officers are disappointed that a more extensive set of coloured street scene drawings (ref 1266-005 rev A) were not submitted to aid officers' assessment of the appearance of the scheme, in particular a street scene including plots 25 to 58 along the spine road and a north / south culs de sacs street scene including plots 5 to 55.

Following Amended Plans-Officers consider that improvements have been made to the scheme since the previous consultation but are not in a position to fully support this application as it is considered that further information is required and further improvements can be made to the proposals to better meet Paragraph 127 of the 'National Planning Policy Framework' (2019), Policy HQ/1 (c), (e), (h) and (m) and SC/7 of the 'South Cambridgeshire Local Plan' (2018) and Paragraphs 6.68, 6.82 and 6.83 of the 'South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide' (2010).

Specifically, officers consider that further improvements can be made in the following areas:

Layout: 1. The parking court on the culs de sac for plots 52-57 will produce a vehicle-dominated environment. 2. 14 of the 58 plots (24%) feature front of plot parking and these will be highly visible and intrusive to the street scene and produce a vehicle dominated environment. 3. Difficulties in reading all the boundary treatments in the revised 'Hard Landscaping Zoning Plan & Boundary Treatments' drawing.

Parking: 4. The double carparking garages are too small and are therefore not of a usable size. 5. A large of dwellings (27%) having excessively long driveways. 6. A large number of dwellings (22%) would be provided with front of plot parking which are located too close to the houses, thus adversely affecting the residential amenity of the residents. 7. the positioning of a single garage next to a double garage in two instances which produces a long row of inactive frontage.

Residential amenity: 8. Several dwellings are not meeting the minimum back-to-back distances for avoiding overlooking habitable rooms in the 'District Design Guide'

Public open space provision: 9. No Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) has been included on the layout.

Architecture:

10. Architecture: The 'Attingham' house type at the corners of two streets facing

the spine road with the front doors not facing the spine road, would benefit from a better arrangement of the fenestration to activate the public realm.

11. Considering the considerable revisions to nearly all the house types, officers would recommend that a more extensive set of coloured street scene drawings are submitted to aid officers' assessment of the appearance of the scheme.

12. Meter cupboards are shown on the front elevations in the drawings for 5 of the housetypes. Officers recommend that meter cupboards should be located either out of site on flank elevations.

Following comments on the original application-Officers are not in a position to support this application as the proposals are considered to conflict with Paragraph 127 of the *'National Planning Policy Framework'* (2019), Policy HQ/1 (c), (e), (h) and (m) of the *'South Cambridgeshire Local Plan'* (2018) and Paragraphs 6.68, 6.75 and 6.82 of the *'South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide'* (2010).

Specifically, Officers have significant concerns over the following areas:

Layout:

1. The parking court on the culs de sac for plots 52-57 will produce a vehicle-dominated environment.
2. Excessive front of plot parking arrangements on several areas of the layout which will be highly visible and intrusive and produce a vehicle-dominated environment.
3. Unacceptable clustering of affordable houses which would have adverse impacts on community cohesion.

Parking:

4. Excessive numbers of visitor car parking dominating the public realm.
5. The double carparking garages are too small and are therefore not of a usable size.
6. A large of dwelling having excessively long driveways.
7. A large number of dwellings would be provided with front of plot parking which are located too close to the houses, thus adversely affecting the residential amenity of the residents.

Residential amenity:

8. Several dwellings are not meeting the minimum back-to-back and/or back-to-side distances for avoiding overlooking habitable rooms in the *'District Design Guide'*
9. The rear gardens for 3 of the plots are not meeting the minimum size requirements stipulated in the *'District Design Guide'*.

Public open space provision:

10. No Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) has been included on the layout.

Architecture:

11. Architecture: Poor arrangement of fenestration on the elevation of one house which faces the spine road and no fenestration on the elevation two other houses facing the spine road meaning a lack of active frontages for the public realm.

Representations

36. There have been a number of letters of objection received on this application. All comments can be found on the Councils website. In summary the following concerns have been raised to the proposed plans:

-The access to the site is via Grafton Drive which is a private road and from No.1 Grafton Drive the road is owned by all residents and managed by a Management

Company.

- 14 of the 33 houses in Grafton Drive have no driveway and park their second car/visitor car outside on the road.
- The road is constructed with tarmac and block paving, and showing signs of wear and tear. The proposal will generate 81 cars which is 127 cars in total using the road
- Questions over how the road will cope with construction vehicles and additional traffic when built.
- Concerns regarding noise, fumes and dust pollution from developers construction vehicles.
- Noise mitigation for living room and bedroom windows facing the road and in close proximity to vehicles using the road.
- Concerns regarding damage to the road from heavy traffic and damage to homes.
- Grafton Drive is very busy with parents parking at school start and finish times with parents taking their children to school.
- Concerns over the unsuitability of additional traffic and parking.
- Concerns regarding highway safety and suitability of additional cars, construction vehicles, parked cars and pedestrians.
- The area outside the school is a no parking area, more cars will be using Grafton Drive to park and drop off children, with additional construction traffic, children's safety will be at risk.
- Concerns regarding the access, the volume and nature of vehicles using the site, the size and design of the existing road and the safety of children.
- Objects to planning permission being granted or works starting until the developer has formed an agreement with Ashcroft Gardens Ltd which owns Grafton Drive between Nos.1-33.
- Concerns regarding the proposed number of dwellings.
- Sustainability of the development
- Does not comply with the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 or National Planning Guidance.
- Site lies outside the village development framework
- Failure to provide a countryside separation between Highfields Caldecote and Bourn Airfield Development.
- Plans are not correct as they include private land which the applicant does not own or has any right of use over.
- No access on pavements for disabled users or wheelchairs as residents have to park on the pavements due to lack of space.
- There has not been sufficient regard to the biodiversity impact of the application.
- Significant loss of meadow habitat which provides important feeding and breeding grounds for species such as barn owls, brown hares and the large rookery in the woods adjacent to the site.
- Wildlife species such as badgers and bats are present on the site.
- Brown hare are regularly present and breeding on site.
- Proposal ignores the presence of invertebrate such as beetles and moths such as the Blackneck.
- Site is adjacent to a County Wildlife site containing significant numbers of grassland indicator species.
- Site is an important feeding round for raptors such as buzzards, barn owls and kestrels.
- The removal of some of the native trees is unacceptable.
- Consideration of the current climate emergency.
- Meadows provide important habitat and buffers for local villages and the countryside areas should be retained between village to preserve the rural nature and biodiversity of this area.
- Concerns regarding loss of privacy, loss of light, noise pollution and overlooking.
- The proposal will exacerbate known flooding, sewerage, infrastructure, lack of public

transport and school places.

-Increased hard surfaces to the site will only increase surface flooding risk of adjacent properties.

-Concerned regarding the provision for foul water and surface water drainage.

-If the foul water drainage is to be via an upgraded sewer along Grafton Drive, the developers will need permission for this from Grafton Drive residents who own and maintain the road.

-No provision for additional transport as a result of the proposal.

-Unsustainable and contradicts what is set out in the NPPF.

-No reference to address any issues stated for the Council's refusal in 2017.

-Number of dwellings, density and the type is inappropriate for the location and the private access route which would be significantly detrimental to the private, quiet nature of Grafton Drive.

-Objections to further housing developments.

-No benefits for the current residents of Grafton Drive, but substantial detrimental impact.

-Road is not owned by the applicant, nor does the applicant have rights to occupy or develop to the road.

-Applicant not contributed to the upkeep of the private road/questions over the covenant for the ownership.

-Unacceptable that with some dwellings having no frontage or front privacy, privacy would be lost to the rear of some properties.

-Increased traffic and pedestrians to the front of dwellings would reduce privacy for residents.

-Lack of provision for accessible housing for the disabled and elderly in the village.

-Loss of boundary between the village of Highfields Caldecote and Bourn Airfield.

-Traffic assumptions should be based on actual vehicle usage in the existing road.

-The suggested provision of cycle storage for each individual property means that visitors to the trail or similar will have no place to secure their cycles.

-The design of some of the parking means that vehicle exhausts will be emitting fumes into the gardens of existing properties.

-The planting area will not be adopted and it is unclear how trees, borders and similar will be maintained, especially as they grow and could obstruct pathways and roads.

-Amendments have not dealt with previous objections. The plans still incorrectly indicate that the developer claims land over which they do not have legal title, the developer has made absolutely no attempt to contact the residents and owners of the private land they mark as being part of their plot, and over which they will need to negotiate access terms. This was a condition of the planning inspector and has been completely ignored by the developer

-The overall design and redesign of plots 52-55 exacerbates the previous issues of the poor clustering of affordable housing contrary to the South Cambs Local Plan policy H/10.

-The design of plots 1-5, 52-58 adjacent to the boundary significantly exacerbates problems of overlooking, loss of light, and loss of privacy for existing residents of Grafton Drive against whose boundaries these properties abut. Several of the proposed properties would be less than 12m from windows of existing properties thereby breaching policies.

- The design of plots 52-55 would require removal of several mature native trees and replacing the area with houses and a large parking lot, thereby having a detrimental biodiversity impact. The overall development would have a significant detrimental environmental impact making it more difficult to meet the Council's climate change strategy.

- The development does not reflect the current character of the village and would change the existing character of the quiet Grafton Drive cul-de-sac beyond all recognition.

- Overall, this proposal is overwhelmingly detrimental and should not proceed.
 - Previous objections apply given the amendments. In addition, comments that there is no alternative for pedestrians, wheelchair users, mobility scooter users and parents with buggies but to use the road in Grafton Drive as the footpaths are inadequate and made even more difficult by the number of cars that need to park both sides of the road due to lack of driveways.
 - The narrow access gate to the proposed development site allows only one vehicle drive through at any one time and the plan is still showing access land that does not belong to the Developer.
 - There is a huge proposed development ongoing within the village, a large development of properties has just recently been completed. The Bourn airfield development site adjacent to the village has now been agreed. This will result in a loss of the boundary between the village and the Bourn site. The volume of traffic through the village and meeting up with the new Bourn development to access the A428 will have a huge environmental impact on the whole of the surrounding area.
 - In the village, no improvements have been carried out to the roads and pathways. These still cause hazards for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists and particularly for children accessing the local school and waiting for school transport to secondary school. Grafton Drive is particularly susceptible to these dangers as it is adjacent to the school and the junction is extremely busy in the mornings and afternoons.
 - The development is not sustainable in any way. In my opinion it will have a serious impact on the health and well-being of all the residents of Grafton Drive.
 - Unsustainable and in the wrong place.
 - Will set a precedent, leading to the north of the development being developed.
 - Development is being developed in isolation from its context, development would be more coherent with the existing private development on Grafton Drive if it considered the new houses as part of the wider community including the existing houses and the context and character of the village.
 - If the proposed new development considered the existing and new houses together and place additional parking for the existing 32 houses and the green space immediately as you enter the new plot, this would benefit both areas and alleviate concerns regarding access and social cohesion.
 - The amendments to the design of the plots 1-5, 52-58 still does not address the issues of overlooking, loss of light and loss of privacy for existing residents of Grafton Drive.
 - A number of properties will be less than 12metres from the windows of properties on Grafton Drive thus breaching current policies on spacing between properties.
 - There is no provision in the amendment to retain the existing 'mature' native trees on the boundary with Grafton Drive, this will result in a loss of biodiversity which cannot be mitigated by planting of smaller saplings.
 - The entire development will result in a significant overall loss of biodiversity that given the current ecological crisis in the UK should not be overlooked.
 - The mitigation measures will not compensate for the fact that this site is unploughed grassland.
- This development is not a sustainable one and does not meet Council's climate change strategy.
- This development will severely affect the quiet nature of Grafton Drive which is a cul de sac and change the rural nature of this small village.
 - This development poses significant issues with regards the safety of young children at the junction to Grafton Drive due to the significant increase in construction and residential traffic and what is already a very busy junction next to a primary school.
 - It will result in a contiguous urban development between the village of Caldecote and the Bourn Airfield and destroy any sense of separation between the two.
 - There has been absolutely no effort made by the developer to consult with the residents about this development as they will need to negotiate access over the

private property of Grafton Drive and agree a construction plan.

-The plans still show that the developer claims land over which they do not have legal title. This is incorrect and must be addressed.

Site and Surroundings

37. The site is located outside of the Highfields Caldecote village framework and within the open countryside. It is situated on the western edge of Highfields Caldecote, off Grafton Drive. The site is located in a sensitive location, an area which sits along the boundary between Caldecote and Bourn Airfield. The site comprises of scrub grassland and hardstanding, extending west behind the existing housing on Grafton Drive and a further strip extending south behind the recreation ground connecting with Bucket Hill Plantation and New Barns Plantation which separates Caldecote from Bourn Airfield. The site's northern boundary is defined by an existing post and wire fence with a hedgerow and some mature trees. The boundary is defined by an existing track that runs north-south through the woodland. The site's southern boundary is defined by an existing mature hedgerow and ditch, adjacent to the Recreation Ground. The site's eastern boundary abuts existing dwellings at Grafton Drive. The site is situated within flood zone 1 (low risk).
38. The site contains a large agricultural barn, piggery and hardstanding from previous buildings which were used for agricultural purposes. The site also features a woodland area to the west and south west.

Proposal

39. This application, as amended, seeks consent for approval of matters reserved for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning consent (S/2764/16/OL) which was approved under appeal (APP/W0530/W/17/3172541) for up to 58 dwellings. The application seeks consent for the demolition of the existing barn on the site and development of up to 58 dwellings with associated infrastructure, landscaping and public open space.
40. This application follows the scheme which underwent pre-application planning advice and discussion with the Design Enabling Panel (DEP).
41. Amended plans have been received for the proposal.
42. A number of comments have been raised in regard to the sustainability of the proposal and complying with the Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework. The principle of the development was established under the approved appeal (APP/W0530/W/17/3172541) and therefore cannot be considered as part of this Reserved Matters application.

Planning Assessment

Principle of Development:

43. The principle of the residential development for up to 58 dwellings (including 40% affordable) with access for the main vehicular entrance was established on the site under outline planning consent (S/2764/16/OL) which was approved under appeal (APP/W0530/W/17/3172541).
44. The key issues to therefore consider in the determination of this Reserved Matters application relate to density, housing mix and the impacts of the development upon

the character and appearance of the area, neighbour amenity, trees and landscaping.

Housing Density

45. The overall site measures approximately 3.56 hectares in area. The proposed density on this site would be approximately 16 dwellings per hectare. Alongside the residential development, other areas of the site would consist of the retention of the existing woodland, two attenuation basins and public open space comprising a trim trail
46. The proposed density would be below the requirement of an average of 30 dwellings per hectare, however the proposal is considered to be acceptable given the character of the area and sites location, in accordance with Policy H/8 of the Local Plan.

Affordable Housing Provision

47. 23 of the 58 dwellings would be affordable to meet the local needs (40%). This was secured within the Section 106 agreement as part of the outline planning consent, approved under appeal (APP/W0530/W/17/3172541). The proposed mix for the affordable rent properties would comprise of 2 x 1 bedroom maisonettes, 7 x 2 bed dwellings and 7 x 3 bedroom dwellings, and for the shared ownership properties 3 x 2 bedroom dwellings and 4 x 3 bedroom dwellings. This would result in 7 (30%) of the units being for shared ownership and 16 (70%) for affordable rented. The dwelling size mix and tenure mix is considered acceptable and would accord with local needs within Caldecote and across the district.
48. 2 no. of the 35 no. private dwellings (plots 22 and 28) and 2 no. of the 23 affordable dwellings (plots 52 and 53) would be M4.2 compliant, which the Housing Officer supports.
49. The Housing Officer has confirmed that the proposed location of the affordable dwellings comprising of plots 3,4,5,6,7,10 and 11 in the south and south eastern part of the site, and plots 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54 and 55 in the north and north eastern part of the site are sufficiently clustered and the proposal would therefore comply with Policy H/10 of the Local Plan.

Market Housing Mix

50. 35 of the dwellings would be for sale on the open market. The market housing mix proposed is 10 x two bed units (28%), 10 x three bed units (28%) and 15 x four bed units (42).
51. Market homes in developments of 10 or more homes will consist of at least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes; at least 30% 3 bedroom homes; and at least 30% 4 or more bedroom homes; with a 10% flexibility allowance that can be added to any of the above categories taking account of local circumstances.
52. The proposal would fall short of this for the proposed 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings, and slightly above for the 4 bedroom dwellings. The proposal given though slightly short of the policy requirement, is considered acceptable.

Character and Appearance of the Area

53. The site comprises two agricultural fields, separated by an area of hard standing. The site is relatively flat, with a slight decline from north to south. The site includes an existing woodland to the west and south west, and numerous trees and hedgerows

along its boundaries.

54. The site is accessed off Grafton Drive which lies to the east and forms relatively new residential development comprising of two storey dwellings, with a mix of detached, semi-detached and link properties, lying either along Grafton Drive or off within smaller clusters or cul-de-sacs. There is a mixture of parking within driveways, with garages often set back from property frontages and on street parking. There are a number of bungalows which are situated and lie along Grafton Drive, as you first enter from Highfields Road.
55. The design and detailing of the dwellings along Grafton Drive are varied, with the design focusing on a modern interpretation of the traditional vernacular. The materials vary with buff brick, black cladding and red brick with a mix of roofing materials.
56. The site lies within the settlement of Highfields, which is situated at the northern end of the Parish. Through the development and replacement of the former smallholding plots, the character of dwellings typical of Highfields Caldecote is of varied styles and periods, though mainly either one storey or one and half storey chalet dwellings, with recent development comprising two or three storey dwellings along cul-de-sacs.
57. The Caldecote Village Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document was formally adopted in January 2020. The proposed site lies within the Strympole and Furlong character area as identified in the Village Design Guide, which forms development from 2001 in cul-de-sac roadways and dwellings of brick and render.
58. Paragraph 6.3 of the Village Design Guide states that new residential developments should integrate with the original Highfields development pattern wherever possible, including linear street layout, green edging to the highway in front of houses, and mature planting. It is considered that the proposed landscaping details would accord with the Village Design Guide with planting to the front of the dwellings.
59. Paragraph 6.4 states that new development should reflect the distinctive pattern of Highfields where off-street parking and generous front gardens mean that cars do not dominate the appearance of roads and building frontages. The proposal would not strictly accord with this, however given the character of the adjacent development in Grafton Drive, the proposed layout would reflect this and it is considered acceptable to continue this visual character.
60. The proposed height of the development would comprise of two storey dwellings and one storey garages, being in accordance with the outline planning condition 5 vi which required dwellings to not exceed 2.5 storey's. The dwellings along Grafton Drive are mainly two storey, which the proposal would accord with paragraph 6.1 of the Village Design Guide.
61. The proposed design and appearance of the dwellings following amendments are considered to be appropriate and would visually connect with the adjacent development at Grafton Drive. Comments have been received that the proposed house designs are poor, with no indication that the designs have been considered in relation to the Village Design Guide. The amended design and appropriate materials proposed are considered acceptable. The Urban Design Officer in their comments were pleased that the amendments as a result of the advice given at the Design Enabling Panel meeting have resulted in the simplifying and rationalising of windows and their designs and the addition of windows in key fenestration. They did however consider the house elevations to be rather suburban looking and the appearance of the dwellings could be improved by reflecting local vernacular. Officers are of the view

that the proposed design of the dwellings has been amended and are of a similar design and appearance to Grafton Drive. The Urban Design Officer was disappointed that the proposed bay windows had been removed, however this was requested by the Design Enabling Panel and Officers consider that bay windows are not appropriate to the character of the area and adjacent development at Grafton Drive.

62. The proposed density of the built form will comprise of a lower density on the edge of the built form consisting of detached dwellings with landscaping, and a higher density within the core of the development comprising of semi-detached and terraced dwellings. It is considered this would be appropriate to the character of the area. Comments have been received that the eastern side of the development, close to the existing development at Grafton Drive appears very crowded, particularly when you enter the site. This design is proposed to ensure a seamless transition from the existing development to the proposed site, with plots 1 and 56-58 lining the highway to provide a visual interest.
63. In prominent locations, dwellings have been used to terminate views and gaps have been retained to provide views to the open countryside and retained woodland.
64. The proposed materials for the dwellings will comprise of a mix of buff and red brick with plain sand faced concrete tiles and artificial slate. The fenestration will include well proportioned casement windows in off white, UPVC. It is considered that the proposed mix of materials will add variety and break up the appearance of the built form. The materials would relate well to the dwellings and materials within Grafton Drive, ensuring a visual continuation and integration of the proposed development. The proposed materials would accord with paragraph 6.5 of the Village Design Guide.
65. The proposed layout of the development is arranged around a variety of roads forming a hierarchy of primary, secondary, and private drives internally and along the woodland edges. This is replicated with different surface materials to define their status. The proposed access into the site off Grafton Drive will provide a long vista and key views as you enter the site, framed by two dwellings that act as an entrance gateway to provide a sense of enclosure and arrival. In the centre of the site, proposed dwellings are orientated around a central green space that acts as a 'green heart' to the scheme and creates a sense of character. Dwellings turn with the streets to provide active frontages leading to informal mews and closes with views out into the surrounding countryside.
66. The proposed design of the site is very landscape led with the large existing woodland to the west and south being incorporated within the site and forming part of the development. Two large areas of public open space would be sited within the core of the development and to the south west. A woodland play trail is proposed with footpaths around the site.
67. Parking within the development has been designed to be convenient and well surveyed. Parking is predominantly on plot, to the front of dwellings and garages, either side by side or tandem. There are a number of enclosed garages proposed. Car parking courts have been sited to the front of a number of dwellings. 10 visitor car parking spaces are proposed to comply with the Outline planning consent condition 5. The Urban Design Officer in their comments raise concern regarding the position of single garages next to a double garage which produces a row of inactive frontage. This only occurs in a few examples on the whole site and is not considered to cause significant visual harm.

68. The Parish in their comments have made reference to parking. There are a number of car parking courts proposed, the application has been amended so that the number of spaces within car parking court areas have been reduced or relocated to reduce the visual impact. It is considered that the proposed car parking court serving plot Nos.52-58 through proposed landscaping, tree planting and use of a different surface material will reduce the visual impact of this area, and the proposal would be acceptable in terms of visual amenity. The Urban Design Officer does not object to this and comments that given the scale of development, a mix of different parking approaches are included taking into account the site constraints.
69. The proposal is considered to be of a high-quality design and would preserve the character of the area, providing a positive contribution in line with Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan.

Residential Space Standards

70. 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.
71. 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 of the development, the sizes of the rooms are considered satisfactory.
72. The proposal would therefore not comply with Policy H/12 of the Local Plan but there are material considerations in this case to justify a departure from policy.

Trees/Landscaping

73. The proposed site is predominantly landscape led, with large areas of formal and informal public open space and the existing woodland to the west. The open space within the site includes two areas of public open space forming a large green within the centre of the site and to the south west. This provides a large area of green space and creates a visual focus within the built form. To the west of the site is the existing woodland which will provide access to residents and wider village residents with footpaths and a Trim Trail.
74. The proposed public open space will be centrally sited and well overlooked by dwellings. A Trim Trail will be provided to the west of the site adjacent to the existing woodland which will provide nine pieces of play equipment, which would be in accordance with the requirements set out in the S106 Agreement for the outline permission. The S106 Agreement required a contribution of £50,000 to the Parish in lieu of a Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) on site. The Urban Design and Landscape Officers in their comments made reference to this and a LEAP was not required on site given this financial contribution.
75. The Landscape Officer has requested clarification and amendments on a number of outstanding landscape matters. Following amended plans, the Landscape Officer has commented that the scheme is not supported and existing comments are still to be addressed. These are in regard to appearance which is discussed under character of the area. The Landscape Officer comments on the lack of native hedgerow along the

- northern boundary. This boundary along the northern edge is to be left open to allow residents to have views out towards the countryside. There are limited public views when looking south towards the site which would lead to limited visual harm with regard to not having any hedgerow. The Landscape Officer comments on the lack of details regarding tree planting pit detail, this can be addressed and condition (d) is recommended. The Landscape Officer concerns and comments are considered to be addressed. The Tree Officer comments that the detailed landscape proposal does not provide a landmark, long lived, large stature tree within the centre green. Given this green is to be used as part of the SuDs system, the agent has advised that it would not be possible for a large tree to be planted within this area. It is not considered that the lack of a tree within this area would result in significant visual harm to warrant refusal. Further comments from the Tree Officer are awaited in terms of this. In addition the Tree Officer comments that the Landscape Management Plan does not accord with the Ecological Method Statement which identifies a minimum of 18 watering visits throughout the year. Condition (d) is recommended to require details of the Landscape Management Plan to be submitted for approval, and that the street lighting layout plan not be approved as plot 22 or road 1 LP04 conflicts with the adjacent tree. Condition (g) is recommended to require a lighting plan to be submitted to agree the proposed lighting and ensure no conflict.
76. Boundary treatment to dwellings will comprise of 1 metre, three bar timber post and rail fence any rear or side boundaries facing onto the countryside and 1.8 metre high close boarded fences between gardens.
77. The retention of the existing woodland on the western boundary will provide a significant landscape and visual buffer between Bourn Airfield and the site and village. The boundaries around the site will be increased with trees and shrub planting to soften the visual impact.
78. A number of comments have been received in regard to the visual impact of hard landscaping forming car parking. The proposal has been amended to reduce the prominence and visual impact of parking within courtyard areas. It is acknowledged that there are car parking spaces which will be evident in street scene views, however these have been minimized where possible.
79. The proposed hard and soft landscaping for the scheme would accord with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the Local Plan.
80. **Flood Risk**
81. The site is situated within flood zone 1 (low risk) as identified by the Environment Agency. There are no watercourses within or on the boundaries of the site.
- A Drainage Strategy has been submitted as part of the application. The strategy proposes an appropriate level of sustainable drainage solutions, including two attenuation ponds which will serve as both drainage and ecological habitat features.
82. The maintenance of any adopted sewer will be by Anglian Water, whilst any private drainage systems will be maintained by the property manager. The SuDs scheme will be offered to Anglian Water or the Parish Council for adoption and future maintenance. If none of the above will adopt and maintain the SuDs features, a management company will be offered the adoption of the SuDS features.
83. The Landscape Officer in their comments have requested that the proposed

headwalls and culverts are proposed to provide green alternatives or natural stone headwall structures rather than precast concrete. Given these details are acceptable by the Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency, it is not considered reasonable to request amendments regarding this. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Drainage Officer, Environment Agency and Anglian Water are in support of the proposed surface water and foul water drainage measures and, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies CC/8 and CC/9 of the Local Plan.

84. Highway Safety and Parking Provision

The vehicular access to the site has been agreed under the approved appeal (APP/W0530/W/17/3172541) for the Outline application (2764/16/OL). Comments have been received in regard to traffic generation from the site, highway safety, the effect of the proposal on the road condition, impact of construction vehicles and safety in regard to the existing use of Grafton Drive for the primary school and children's safety.

85. Given that access for the site has been agreed under the Appeal for the Outline Consent and was satisfactory to the Planning Inspectorate, this cannot be considered as a material planning consideration under this Reserved Matters Consent.

86. Condition 10 on the allowed appeal requires submission of a Construction Management Plan to be submitted and approved prior to any development on the site. This will provide details of how construction traffic will access the site from Grafton Drive, the days and hours of working, proposals to minimise disruption to the area, parking for vehicles of site personnel, contractor storage areas and compound. The Parish Council in their comments made reference to the request for the application to go to Planning Committee on the grounds of traffic, banksman and delivery.

87. The Local Highways Authority in their comments stated that they are not in a position to adopt the site as Grafton Drive is a private street and all adopted public highway must be contiguous and therefore, the entire site will remain private. If in the future, Grafton Drive is brought forward for adoption, currently as it stands the proposed layout is not up to adoptable standard.

88. Each dwelling would have two off road car parking spaces which would meet the requirement of Policy TI/2 of the Local Plan. This would be in the form of a driveway on plot and/or a garage or within court yard parking. The Urban Design Officer raised concern that the driveways were excessively long. The driveways are considered to be of an appropriate size to allow two cars to park with sufficient space surrounding for use. 10 visitor car parking spaces will be provided as per the Appeal decision for the Outline consent. The Landscape Officer in their comments raised concern regarding the location of the visitor parking to the north of the open space. It is considered this is sufficient to allow easy access for visitors and would not cause visual harm to the open space.

89. The Parish Council in their comments raised concern regarding the size of the proposed garages. The District Design Guide states that to provide garages of adequate size, a minimum of 3.3 metres by 6 metres should be allowed for car parking and circulation, with an allowance of 1 metres at the end or 650mm-750 mm for cycle or other storage. The proposed single and double garages proposed would comply with the size requirements of the District Design Guide.

90. The proposal has provided a mix of methods for cycle storage with provision within

oversized garages and lockable garden sheds with direct access to the street and approached by a hard path. The Transport Assessment Team in their comments have mentioned that secure bike storage should be provided for all dwellings with one cycle space per bedroom. To ensure this is provided, Condition (d) is recommended to require details of external materials and sizes of the proposed garden sheds for bike storage.

91. Representations have been received in regard to Land Registry details for the access road along Grafton Drive, in which the developer is required to make payment to the owner of the access road for maintenance costs. This is a legal matter and not a planning consideration and cannot be considered as part of the planning process.
92. The proposal would therefore accord with Policies TI/2, TI/3 and HQ/1 of the Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

93. Comments have been received that the proposal would cause significant harm to existing neighbouring dwellings along Grafton Drive.
94. The neighbours at No.22 Grafton Drive have raised concerns regarding loss of privacy. Neighbouring properties serving Nos.19 to 22 Grafton Drive lie to the east of the proposed site, with their rear elevations and back rear gardens abutting the development site which lies to the west. The side elevation of Plot 55 would be set off the common boundary and sited 15 metres from the rear elevation of No.22 Grafton Drive. This would accord with Paragraph 6.68 of the District Design Guide which states where blank walls are proposed opposite the windows to habitable rooms, this distance can be reduced further, with a minimum of 12m between the wall and any neighbouring windows that are directly opposite. Plot 55 would not result in any loss of privacy to the adjacent neighbouring properties given there are no windows proposed in the side (east) elevation.
95. Following amended plans, the roof of Plot 55 has been hipped to the east, to reduce the visual impact in terms of the mass and bulk. Proposed plot 55 is not considered to result in significant harm in terms of loss of light, loss of privacy or be visually overbearing to the existing neighbouring properties.
96. Proposed plot 58 would be set off the common boundary and sited 15 metres from the rear elevation of No.19 Grafton Drive. This would accord with Paragraph 6.68 of the District Design Guide which states where blank walls are proposed opposite the windows to habitable rooms, this distance can be reduced further, with a minimum of 12m between the wall and any neighbouring windows that are directly opposite. Plot 58 would not result in any loss of privacy to the adjacent neighbouring properties given there are no windows proposed in the side (east) elevation.
97. Following amended plans, the roof of Plot 58 has been hipped to the east, to reduce the visual impact in terms of the mass and bulk. Proposed plot 58 is not considered to result in significant harm in terms of loss of light, loss of privacy or be visually overbearing to the existing neighbouring properties.
98. Neighbouring properties serving Nos.15 and 18 Grafton Drive lie to the east of the proposed site, with their side elevations and rear garden areas lying to the side of proposed plots 1-5.

99. Proposed plot 1 would be sited approximately 13 metres from the side elevation of No.18 Grafton Drive and 8 metres from the common boundary. In between this space would serve the driveway for proposed plot 1, with the garage set back. No.18 Grafton Drive is set off the boundary. The proposed garage serving plot 1 would be set less than a metre from the boundary with No.18 Grafton Drive, facing to the side of their garden area. Within the side elevation of No.18 Grafton Drive lies a set of patio doors serving a kitchen/dining and living room with no first floor windows in the side (west) elevation.
100. Within the side east elevation immediate gable of Plot 1 lies no ground or first floor windows. In the rear projecting element which lies 13 metres from the boundary would be a set of patio doors serving a kitchen and breakfast room and a secondary window at first floor serving bedroom one. A condition (e) is recommended to any consent granted to obscure glaze and fix shut the proposed secondary first floor window serving bedroom one to prevent any loss of privacy to No.18 Grafton Drive and condition (f) to prevent the insertion of future windows.
101. The proposed distance of plot 1 from No.18 Grafton Drive would accord with Paragraph 6.68 of the District Design Guide which states where blank walls are proposed opposite the windows to habitable rooms, this distance can be reduced further, with a minimum of 12m between the wall and any neighbouring windows that are directly opposite. As a result, the proposal would not result in any harm in terms of loss of privacy.
102. Given the siting of proposed plot 1 set off from the boundary, with No.18 Grafton Drive having patio doors which face towards this plot, but main garden area to the rear with windows serving No.18 to the rear, the proposal is not considered to result in significant loss of light or be visually overbearing.
103. The proposed garage for plot 2 would be sited approximately 3 metres from the common boundary with No.18 Grafton Drive, however would sit slightly further to the north of the garage which serves No.18 Grafton Drive. Plot 2 would not result in any significant harm to the amenity of No.18 Grafton Drive.
104. Plots 3, 4 and 5 would be sited 15 metres from the side elevation of No.15 Grafton Drive. Within the side elevation of No.15 Grafton Drive there are ground floor windows but no first floor windows. Plots 3,4 and 5 would be sited approximately 14 metres from the side elevation of No.15 Grafton Drive. First Floor windows serving a bedroom lie within the rear elevation of plots 3,4 and 5. The District Design Guide states 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. Plots 3 and 4 on balance given the distance from the side elevation of the neighbour, and boundary treatment are considered acceptable in terms of loss of privacy. Given the distance and siting of plot 5, condition (f) is recommended to prevent any loss of privacy to the rear garden amenity area of No.15 Grafton Drive.
105. Given the distance and siting of plots 3,4 and 5 from the side elevation window of No.15 Grafton Drive and rear garden amenity area, the proposal is not considered to result in any significant loss of light or be visually overbearing to the amenity of this

resident.

106. The Urban Design Officer in their comments raise concern that a number of the dwellings do not meet the required back to back distance of 25 metres as set out in the District Design Guide. The shortest distance proposed is 22 metres from the rear elevation of plot 7 to the rear elevation of plot 10, with this occurring again between plots 6 and 11 and plots 18 to 21. A number of other plots fall short at 23 and 24 metres. Given the majority of the plots meet the 25 metre distance and there are only a few instances where this is less than 25 metres, which is often expected at the centre of developments being of a higher density, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of impact on residential amenity.
107. Officers acknowledge the Urban Design Officers comments in regard to the proximity of front of plot parking spaces to dwellings being less than 2 metres and request to reposition the parking bays to provide a wider distance of 3 metres to reduce the impact of car headlights and engine noise, however given parking to the front of dwellings would be for the host dwelling only, with no parking for adjacent plots opposite other houses, the siting is considered acceptable.
108. The proposed rear garden sizes would comply with the space and size requirements under paragraph 6.75 of the District Design Guide.
109. The development is not considered to adversely affect the amenities of adjoining neighbours through being unduly overbearing in mass, through a significant loss of light or through a severe loss of privacy.
110. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan.

Biodiversity

111. The ecological constraints of the site were considered under the outline planning application.
112. An Ecological Method Statement and updated statement in relation to condition 15 of the appeal decision notice has been submitted as part of this Reserved Matters application.
113. The woodland in the west section of the site will remain. The proposal will include the creation of two ponds and two public amenity grassland areas. Landscaping for the site, includes tree planting, ditch filling and creation of a woodland play trail. The submitted Ecological Method Statement is sufficient to provide a wide variety of mitigation strategies. The Ecology Officer has requested that further bat and bird boxes are provided within the site and the number was increased to the installation of 29 bat bricks and 29 brick bird nests across the site. In addition, the Ecology Officer requested that the landscaping plan match the recommendations in the Ecological Method Statement in regard to marginal planting, removal of reed species or provision of a management plan that will contact the species going forward. This has been addressed and the Ecology Officer supports the proposal in terms of biodiversity.
114. The proposal will result in a wide range of habitats comprising native species and improve and maintain ecological connectivity. Given the above, the proposal would not result in the loss of any important habitats for protected species and would result in a net increase in biodiversity on the site, in accordance with Policy NH/4 of the

Local Plan.

Contamination

115. As part of the allowed appeal (APP/W0530/W/17/3172541) for the Outline application (S/2764/16/OL) a Land Contamination Assessment was submitted. In the report, the site was considered to present an overall low to moderate/high risk from past and current use, adjacent operations and environmental settling. Condition 17 of the approved appeal decision requires an assessment of the risks posed by any contamination to be submitted, requiring a risk assessment, detailed remediation options and scheme, Condition 17 remains outstanding and has not been discharged, a discharge of condition application is required and a written scheme for investigation and recording of contamination and remediation remains outstanding.

116. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies SC/11 of the Local Plan.

Noise

117. A Noise Assessment has been submitted as part of the application and the Environmental Health Officer has commented that the proposal is acceptable from a noise perspective. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy SC/10 of the Local Plan.

Permeability

118. The site is accessed via a single point of access from Grafton Drive, with primary and secondary access roads and pedestrian footways within the site. A footpath is proposed through the woodland which would provide sufficient connectivity within the site in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan.

Conclusion

119. The principle of residential development up to 58 dwellings on the site, has been established through outline planning consent (S/2764/16/OL) which was allowed under appeal (APP/W0530/W/17/3172541).

120. Whilst the concerns of the Parish Council and local residents are acknowledged in relation to the design, layout, neighbour amenity, highway safety, drainage, biodiversity and landscaping no objections have been received from statutory consultees in relation to these matters.

121. Most of these matters were considered at outline stage and no adverse impacts were identified that could not be controlled or mitigated by way of conditions.

122. The amendments are considered to further improve the quality of the scheme to ensure that it preserves the character and appearance of the area and fits comfortably within its rural context. The reserved matters details for appearance, layout, scale and landscaping of the development are considered acceptable by officers and the application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

123. Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is considered that the reserved matters should be approved in this instance.

Recommendation

124. Officers recommend that the Committee approves the application, with the planning conditions and informatives set out below, with the final wording of any amendments to these to be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair prior to the issuing of planning permission:

Conditions

- (a) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: HA3B(MID)/1 Rev H Planning Layout, PH220.1.41 Rev A Osborne Planning-Plans & Elevations Plot 41 Only, PH221.1 Rev A Waddesdon Planning- Plans and Elevations, PH320.1 Rev A Attingham Planning- Plans and Elevations, PH323.2/3 Rev C Alexander Planning-Plans and Elevations, PH421.1 Chartwell Planning-Plans and Elevations Plot 17 and 18, PH421.2 Chartwell Planning-Plans and Elevations Plot 22 and 28, PH422.1 Rev A Waddesdon Planning- Plans and Elevations, PH4423.1 Rev B Coughton Planning- Plans and Elevations, PH220.1.45 Rev B Osborne Planning- Plans and Elevations Plot 57-58 Only, PH322.1 Rev A Newstead Planning-Plans and Elevations, HA1BED HA-1BED Planning-Plans and Elevations, SH322.1 Rev C HA-3B Planning-Plans and Elevations, SH220.1 Rev B HA-2B Planning Plans & Elevations, SH220.2 Rev B HA-2B Planning-Plans and Elevations Plot 55 Only, G203.1.1 Twin Garage Planning- Plans and Elevations, G201.1 Double Store Planning-Plans and Elevations, GD.G101.1.1/3 G101.1.1 Single Garage Planning- Plans and Elevations, 25129_02_020_02 Rev C Engineering Layout, 25129 Rev A Engineering Design Calculations M-EC April 2020, GL1203 02 Rev D Hard Landscaping Zoning Plans and Boundary Treatments, GL1203 Rev A Landscape Management Plan 18 May 2020, 1266-004 Rev J Planning Layout, GL120301 Rev D Landscape Proposals, 20876/CAM Trim Trail Details, 1266-Bin Rev C Bin Carry Drawing, 1266-005 Rev C Materials Plan, 1266-MOV Rev B Movement and Access Drawing, 1266-PAR Rev B Parking Plan, 1266-SH Rev B Storey Height Plan, 1266-TM Rev B Tenure Mix, 25129_02_SMM_01a SUDS Maintenance Note, 25129_02_100_01 Rev C Private Street Lighting Layout, 25129_02_110_01 Rev D Refuse Vehicle Tracking Plan, 25129_02_110_02 Rev E Fire Tender Vehicle Tracking Plan, Ecological Method Statement by ADAS Feb 2020, GL1203 03 Tree Pit Details, P3405.1.001 Tree Constrains Drawing, P3405.1.002 Tree Constrains Drawing, P3405.1.003 Tree Constrains Drawing, P3405.1.004 Tree Constrains Drawing, P3405.1.005 Rev D Tree Protection Plan, P3405.1.006 Rev D Tree Protection Plan, p3405.1.007 Rev D Tree Protection Plan, P3405.1.008 Rev D Tree Protection Plan, P3405.1.4 Arboricultural Impact Assessment 19 February 2020, Waste Management Strategy, SH104.1/21 HA 1 bed, SH104.1/3 HA 1 Bed, SH104.1/3 Rev A, SH220.2 HA2 Bed Plot 55, SH220.1 HA2 Rev B Bed, SH220.1/3 Rev A (PLT 5 ONLY), SH322.1 Rev C HA 3 Bed, PH323.2/3 Rev C Alexander, PH320.1 Rev A Attingham, PH421.1 Rev A Chartwell Plots 17 and 18, PH421.2 Chartwell Plots 22 and 28, PH423.1 Rev B Coughton, GD.G201.1.1/3 Double Store, PH322.1 Rev A Newstead, PH220.1.45 Rev A Osborne Hipped Plots 57 and 58, PH220.1.41 Rev A Osborne Plot 41, PH220.1 Rev B Osborne, G101.1.1 Single Gable Garage, GD.G203.1.1/3 Twin Shared Store, PH422.1 Rev A Waddlesden and PH221.1 Rev A Whitmill. (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 foundation level shall take place until details of external materials of construction for the development have been submitted to

and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The 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 adopted Local Plan 2018.)

- (c) No development above foundation level shall take place until details of external materials and sizes of the proposed garden sheds for bike storage for all dwellings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for each plot prior to the occupation of that dwelling.
(Reason - To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)
- (d) Notwithstanding the approved plans, details of tree pit planting and structural soils or 3D cellular confinement systems including the location, trees with trimmer guards stakes and the Landscape Management Plan shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The 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 adopted Local Plan 2018.)
- (e) Notwithstanding the approved plans, the proposed first floor window within the side east elevation of plot 1 and first floor window in the rear elevation of plot 5 shall be permanently fixed shut and obscure glazed (meeting a minimum of Pilkington Standard level 3 in obscurity) up to a height of 1.7 metres above finished floor level. The development shall be retained as such thereafter.
(Reason - To protect the amenity of neighbouring properties and ensure the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)
- (f) No first floor windows shall be erected in the rear elevation of plot 5 unless they are permanently fixed shut and obscure glazed (meeting a minimum of Pilkington Standard level 3 in obscurity) up to a height of 1.7 metres above finished floor level.
(Reason - To protect the amenity of neighbouring properties and ensure the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan 2018.)
- (g) Notwithstanding the approved plans, details for refuse / recycling storage and collection points, including a Waste Management Plan for the site and an external lighting strategy to ensure adequate illumination of roads and paths and to avoid unnecessary light pollution shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The 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 adopted Local Plan 2018.)

Informatives

- (a) **Assets Affected**
Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing the site or there are assets subject to an adopted agreement. Therefore, the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the

sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991 or in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the Diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.

(b) Signage

Appropriate signage should be used in multi-function open space areas that would normally be used for recreation but infrequently can flood during extreme events. The signage should clearly explain the use of such areas for flood control and recreation. It should be fully visible so that infrequent flood inundation does not cause alarm. Signage should not be used as a replacement for appropriate design.

(c) Green Roofs

All green roofs should be designed, constructed and maintained in line with the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753) and the Green Roof Code (GRO).

(d) 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 Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)
- Planning File References: S/2764/16/OL, S/1144/17/OL and S/2768/16/E1

Report Author: Katie Christodoulides Principal Planner
Telephone Number: 07704 018469