

Appendix 2 Planning application validation requirements for South Cambridgeshire District Council -representations and responses

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
	General	<p>List fails to distinguish between requirements for different types of applications eg outline and full etc A summary schedule could be provided as the list is very long.</p> <p>Validation requirements should be proportionate - requirements of this list appear to be excessive and many matters could be covered by condition.</p> <p>Emphasis on pre-application advice is unrealistic given quality of service currently provided.</p>	<p>A summary checklist per category of application will be provided with the website information eg major; minor etc.</p> <p>The requirements are all cross-referenced to Local Plan policy and guidance. The aim is to ensure that applications are submitted in as complete a form as possible so as to reduce the need for planning conditions to be imposed.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>Some improvements have been made to the pre-application service and further improvements will be progressed as part of the planning service review</p>
A	Application Form	Questioned whether requirements for red line plan and adjacent land to be outlined in blue are clearly defined	<p>These comments are made in respect of national validation requirements.</p> <p>Noted and no changes proposed. Technical support officers will take a reasonable and proportionate approach to the amount of information required.</p>
B	Fee		
C	Location and site plans		
D	Other relevant plans	<p>The requirement for both proposed and existing Block Plans seems unnecessary provided the new work is clearly defined – i.e. drawn in red. Two plans should only be required in complex cases.</p> <p>Site Sections should only be required where the site is sloping and the proposal warrants it – most sites in the district are level.</p>	<p>These comments are made in respect of national validation requirements for householder applications which are not subject to this consultation.</p> <p>The respondent has been advised accordingly, but also advised that technical support officers will always take a reasonable and proportionate approach to the amount of information that is required.</p>

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
		<p>Roof Plans should only be required in unusual and complex cases. Generally the elevation drawings should be sufficient.</p> <p>Reasonable flexibility should be shown in the validation process with the general principle being to reduce bureaucracy, expedite applications and reduce delays.</p> <p>More before and after images for medium and large developments and those affecting conservation areas should be provided.</p> <p>More definition should be provided about the individual types of applications and context where further plans will be required.</p>	<p>These requirements can either be provided as part of the design and access statements, landscape and visual impact assessments. However, each application has to be assessed on its own individual merits rather than this being a general validation requirement.</p> <p>It would be difficult to define every circumstance and every plan that will be required. A summary by category of application will be provided on the website.</p>
E	Plans for advertisement consent applications	No need to repeat general requirements for planning applications as well as additional advertisement application requirements.	Information requirements are set out in full for clarity. No changes proposed.
F	Plans for Listed Building Consent applications	Plans at a scale of 1:20 of details are onerous and should be subject to conditions rather than being required for validation purposes.	The aim is to make applications as complete as possible upon submission and to avoid the need to impose planning conditions where possible. No changes proposed.
G	Design and Access Statement	<p>Amend wording to refer to sites of 0.5 ha or more</p> <p>Under requirements -reference consultation undertaken more generally</p> <p>Under requirements for listed buildings note that Heritage Statements can include some of this information</p>	<p>Wording amended</p> <p>Wording amended.</p> <p>Wording amended.</p>
H	Environmental Impact Assessment		
I	Environmental Impact Assessment screening options	Not a validation list requirement and should be removed. Subject to separate EIA Regulations and associated procedures.	This list also sets out the validation requirements for EIA Screening requests and it is therefore proposed to retain this.
J	Environmental Impact Assessment scoping opinions	Not a validation list requirement and should be removed. Subject to separate EIA Regulations and associated procedures.	This list also sets out the validation requirements for EIA Scoping Opinions and it is therefore proposed to retain this.
S1	Agricultural, Forestry and other Occupational Dwellings Appraisal / Justification	The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate.	Noted.

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
		Requirement for this to be submitted for extensions to dwellings restricted for use by persons involved in Agriculture, Forestry or other rural enterprises is onerous and unjustified.	Applicants can provide detailed justification as part of applications. No proposed changes.
1	Air Quality Assessment	The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate.	Noted.
2	Biodiversity – Ecological Impact Assessment	The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate. Should not be abbreviated to EIA as confusing	Noted. Agreed -abbreviation removed
S2	Broadband (supplementary information)	We consider this to be a Building Regulations matter only. In any case, there is never any guarantee that appropriate broadband is available in a particular location and this should form a criterion for this theme. Required for new residential, employment and commercial development -requirement is too onerous/unjustified.	Planning conditions are being routinely applied in accordance with policy TI/10 and have been upheld on appeal. The (simple) standard condition now being proposed is “Prior to the first occupation of the/any dwelling, infrastructure to enable the delivery of broadband services, to industry standards, shall be provided for that dwelling” While suitable broadband may not yet be available in every location, the necessary ducting to enable future delivery is still required. A simple statement submitted at validation stage to demonstrate that the proposal has been designed to accommodate this infrastructure will provide an assurance that the condition can be complied with.
3	Community Facilities / Community Development Strategy	This criterion needs to specify what exactly constitutes “cumulative total of groups of smaller sites” as this is ambiguous and could be misinterpreted or misapplied by the Council	Agree the criterion could be better expressed. It is intended to mean where the new development is ultimately expected to exceed 199 dwellings, yet may not come forward as a development of this scale at the outset. Suggest requirement is “For new developments of 200 homes or more (including where the cumulative total of groups of smaller sites that are likely to come forward as part of that development are of 200 homes or more).
4	Construction Environmental Management Plan	The stated criterion contradicts itself in that it states that a CEMP would be applied in the stated instances, yet it also	Agree that the requirement for a CEMP should be specific.

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
		<p>states that “where a Construction Management Plan is not submitted with the application, it is likely that details will be required by planning condition”. This implies that a CEMP is not always necessary to validate /determine an application. We are of the view that a CEMP can easily be applied as a condition, unless there are site-specific circumstances which merit submission of a document at the validation stage</p> <p>Requirement is too onerous and would apply to too many types of applications and could be conditioned.</p>	<p>While a CEMP can easily be applied as a condition, policy CC/6 requires such a document at planning application stage. It also helps reduce the burden of a condition and possible delay which the validation process aims to prevent.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the first part of the proposed validation requirement is retained and the second deleted.</p> <p>The technical support officers will take a reasonable and proportionate approach to the requirement having regard to the potential for the specific details and mitigation measures to be required by a planning condition.</p>
5	Contaminated Land Assessment	<p>The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate.</p> <p>Requirement for a Conceptual Site Model is onerous for Phase 1 investigation as is the requirement that a Phase 2 investigation should be submitted if Phase 1 recommends it.</p>	<p>While the representations received are noted, officers consider that the totality of what is required is excessive and potentially unduly onerous for applicants.</p> <p>A Preliminary risk assessment (Phase I Investigation) to determine historical land-uses, current land-uses and environmental settings is essentially a desk-based exercise. This represents a minimum level of information and assists in identifying potentially contaminated sites.</p> <p>Requiring the additional information at validation stage is potentially expensive for applicants, especially of there is no certainty that planning permission will be granted. There will also be instances where the applicant does not own the land and therefore an investigation of ground conditions may not be possible.</p> <p>The Contaminated land Officer has suggested that front loading the validation stage in this way will not necessarily result in fewer conditions and may actually complicate the whole process. If the Phase 1 investigation is carried out correctly, this will generally provide the information required to assess whether further intrusive work is necessary, or not, which can then be conditioned.</p>

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
			It is therefore recommended that the first bullet point requirement is retained, but that the two following bullet point requirements are deleted as necessary at validation stage.
6	Daylight / Sunlight Assessment, Shadow Study	The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate. Wording should be changed to reference “unacceptably overshadow” instead of “overshadow”	Noted. Wording amended.
7	Design – Masterplans / Design codes	This criterion needs to specify what is meant by a “Large Major” application	Chapter 12 of the adopted District Design Guide simply refers to masterplans being needed for “large-scale sites” where phased development is likely. For dwellings, a largescale major development has been traditionally defined as one where the number of residential units to be constructed is 200 or more. Where the number of residential units to be constructed is not given in the application a site area of 4 hectares or more should be used. For all other uses a largescale major development is one where the floor space to be built is 10,000 square metres or more, or where the site area is 2 hectares or more. It is recommended that these thresholds are adopted and set out for clarification and the first “When required” paragraph is deleted as this will inevitably be covered by the definition.
8	Energy Statement	The threshold of a “major development” (i.e. 10 dwellings or more) is too low for this requirement. It may be appropriate to apply this to a Full planning application, but at Outline stage, there is little concept of how the relevant criteria can be met. We would consider that for outline applications and those below, say 50 dwellings, an Energy Statement is better applied as a planning condition. Requirement is too onerous.	Policy CC/3 requires that proposals for new dwellings (i.e. not just major development) and new non-residential buildings of 1,000 square metres or more will be required to reduce carbon emissions. The recently adopted SPD details submission requirements but does not state what level of development triggers the need for an Energy Statement at validation stage. Two new standard conditions are proposed in consultation with the

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
			<p>Sustainability Officer – one where details have been submitted and the other where they have not.</p> <p>Nonetheless the stated threshold is considered to be both proportionate and reasonable having regard to the climate change agenda.</p> <p>Officers recommend no change to the proposed validation requirements.</p>
9	Flood Risk Assessment	The thresholds should ensure that they are consistent with the threshold for a Flood Risk Assessment, as set out in the NPPF and NPPG	<p>The thresholds are consistent with standing advice.</p> <p>Typo needs to be corrected. The requirement should read “A site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required <u>if</u> the site is:...”</p>
10	Foul Sewage and Utilities /Infrastructure Statement	<p>It is considered that the stated requirements (Statements for foul sewage, utilities and infrastructure) are three different requirements and accordingly, should be listed separately.</p> <p>It is not considered that the stated threshold for the statements are reasonable or proportionate. It is not reasonable to assume that such statements are required for all development. We consider a more suitable threshold would be for major development, or where there is an acknowledged existing problem with the stated infrastructure requirements. For minor development, it would be reasonable to assume that any pre-existing issue could be dealt with by planning condition – requiring the submission of such detail prior to commencement of development. This could reasonably be secured by off-site “Grampian” conditions. This is the approach currently taken by many Councils (including SCDC) and is an effective way of granting planning applications promptly and adding delivery. This accords with paragraph 68 of the NPPF. (Paragraph 68 emphasises the importance of delivery of small and medium sized sites which can make an important contribution to</p>	<p>There is no reason why the stated requirements should not be separately listed as Foul Sewage and Utilities Assessment.</p> <p><u>Foul Sewage</u></p> <p>Adopted Local Plan CC/7 states that permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there is, or will be, sufficient infrastructure capacity to support and meet all the requirements arising from the new development.</p> <p>It may be onerous to expect details to be provided on drawings for all smaller (i.e. householder developments), some of which will not require any new connection to a drainage system. The planning application form also requires details of surface and foul water connections to be provided.</p> <p>Minor development may include up to 9 dwellings or floor space up to 1,000 square metres. It is not unreasonable or</p>

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
		meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly).	<p>disproportionate to expect some level of detail and or a statement (however brief) to be provided at application stage.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the “What is required” section is amended to read “If an application proposes to connect a development to the existing drainage system, then details of the existing system should be provided as part of a Foul Drainage Statement and shown on the application drawing(s) where appropriate to do so”.</p> <p>The “What is required” details include “Where the development involves the disposal of trade waste or the disposal of foul sewage effluent other than to the public sewer, then a Foul Drainage Assessment will be required.” This sentence should be added to the “When required” section.</p> <p><u>Utilities Assessment</u></p> <p>As with the above drainage requirements, it may be onerous to expect details to be provided for smaller (i.e. householder) developments with evidence to show there has been prior consultation with the relevant service provider.</p> <p>Minor development may include up to 9 dwellings or floor space up to 1,000 square metres. It is not unreasonable or disproportionate to expect some level of detail and or a statement (however brief) to be provided at application stage.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the “What is required” section is amended to read “Where an application proposes to connect to existing utility infrastructure systems, details should be provided as part of a Utilities Assessment Statement and details shown on the application drawing(s) where appropriate to do so”.</p>

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
11	Health Impact Assessment	It is considered that the minimum threshold (New development of 20 or more dwellings or 1,000m ² or more floorspace) is far too low for this Assessment. It is not clear what value this requirement brings to an application and we suggest the threshold is raised to a minimum of 50 dwellings and corresponding floor space.	The requirement for new development of 20 or more dwellings or 1,000m ² or more floorspace to be accompanied by a HIA is clearly set out in policy SC/2. No change proposed.
12	Heritage Statement (including historical, archaeological features and Scheduled Ancient Monuments)	The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate. More definition required in relation to what is a Heritage Asset and in relation to archaeological requirements/Designated/non Designated Heritage Assets.	Noted. More definition provided.
13	Housing Statement	This criterion should ensure that it is in line with that stated in the NPPF and NPPG. Housing mix details cannot be provided for outline applications.	While policy 45 refers to developments of 11 dwellings or more, extant legal advice given to the Council has confirmed that the threshold for the provision of affordable housing should be 10 dwellings or more in line with NPPF paragraph 63. No change proposed. Noted that detailed housing mix information cannot be provided for outline applications but an indicative housing mix can be.
14	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate.	Noted.
15	Landscape Details	The minimum threshold of a “major” development is far too low. The requirement for landscape details should not be arbitrary as is proposed – It should be site specific and based on the merits of the site Landscape management and maintenance plans can be conditioned.	All new “major” development, or “Development in or adjacent to the Green Belt” has the capacity to have an impact on the local and/or wider landscape or townscape as a result of its proposed location or height. As a minimum, the requirement for details of a landscape strategy or indicative planting scheme along with management and maintenance plans relative to the development proposed is not considered to be unreasonable or disproportionate.

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
			<p>To require details for all other development is much more subjective to assess at validation stage. Not all development will have an impact on the local and/or wider landscape or townscape as a result of its proposed location or height.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the height and location of a new development can have an impact on the local and/or wider landscape or townscape</p> <p>It is recommended that the wording for “When required?” is amended to read “Major development and other development where landscape proposals will be necessary because the new development is likely to have an impact on the local and/or wider landscape”.</p> <p>Development likely to have an impact as a result of its proposed location or height”.</p> <p>Development in or adjacent to the Green Belt.”</p> <p>Agree landscape management and maintenance plans can be conditioned but this list aims to ensure that applications are as complete as possible to avoid the need to impose conditions where possible.</p>
16	Lighting (artificial) Assessment	The second paragraph under the “when required?” heading is superfluous as the requirement for a Lighting Assessment should be based on the criteria outlined in the first paragraph and on the merits of the site	<p>While the second paragraph is some to some extent superfluous a reordering of the requirement would make more sense.</p> <p>Suggest</p> <p>“Major sites at the edge of Cambridge and adjoining open countryside in South Cambridgeshire</p>

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
			<p>Where other proposals for new external artificial lighting or changes to existing lighting may have an adverse impact on local residential amenity, wildlife or landscape character through light pollution, illuminated adverts, and outdoor sports facilities (including multi-use games areas) where external lighting is proposed”.</p> <p>The “What is required” information should be altered to read:</p> <p>“Details of external lighting including building, security, floodlighting, street/courtyard columns and bollards where appropriate shall be provided”.</p>
17	Marketing Assessment / Local Needs Assessment/ Viability Appraisal / Business Plan / Structural Survey	This criterion needs to specify exactly what is required and in what instances. The current wording is ambiguous and could be misinterpreted/misapplied by the Council	<p>If clarification is required, suggest the “When required?” section is changed to read:</p> <p>“Several policies require these types of studies to accompany planning applications to provide additional evidence. In particular:</p> <p>Marketing Assessment - Required for applications proposing the reuse of buildings in the countryside for residential use; new rural dwellings in the countryside; loss of employment land to non-employment uses; and loss of village services and facilities</p> <p>Local Needs Assessment - Required for applications proposing the loss of village services and facilities</p>

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
			Structural survey – Required for applications proposing the reuse of buildings in c/side for residential use Business plan/Viability appraisal - Required for applications proposing new rural dwellings in the countryside; expansion of existing businesses in the countryside; and farm diversification proposals”
18	Noise / Vibration Assessment	The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate.	Noted.
19	Open Space Assessment (new provision and protection of existing)	This criterion needs to be more specific about the policy requirements for open space and in what instances provision of public open space is required	Policies SC/7 and SC/8 set out in detail what is required and when. No changes proposed.
20	Parking Provision (Car and cycle)	The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate. Parking provision will not necessarily be required for all development.	Noted. Noted and no changes proposed as text explains that proposals that do not include parking provision/reduced parking provision can be supported by justification.
21	Planning obligations – draft heads of terms ¹	The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate.	Noted. Requirement will be applied flexibly rather than a separate best practice list being produced.
22	Planning Statement	The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate. Requirements are not clear enough with respect to application to different categories of development.	Noted. Not agreed. No changes proposed.
23	Retail Statement	The Council should ensure that this is consistent with the criteria set out in the NPPF and NPPG	The requirement is consistent with policy E22. Policy E/23 specifically covers retailing in the countryside and is not subject to the same requirements.

¹ This is not a requirement for validation but is considered to be best practice and will help to speed up the planning decision process

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
			Suggest reference to policy E/23 can be deleted. Otherwise No change
24	Statement of Community Engagement	A minimum threshold of 10 dwellings is far too low for such a requirement. This is disproportionate and unreasonable, particularly when the Council should be focussing on delivering housing. We suggest a minimum threshold of 50 houses, or where local circumstances warrant it	<p>Other than development for more than 2 turbines or where the hub height of any turbine exceeds 15 metres, neither the NPPF or NPPG are specific about the thresholds for pre-application engagement.</p> <p>The adopted GCSP SCI 2019 encourages community engagement “particularly where development is likely to have significant impacts on local communities or where the site is particularly sensitive”.</p> <p>The suggestion that a minimum threshold of 50 houses, or where local circumstances warrant it be adopted is considered somewhat arbitrary as a validation requirement.</p> <p>Suggest that the stated criterion is retained, especially as it does not specifically require engagement to have been undertaken, but rather a statement of what has been undertaken.</p> <p>Don't agree that should only be a best practice requirement -needs to be retained.</p>
25	Surface Water Drainage Strategy	It is not reasonable or proportionate that a Surface Water Drainage Strategy is required for all scales of development. It is not considered that 'minor' development' would usually result in a significant adverse impact on surface water drainage. Likewise, the layout of many outline applications is not fixed which may mean that such a strategy is difficult to produce and, in any case, would be meaningless until the layout of the development had been fixed. We suggest that the threshold is amended to require such a strategy only for 'major' development, development of 1 hectare or more ² , where there is an acknowledged pre-existing drainage issue or where the orientation or topography of the site warrants such a strategy. For all other minor development, we consider that such a strategy could be suitably dealt with through a planning	<p>SCDC policies do not stipulate that any particular level of information is required to support a planning application.</p> <p>The “strategy” for householder applications is for the means of and changes to surface water drainage to be shown on the plans and for further details to be provided as necessary for other types of application. This is considered to be both proportionate and reasonable.</p> <p>No changes are therefore required.</p>

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
		<p>condition – which is the approach that most Councils (including SCDC) currently apply.</p> <p>Infiltration testing requirements conflict with other guidance that suggest that this can be conditioned.</p> <p>Drainage proforma should be provided as a separate document on the website.</p>	<p>If a development is being proposed for infiltration testing then details should be provided at application stage to avoid the need for planning conditions.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>
26	Sustainability Statement and Sustainability Checklist	<p>The stated threshold is far too low and be at least 50 houses. The Council should focus on delivering houses and should not concern itself with such detail at the validation stage for smaller developments or where the application is in outline. It would be appropriate to apply such matters as a planning condition.</p> <p>If the information isn't integrated into the Design and Access Statement but still provided , it should be accepted.</p> <p>The Sustainability Checklist should be saved separately to the SPD on the website.</p>	<p>Policy CC/1 states quite clearly that “Applicants must submit a Sustainability Statement ... The level of information provided in the Sustainability Statement should be proportionate to the scale and nature of the proposed development.”</p> <p>Thus, with smaller proposals only a brief Statement may be necessary to confirm the extent of any impact on climate change.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p>
S3	Telecommunications development (supplementary information)	The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate.	Noted.
27	Transport Assessment or Statement	<p>This policy needs to state the difference between a Transport Statement and Assessment and specify in what instances one is required. This should correspond with any thresholds that the County Council apply in such instances It is not reasonable to state that the applicant should agree the exact scale of development with the County Council. The only way that this could be done is by a paid-for pre-application enquiry to the County Council. Whilst this may be appropriate for larger-scale developments, the district Council should not defer to a third party on this matter – It is passing the buck</p> <p>Requirements are not defined clearly enough.</p>	<p>Policy TI/2 states that a Transport Assessment (TA) will be required for the specific criteria as listed and also defines what is meant by “significant transport implications”. All other developments will be required to submit a Transport Statement. This distinction can usefully be made.</p> <p>There can be no justification for a TA only being submitted by way of a condition.</p> <p>However, not all developments will give rise to increased travel demands and thus the need for a Transport Statement serves no purpose.</p> <p>Suggest:</p> <p>A Transport Assessment is required for;</p>

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential Developments at or above 20 dwellings or 0.5 hectares • Other developments at or above 1000m² or 1 hectare • Where developments have significant transport implications <p>A Transport Statement will be required for all other developments <u>where an increase in travel demands is likely</u>.</p>
28	Traffic Management Plan	It is not reasonable to provide this for all non-householder applications. This is highly disproportionate. Such a Plan should be provided at validation for larger-scale development or where it is warranted. It could easily be applied as a condition or informative to a planning permission. The Council needs to focus on delivering dwellings and the best way of doing that, in this instance is to provide a far more pragmatic and less burdensome approach to its validation requirements.	<p>While a condition can and usually is applied to many developments, research has shown that the number of applications to discharge conditions for traffic management plans are considerable and often initially refused causing unnecessary delay for developers (as well as increased workloads for officers). It is more efficient for all concerned if this information is provided with the application.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
29	Travel Plan	<p>The three criteria appear to contradict themselves in that they specify two specific thresholds and then state that a Plan would be required where the development would have significant transport implications. Are these “or” or “and” criteria? We would suggest that only the third criterion is relevant as a Travel Plan should only be required where there are significant transport impacts. The first two criteria are entirely arbitrary and should not be necessary if indeed, the proposed development will have such significant impacts.</p> <p>Requirement for travel plan is vague and should be more clearly defined. Some uses could have quantified thresholds.</p> <p>Low Emission Strategy Statement -requirement is unclear/unjustified.</p>	<p>Policy TI/2 states that a Travel Plan (TP) will be required for the specific criteria as listed and also defines what is meant by “significant transport implications”.</p> <p>The key issue is whether there is sufficient justification for a TP to be required upfront and not imposed simply as a condition.</p> <p>Given that a TP is a means by which to explore the transport impacts of a proposal and how they will be addressed, and because the criteria are clearly defined, the proposed requirement appears to be proportionate and reasonable.</p> <p>No changes proposed in relation to requirements.</p>

	Validation requirement	Representations Received	Officer response
			Don't agree that requirement for Low Emission Strategy Statement is unclear. Linked to Transport Assessment. Further advice can be obtained at pre-application stage.
30	Tree survey / arboricultural implications	The stated thresholds are consistent with the NPPF and NPPG and appear to be reasonable and proportionate.	Noted.
31	Waste Design Guide Toolkit	The stated minimum criterion is disproportionate and could easily be secured by planning condition. Such a requirement would not be relevant for outline planning applications. The Council needs to focus on delivering housing and such matters can easily be dealt with through a planning condition – They are not needed to validate a planning application	No alternative minimum provision has been suggested. So long as the details required are proportionate to the level of development proposed, the requirement is considered reasonable. No change proposed.

Consultation Responses referenced in this Schedule

E-Mail dated 05/02/20 from Hugo Prime and Co

E-Mail dated 11/02/2021 from Cheffins

Letter dated 17/02/20 from Turleys

Letter dated 17/02/20 from Savills

Letter dated 17/02/20 from Cambridge Past Present and Future