

11 August 2021

Report to: South Cambridgeshire District
Council

Lead Officer: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

20/04754/HFUL, Reston Huntingdon Road Girton CB3 0LH

Proposal: Removal of existing rear conservatory and replace with larger rear extension with canopy. Extension of existing rear and front gables. Loft conversion with the addition of rooflights. Replacement garage with workshop above and new detached outbuilding with tennis court and gym to rear.

Applicant: Dr Ajay Kumar

Recommendation: Approval

Key material considerations: Principle of Development
Visual Amenity and Design
Residential Amenity
Drainage
Ecology
Tree Matters
Other Matters.

Date of Member site visit: N/A

Is it a Departure Application?: No

Decision due by: 5 February 2021

Application brought to Committee because: The application was called into planning committee by Councillor Bygott and Councillor de Lacey

Executive Summary

1. This application seeks permission for removal of existing rear conservatory and replace with larger rear extension with canopy. Extension of existing rear and front gables. Loft

conversion with the addition of rooflights. Replacement garage with workshop above and new detached outbuilding with tennis court and gym to rear.

2. Girton College is located across the highway to the north, notwithstanding this the area is predominantly residential. The site is located within the Girton Development Framework and there is a Protected Village Amenity Area and a Tree Preservation Order located across the front of the site. The North West Cambridge Action Area site is located just beyond the rear boundary with the Green Belt beyond.
3. The application is brought before Planning Committee due to the call in request by Cllr Bygott and Cllr de Lacey, the concerns raised relate mainly to the proposed tennis court outbuilding and garage. Officers recommend that Members of the Planning Committee should give significant weight to the legitimate fallback position provided by the permitted development rights available on this site.
4. Officers recommend that the Planning Committee approves the application, subject to the conditions set out at the end of the report.

Site and Surroundings, and Proposed Development

5. Reston, Huntingdon Road comprises a two-storey detached dwelling. It follows the prevailing pattern of development along this section of Huntingdon Road as it comprises a large dwelling in a deep and spacious plot.
6. Girton College is located across the highway to the north, notwithstanding this the area is predominantly residential. The site is located within the Development Framework of Girton and there is a Protected Village Amenity Area and a Tree Preservation Order located across the front of the site. The North West Cambridge Action Area site is located just beyond the rear boundary with the Green Belt beyond.
7. The proposed development comprises several elements. The first element comprises the removal of the conservatory and replacement with a flat roof rear extension and canopy. The rear extension would create a dining area, with the canopy extending across the rear of the dwelling to serve the sitting room and snug. The second element is the loft conversion with gable extensions to the front and rear. This would maintain the form of the gables but increase their height to roof level to offer one additional bedroom in the loft. Thirdly, a replacement garage is proposed with increased width and workshop in the roof space. Finally, an outbuilding is proposed to accommodate an indoor tennis court in the rear garden. This would be set down into the ground by 1.5 metres to allow the sufficient height to be met.

8. Planning History

9. S/0566/01/F – Conservatory – Approved
10. S/0602/00/F – Extension and Double Garage - Approved

Planning Policies

11. National Planning Policy Framework 2021
National Design Planning Guidance (PPG)
National Design Guide 2019
12. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018

S/7 Development Frameworks
HQ/1 Design Principles
NH/4 Biodiversity
NH/11 Protected Village Amenity Areas
CC/8: Sustainable Drainage System
CC/9: Managing Flood Risk

South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs):

13. Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction - Adopted January 2020
Trees and Development Sites – Adopted Jan 2009
Biodiversity – Adopted July 2009
District Design Guide – Adopted March 2010

Consultation

14. Girton Parish Council – No comments received.
15. Councillor Bygott and Councillor de Lacey – We would like to call in Planning Application 20/04754/HFUL for determination at the Planning Committee.

The planning grounds are:

Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan

Several aspects of the proposal do not preserve or enhance the character of the local urban and rural area or respond to its context in the wider landscape. They are not compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale, mass, form, siting or proportion in relation to the surrounding area. These include the proposed tennis court building, which is excessive in scale, the addition of a third storey to the main house and the placement of a second storey above the garage in the front garden further forward than the established building line.

District Design Guide SPD

Paragraphs 7.10 and 7.11 require an ancillary building to be subservient to the main dwelling. The tennis court building would have more than three times the footprint of the main house. Cllr Bygott calculates its volume to be more than 1,800 cubic metres.

Permitted Development

If the tennis court were to be able to be constructed under permitted development, it would exploit a loophole in the drafting of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015, allowing ancillary buildings on up to 50% of the total area of the curtilage beyond the footprint of the dwelling house, without limit to the size of the land.

However the building exceeds the maximum 4m height allowed under Class E. Further it is not possible to build a regulation indoor tennis court under permitted development, because Lawn Tennis Association rules require an indoor court to have a maximum unobstructed height at net line of 9 metres.

Policy CC/9 of the Local Plan

The tennis court building would increase flood risk by removing a substantial area (about 530 square metres) of permeable land surface, increasing run-off to adjacent land. Reston is within the catchment area of Washpit Brook which flows into Beck Brook and has contributed to numerous incidents of flooding within Girton in recent years.

Policy NH/14 of the Local Plan

The front garage of Reston and its mature trees lies within a conservation area. The two storey garage building would not sustain or enhance the significance of this conservation area.

16. Ecology Officer

Initial comments

An Ecological Survey and Assessment has been submitted. The report does not provide a sufficiently robust assessment of bat roost potential in accordance with Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists – Good Practice Guidelines 3rd Edition (Collins et al, 2016). For example, a bat scoping survey needs to assess potential for bats to be present and impacted not just whether there is any obvious evidence of use in accessible areas. The potential for the external fabric of the building to support crevice-dwelling bats such as pipistrelle species has not been evidenced. As these species can use crevices wider than 1.5cm, an assessment of suitability such as whether any slipped, lifted or loose slates or flashing is present or whether there are any potential roost crevices behind flashing or soffits needs to be provided. If these type of roosts are present, the roof linings including sarking and bitumen underlay may restrict inspection of potential roost features and evidence of crevice-dwelling bats may not be found inside the loft or internal voids. Contrary to the report, cobwebs are not a deterrent to roosting bats, although very dense cobwebs throughout an entire void often indicates that there are no bats roosting regularly in the roof space.

In accordance with the Good Practice Guidelines, one emergence/re-entry surveys is required for buildings with low potential, two surveys for buildings with moderate potential and three surveys for buildings with high bat roost potential.

A more robust and detailed evidence-based assessment in accordance with best practice guidance will be required.

Further Comments following submission of bat survey

The applicant has submitted a Bat Survey which found no evidence of roosting bats. Would therefore suggest that conditions regarding the following are included within any decision notice issued:

- Compliance with Ecological Survey and Assessment (Essex Mammal Surveys, February 2021) and Bat Survey (Essex Mammals, June 2021)
- Biodiversity enhancement

17. Landscape Architecture – No comments received.

18. Trees Officer - No arboricultural or hedgerow objections to this application.

An Arboricultural Impacts Assessment has been submitted. This is sufficient for this proposal, trees and should be listed as an approved document.

Four TPOd trees appear to be proposed for removal, T1, T4, T7 and T19. No replacements appear to be proposed but the area is still well treed. Any future tree removals will require replacement planting.

19. Drainage Officer

Initial comments

It is not possible to comment on the proposed development and, given the size of the proposed development, the following additional information will be required:

Please provide sufficient detail on how surface water will be disposed of to determine if the proposal is in accordance with South Cambs adopted Policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9. If an infiltration system is proposed, this detail would be expected to include infiltration testing undertaken in line with BRE Digest 365 Revised 2016 whereby the soakage trial pit is filled and allowed to drain three times to near empty on the same or consecutive days and the lowest value used for calculating the required attenuation volume.

It is appreciated that some information may not be available at the time of submitting an application therefore a number of options may be presented with the final option to be confirmed at a later date. Ultimately at least one viable solution to deliver a sustainable drainage system in principle must be presented to and accepted by the local planning authority.

Further Comments following submission of soakaway testing information

The proposals have not indicated a surface water drainage strategy however, as this is a minor development it would be acceptable to obtain this information by way of a condition.

The development proposed is acceptable subject to the imposition of the condition(s) regarding:

- Surface water drainage
- Maintenance arrangements
- Foul drainage
- Floor levels

Representations

20. Several representations have been received raising concerns regarding:

- Detrimental impact to the character of the area due to the proposed tennis court
- Detrimental impact upon the character of the area due to the garage
- The commercial nature and utilitarian appearance of the tennis court
- Height, scale, mass and footprint of the proposed tennis court
- Overbearing and obtrusive nature of the proposed tennis court
- Light and noise pollution from the tennis court
- Loss of privacy from tennis court
- Hours of use for the tennis court
- Potential future use of the tennis court
- Overbearing impact of proposed garage
- Potential use of space in garage
- Impact to wildlife, especially protected species
- Impact upon trees
- Increased flood risk
- Restrictive covenant on the land
- Loss of open space
- Errors in tree survey
- Archaeological impacts

- Lack of biodiversity enhancement
- Precedent set

Planning Assessment

21. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to the visual amenity and design, protected village amenity area, residential amenity, trees matters, ecology, drainage, other matters.

Visual Amenity and Design

22. Policy HQ/1 states that development must preserve or enhance the character of the local urban and rural area and respond to its context in the wider landscape and be compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale, density, mass, form, siting, design, proportion, materials, texture and colour in relation to the surrounding area.

New detached outbuilding with tennis court and gym to rear

23. After amendments, the proposed outbuilding contains a tennis court with a length of 32.7 metres, a width of 17 metres and a height above ground level of 4.7 metres. It would be set down 1.5 metres into the ground to allow an internal height of 6.2 metres. The proposed tennis court building would be finished in composite cladding and a standing seam metal roof.
24. A number of concerns have been raised to the proposed tennis court, mainly in reference to its use, height, scale, mass, design and footprint. The representations suggested that due to these aspects the outbuilding would have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the main house and the locality.
25. The tennis court is intended to be used in association with the main house by the current occupier for sports leisure, specifically tennis. The representations received raised concerns about any use beyond this private function. The application does not seek permission for this building to be used beyond an ancillary function, however Officers do consider that a condition to restrict the use for private domestic purposes only would be reasonable to ensure that the building is not used for commercial purposes in the future.
26. In terms of the height, scale, mass and footprint, there is no doubt that the proposed outbuilding would be of a significant size. However, Officers must have regard to the fallback position which is afforded by the permitted development rights available for outbuildings.
27. Schedule 2, Part 1 of Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) provides the permitted development rights for development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse, these rights have not been removed or restricted on this site and therefore form a material consideration in the determination of the application. Class E defines the rights regarding buildings etc incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse. The scope of this class allows buildings with dual pitched roofs to have a height of up to 4 metres, with an eaves height of 2.5 metres. The only restriction in terms of footprint comes from section (b) which states development would not be permitted if the total area of ground covered by buildings within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse would exceed 50% of the total area of the curtilage. The proposed building would not conflict with this requirement. Given that it is possible for an incidental outbuilding to be erected under permitted development rights on this site at any point, the material consideration should be given significant weight in the determination of the application.

28. The proposed building would have an eaves height above ground level of 2.0 metres and an overall height of 4.7 metres. Officers acknowledge that the building would exceed the overall height allowance by 0.7 metres, however it is not considered that this additional height would result in a building that would be wholly disproportionate with the main house. Given the permitted development rights available, it would be difficult to argue that this building goes above and beyond what would be reasonably considered a subservient and ancillary building.
29. The eaves height would remain low and well under the allowance given by Class E and therefore the main mass and bulk of the building would be set within the Class E requirements. In addition, the main house is a large two storey dwelling, in a deep and spacious plot. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a dominating or disproportionate addition to this.
30. In addition, concerns were raised about the appearance of the building, some representations suggesting that together with the size and external materials it would appear utilitarian rather than domestic. Officers acknowledge that the outbuilding would appear different from the main house and the tennis court would appear reasonably contemporary, however this is not considered to result in detriment to the character and appearance of the main house. The proposal is a subservient building in the rear garden, the design and appearance would be considered appropriate for an outbuilding which are often finished in a material that differs from the main house. As the proposal is to the rear and not visible from public views it would not be considered to detract from the main house or street scene.
31. This section of Huntingdon Road is characterised by large detached dwellings in spacious plots. The spacious character is predominantly formed through the significant set back from the road and the large separation distances between the dwellings. Whilst, most properties along this section of the road also have large rear gardens these are visible from private views only and therefore do not form such an important part of the character of the area. The proposed tennis court would be wholly contained in the rear garden and therefore not visible from the street scene, and therefore would be considered to preserve this character.
32. A representation raised a concern that the tennis court would not meet the recommended height for indoor tennis courts given by the LTA, the National Governing Body for tennis in Great Britain. The LTA guidance gives that the height of an indoor tennis court should be 5.75m at the base line and 9.00m at the net line. The height at the baseline is sufficient, however the height at the net line would be below what is recommended. These recommendations are given to allow a full game of professional tennis to take place, these are recommendations only. The dimensions for the proposed court are considered suitable for a game of tennis to take place within an at home court.
33. One representation was received regarding loss of open space from the proposed tennis court building. The land as existing forms the private garden of Reston, Huntingdon Road and therefore does not contribute to public open space. Given the size of the rear garden there would be sufficient space to ensure good quality outdoor amenity could be achieved for the occupiers of the dwelling.
34. Overall, given the permitted development rights afforded to the main house regarding incidental outbuildings and the rear siting, the proposal would be considered to be preserve the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan 2018.

Replacement garage with workshop above

35. The existing garage would be situated to the front of the proposed dwelling and would appear very modest, comprising a low eaves height and a hipped roof. The current garage is partially visible within the street scene, with mature and protected trees screening the majority of public views.
36. The replacement garage would be sited in the same area as the existing garage and would extend the footprint further, closer to the main house. It would host two parking spaces at ground floor level and a workshop in the roof space above. It would result in a replacement built form with additional height and mass however it would remain subservient to the house due to its overall height and scale. Whilst some concerns have been raised about breaching the building line of the main houses, front garages are not uncommon features along Huntingdon Road, with similar ancillary buildings in front of the building line seen at New Hayes and Girton Corner. Therefore, it is not considered that the garage building would appear out of place in this context.
37. In addition, as with the original garage, the proposal would be substantially screened by the protected trees to the front of the dwelling. It is considered that the proposed garage would not result in a dominant addition in the street scene and therefore would be considered to preserve the character and appearance of the area and main house.
38. A concern has been raised about the use of the garage, given that it would have habitable space above the parking area in the roof space. This has been labelled as a workshop to be used ancillary to the main house by the occupiers. This is considered acceptable, however to ensure the ancillary nature is retained in the future a condition will be attached.
39. The proposal would be considered to be in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan 2018.

Loft conversion and gable extensions

40. The proposal also seeks to convert the loft space and extend the existing gable elements at the front and rear of the property to create additional space at this level. The proposed extensions would increase the height of the gable elements so that they would extend to roof level and the eaves of these elements would sit above the eaves of the main roof. Concerns have been raised that the proposed extensions would give the impression of a three storey dwelling which is not common along Huntingdon Road, however as the roof form and eaves of the main house would be maintained the main house would continue to read as two storey with accommodation in the roof space. The height of the gable elements would remain below the ridge of the main house and therefore would be subservient. As the design and form of the gables would be maintained they would not be considered to result in adverse impacts to the character and appearance of the main house and street scene.

Rear extension and canopy

41. The proposal also seeks to replace the existing rear elements with a single storey rear extension and canopy structure. The rear extension would not be visible from the street scene and therefore would not be considered to result in adverse impacts to the character and appearance of Huntingdon Road. In addition, it would be modest in height and therefore subservient and cohesive to the main dwelling.

42. The proposal would be considered in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan 2018.

Protected Village Amenity Area

43. The front of the site is served by a Protected Village Amenity Area. Policy NH/11 states that Protected Village Amenity Areas are identified on the Policies Map where development will not be permitted within or adjacent to these areas if it would have an adverse impact on the character, amenity, tranquillity or function of the village.
44. The proposed replacement garage would be situated within the Protected Village Amenity Area. In this instance, the area comprises the land between the dwellings and the road which is generally characterised with mature trees. The proposed garage would replace an existing element, adding some mass and height. Whilst, the proposed garage would offer an increased scale, it is not considered that it would result in adverse impacts upon the character, amenity, tranquillity or function of this area as it would respect the main aspect of this character.
45. Therefore, the proposal would be considered in accordance with Policy NH/11 of the Local Plan 2018.

Residential Amenity

46. The proposal site has two adjoining neighbours, Huntingfield Huntingdon Road and Farmfield Huntingdon Road.

New detached outbuilding with tennis court

47. The proposed tennis court would be located in the rear garden of Reston, Huntingdon Road. It would comprise a significant footprint and a ridge height of 4.7 metres. As the building would comprise a pitched roof the roof would slope down towards the east and west boundary to have an eaves height of 2 metres.
48. Whilst the proposal would create a significant built form in the rear garden of the host dwelling, it would be set back from the rear building line by approximately 60 metres. In addition, it would sit towards the centre of the plot with a separation distance of 12.6 metres between the west elevation and the common boundary, and 7.5 metres between the east elevation and the common boundary. Taking into account the above and given that the neighbouring dwellings have large rear gardens, it is considered that whilst the proposal would be visible it would not result in an overbearing and dominating addition upon the neighbouring properties. Adjoining occupiers have raised concerns about the potential lack of privacy created by the tennis court. As it is single storey and set back from the dwellings it is not considered that any overlooking would take place.
49. Adjoining occupiers have raised some concerns regarding the potential noise and light pollution created by the outbuilding and the timings of use. As this would be an ancillary building, and taking into account that the glazing has been reduced, the noise and light spill is not considered to be over and above that which would be usual for a domestic property and ancillary buildings. It would be unreasonable to restrict timings on an ancillary building used by the occupiers of the dwelling as the use by its incidental nature would be considered compatible with domestic residencies. The proposal would not be considered to result in adverse impacts in terms of light, noise or timing.
50. The occupier at Huntingfield has requested that a hedge be erected on the boundary to screen the outbuilding. The existing boundary contains trees and shrubs, although there

are some views into the rear amenity space from Huntingfield where this is slightly sparser. Given that the proposal would be set away from the boundary and the roofline would pitch away, it would not be necessary in Officers' opinion to require this level of screening along the common boundary.

Replacement garage with workshop above

51. The proposed garage would be located towards the east of the site and set away from the boundary with Huntingfield. The proposal would be closest to Farmfield. The garage would sit adjacent to the common boundary and be set slightly closer to the dwelling. The property contains a garage on this side of the building, although there are some habitable windows on the west side of the building. Given this and taking into account the mature trees on the east boundary, the garage would not be considered to result in an adverse impact to these in terms of loss of light and overbearing.

Loft conversion and gable extensions

52. The gable extensions would be located in towards the centre of the front and rear elevations, away from the neighbouring dwellings and therefore would not be considered to result in loss of light or an overbearing impact. The proposal would introduce additional windows and rooflight at roof level which should serve habitable rooms. Given the position of these windows any views to neighbouring occupiers would be significantly oblique and would not result in significant overlooking over and above that offered by the existing openings.

Rear extension and canopy

53. The proposed rear extension and canopy would be considered modest in height, and would be set off the common boundaries. Therefore it would not result in significant adverse impacts to neighbouring occupiers.

Tree Matters

54. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment was submitted with the application to detail the tree removals and pruning that would need to be undertaken to facilitate development on this site. This has been reviewed by the Tree Officer and no objections were raised. The Tree Officer states that the proposal would involve the removal of four TPO trees, however the area would remain well treed and therefore the proposed removal would be considered acceptable. Officers agree with this assessment, the proposed tree removal would not be considered to result in adverse impact to trees in terms of biodiversity or visual amenity.
55. A concern was raised regarding the impact of the proposed tennis court building to the trees and hedge in the rear garden. The tennis court building would involve the removal and pruning of some trees in the rear garden, these are not protected by the TPO on the front of the site and the Tree Officer has not raised concerns about this. It is considered that given the mature trees that would remain in situ, the loss of the trees would not result in adverse impacts to biodiversity or amenity on the site. The hedge is designated to remain, it forms part of the green and soft character to the rear. An informative will be attached to advise that this should be replaced if it is damaged during construction.
56. Therefore, the proposal would be in compliance with Policy NH/4 and HQ/1 of the Local Plan 2018.

Ecology

57. An Ecological Survey and Assessment and Bat Survey have been submitted through the application process. Following this, the Ecology Officer is satisfied that the proposal would not result in harm to biodiversity on the site subject to conditions regarding compliance with the submitted documents and enhancements on the site. These are considered reasonable and necessary and will be added to any permission granted. There were some concerns raised regarding the impact the tennis court building may have on biodiversity in reference to noise and light pollution. The outbuilding has been altered so that the rooflights have been removed and the glazing reduced to direct any light to the front of the building and away from the rear boundary to help reduce this impact. The noise levels emitted from the building are not likely to be significant over and above what would be expected for a domestic building.
58. The proposal would be considered to conserve ecology levels on the site and therefore would be in accordance with Policy NH/4 and HQ/1 of the Local Plan 2018.

Drainage

59. The proposal site is located outside a flood risk zone, the surface water risk is designated as very low for the majority of the site, however there is one area of low risk to the rear of the site where the tennis court would be located and one in the adjacent site close to where the proposed garage would be located.
60. Whilst the proposal would fall under a minor extension in drainage terms, given the size of the tennis court the Drainage Officer requested information regarding surface water disposal. Additional information was submitted regarding soakaway testing and this was considered satisfactory to address the initial concerns subject to further information to be submitted via condition. The conditions regarding surface and foul water drainage and maintenance are considered reasonable given the size of the outbuilding and therefore will be attached to any permission granted. The Drainage Officer also requested a condition regarding finished floor levels, however the tennis court building is due to be set down into the ground by 1.5 metres. Clarity was sought through further informal consultation with the Drainage Officer and it was confirmed that the lower floor level would be acceptable given that the use of the tennis court would not be sensitive if flooding did occur. The Drainage Officer advised that the building may be subject to flooding, however confirmed that the lower floor levels would not increase surface water risk to surrounding properties. Therefore, the condition will be attached to the other aspects of the development, however the tennis court will be allowed to be set down into the ground as proposed.
61. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy CC/8 and CC/9 of the Local Plan 2018.

Other Matters

62. In some of the representations submitted a concern was raised about a covenant covering the houses along this section of Huntingdon Road that may restrict some parts of the development. Covenants are given as restrictions on the title of a property, they are not a planning matter and therefore need to be resolved outside of the planning process. It is the responsibility of the applicant to check these restrictions.
63. A concern was also raised about potential archaeology impact, however this site is not considered to be of archaeological interest and therefore Officers do not consider that it is necessary to require any information regarding archaeological works.

64. A concern has been raised about the proposed outbuilding setting a precedent for other structures along Huntingdon Road. It has been recognised that the consistency of the decision maker is important, however the idea of precedent is not a material planning concern as each application would need to be considered according to its own merits.

Recommendation

65. That planning permission be granted subject to appropriate planning conditions/informative:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. The outbuilding and garage hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling house.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

4. All ecological measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Ecological Survey and Assessment (Essex Mammal Surveys, February 2021) and Bat Survey (Essex Mammals, June 2021) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.

Reason: To conserve and enhance ecological interests in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

5. Prior to the commencement of development above slab level a scheme of biodiversity enhancement shall be supplied to the local planning authority for its written approval. The scheme must include details as to how a positive net gain in biodiversity has been accomplished. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented within an agreed timescale unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: To conserve and enhance ecological interests in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

6. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and in accordance with policies CC/8 and CC/9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.

The scheme shall include:

- a) Details of the existing surface water drainage arrangements including runoff rates for the QBAR, 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 30) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) storm events;
- b) Full results of the proposed drainage system modelling in the above-referenced storm vents (as well as 1% AEP plus climate change) , inclusive of all collection, conveyance, storage, flow control and disposal elements and including an allowance for urban creep, together with a schematic of how the system has been represented within the hydraulic model;
- c) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers, details of all SuDS features;
- d) A plan of the drained site area and which part of the proposed drainage system these will drain to;
- e) Full details of the proposed attenuation and flow control measures;
- F) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
- G) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water

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

Reason - To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development, in accordance with policies CC/8 and CC/9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

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

Reason - To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publicly adopted, in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 167 and 169 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies CC/8 and CC/9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

8. No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until foul water drainage works have been detailed and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development, in accordance with policies CC/8 and CC/9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

9. Other than the tennis court building, finished ground floor levels shall be set no lower than 150 mm above existing ground level.

Reason - To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants, in accordance with policies CC/8 and CC/9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.

