



<b>Planning Committee Date</b>	29 June 2022
<b>Report to</b>	South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee
<b>Lead Officer</b>	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
<b>Reference</b>	21/02476/REM
<b>Site</b>	9A And Lion Works Station Road (west) Whittlesford Cambridge
<b>Ward / Parish</b>	Whittlesford
<b>Proposal</b>	Approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/0746/15/OL to provide 67 residential units following demolition of 39a Station Road West and the formation of a new access road. (Re- submission of 20/03755/REM)
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr Best
<b>Presenting Officer</b>	Michael Sexton
<b>Reason Reported to Committee</b>	Referred by officers and Whittlesford Parish Council
<b>Member Site Visit Date</b>	n/a
<b>Key Issues</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Principle of Development</li><li>2. Compliance with the Outline Consent</li><li>3. Housing Provision</li><li>4. Reserved Matters (access, layout, scale, appearance, landscape)</li><li>5. Residential Amenity</li><li>6. Biodiversity</li><li>7. Flood Risk and Drainage</li><li>8. Highway Safety and Parking</li><li>9. Heritage Impact</li><li>10. Renewables / Climate Change</li><li>11. Noise</li><li>12. Lighting</li><li>13. Contamination</li><li>14. Other Matters</li></ol>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>

## **1.0 Executive Summary**

- 1.1 The application seeks the approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/0746/15/OL to provide 67 residential units following demolition of 39a Station Road West and the formation of a new access road.
- 1.2 Officers consider the matter of access to be acceptable and that the development would not result in harm to highway safety.
- 1.3 Officers do not consider that the matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping would be acceptable and would fail to comply with the relevant policies of the adopted Local Plan, national planning policy and associated guidance.
- 1.4 The proposal would fail to provide a high-quality scheme that would make a positive contribution to the local and wider context of the site and the character of the area, failing to be responsive to its location and wider setting or to provide a good level of amenity to the future occupiers of the development.
- 1.5 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee refuse the application for the reasons set out in this report

## **2.0 Site Description and Context**

- 2.1 This site is located within the development framework boundary of Whittlesford Bridge and comprises a brownfield site with an area of approximately 1.17 hectares. The site is bound to the north and west by agricultural land that is located within the Cambridge Green Belt. A railway line (Cambridge to London) is located immediately to the east of the site with commercial development beyond, while to the south are areas of residential development and Whittlesford Parkway Station.
- 2.2 The site is not located in or near to a conservation area. To the south east of the site are two listed buildings: the Red Lion Hotel (Grade II) and the Chapel of Hospital of St John the Baptist (Grade II\*), approximately 80 metres from the site.
- 2.3 The site is located in flood zone 1 (low risk) with some areas of the site identified as being at risk from surface water flooding.
- 2.4 The site is vacant, previously in use for a variety of uses including a scrap yard and sits slightly lower than the adjoining agricultural land. Access to the site is to be taken from Station Road West to the south.

## **3.0 The Proposal**

- 3.1 This application is for reserved matters permission for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning

permission S/0746/15/OL to provide 67 residential units following demolition of 39a Station Road West and the formation of a new access road.

#### **4.0 Relevant Site History**

##### Application Site

- 4.1 21/03045/S106A – Modification of planning obligations contained in a Section 106 Agreement dated 10th August 2018 pursuant to ref: S/0746/15/OL – pending decision.
- 4.2 20/03755/REM – Approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/0746/15/OL to provide 86 residential units following demolition of 39a Station Road West and the formation of a new access road – Withdrawn (30 November 2020).
- 4.3 S/0746/15/OL – Redevelopment of site for residential use (outline planning application all matters reserved) – Approved (14 August 2018).

##### Adjacent Site

- 4.4 21/02477/FUL – Demolition of existing building and erection of three storey building to provide 8 flats, together with parking and landscaping – pending decision.
- 4.5 20/03756/FUL – Demolition of existing building and erection of a three storey building to provide 12 flats, together with parking and landscaping – Withdrawn (30 November 2020).

#### **5.0 Policy**

##### **5.1 National**

National Planning Policy Framework 2021  
National Planning Practice Guidance  
National Design Guide 2021

##### **5.2 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018**

S/1 – Vision  
S/2 – Objectives of the Local Plan  
S/3 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
S/4 – Cambridge Green Belt  
S/5 – Provision of New Jobs and Homes  
S/6 – The Development Strategy to 2031  
S/7 – Development Frameworks  
S/10 – Group Villages  
CC/1 – Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Change

CC/3 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments  
CC/4 – Water Efficiency  
CC/6 – Construction Methods  
CC/7 – Water Quality  
CC/8 – Sustainable Drainage Systems  
CC/9 – Managing Flood Risk  
HQ/1 – Design Principles  
HQ/2 – Public Art and New Development  
NH/2 – Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character  
NH/4 – Biodiversity  
NH/8 – Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining the Green Belt  
NH/14 – Heritage Assets  
H/8 – Housing Density  
H/9 – Housing Mix  
H/10 – Affordable Housing  
H/12 – Residential Space Standards  
SC/2 – Health Impact Assessment  
SC/6 – Indoor Community Facilities  
SC/7 – Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments  
SC/9 – Lighting Proposals  
SC/10 – Noise Pollution  
SC/11 – Contaminated Land  
SC/12 – Air Quality  
TI/2 – Planning for Sustainable Travel  
TI/3 – Parking Provision  
TI/8 – Infrastructure and New Developments  
TI/10 – Broadband

### **5.3 Neighbourhood Plan**

5.4 Whittlesford Neighbourhood Plan – Area Designated

5.5 Given the very early stage of development, no weight can be afforded to the Whittlesford Neighbourhood Plan.

### **5.6 Supplementary Planning Documents**

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020

Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

5.7 The following SPDs were adopted to provide guidance to support previously adopted Development Plan Documents that have now been superseded by the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. These documents are still material considerations when making planning decisions, with the weight in decision making to be determined on a case-by-case basis:

Health Impact Assessment SPD – Adopted March 2011  
Development affecting Conservation Areas SPD – Adopted 2009  
Landscape in New Developments SPD – Adopted March 2010  
District Design Guide SPD – Adopted March 2010  
Affordable Housing SPD – Adopted March 2010  
Listed Buildings SPD – Adopted 2009  
Open Space in New Developments SPD – Adopted January 2009  
Public Art SPD – Adopted January 2009  
Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009

## **5.8 Other Guidance**

5.9 Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy for 2019 to 2023

## **6.0 Consultations**

### **6.1 Whittlesford Parish Council – Objection**

6.2 October and November 2021 Comments

Whittlesford Parish Council did NOT support either application on the grounds of it being an over development of the area.

July 2021 Comments (in full)

This application to provide 60 residential units amounts to 51.3 units per hectare this figure is in excess of an urban location which is 40dph and 30dph set for a small rural village (Local plan of 2018, Policy H/8) this application sees this limitation with proposals for 75 which is total unacceptable being 2.1 times the rural limit. Whittlesford is classified as a South Cambridgeshire group village and such applications of a residential development should be restricted to a maximum of 8 dwellings. This development is out of keeping with the surrounding properties, there is no requirement in the village for 4-bedroom properties. It was noted that no affordable housing has been incorporated in this development.

The play area is totally inadequate and a substantial piece of land in the development providing proper equipment. The Lawn in the village is the only place where children can go and play safely and that is a long way from this site. The school is up to capacity and could not accommodate even a small fraction of children who could potentially live on this site.

There is insufficient parking at these properties and it is assumed that these properties would only have one vehicle parking space as residents would use public transport. Which in practice is not the case, therefore any extra vehicle would finish up being parked in Station Road West where there is ongoing problem with commuter parking.

The only real public transport is the trains as other public transport is non-existent at best the buses run every 1.5 hours and there is no service in the evenings or on Sundays.

Ads you will see from our other communications regarding this development the Whittlesford Parish Council opposed the other applications and this one is no different. The developer again is trying to cram as many units as it can of the site and has not taken on board any comments we raised on the last applications.

The Parish Council considers this application an over development.

The Parish Council does request that the application be referred to the District Council Planning Committee.

**6.3 Air Quality Officer – No Objection**

6.4 Recommend a low emission strategy compliance condition.

**6.5 Anglian Water – No Objection**

6.6 Request consultation on condition 7 of outline planning permission S/0746/15/OL (foul drainage).

**6.7 Conservation Officer – No Objection**

6.8 There are no material conservation issues with this proposal.

**6.9 Contaminated Land Officer – No Comments**

6.10 The decision notice for S/0746/15/OL had land contaminated land conditions attached.

**6.11 Designing Out Crime Officer – No Objection**

6.12 Comments that would like to see more information in regards to access control to residents and details of external lighting.

**6.13 Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue – No Objection**

6.14 Requests that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants by way of a Section 106 agreement or planning condition.

**6.15 Ecology Officer – No Objection**

6.16 Recommend conditions for compliance with ecological measures and/or works within the Ecological Impact Assessment submitted and measures to protect badgers.

**6.17 Environment Agency – No Objection**

6.18 Draw attention to the remediation strategy and piling conditions attached to the decision notice of S/0746/15/OL.

**6.19 Environmental Health Officer – No Objection**

6.20 n/a

**6.21 Historic Environment Team (Archaeology) – No Objection**

6.22 The Heritage Statement submitted notes that the extent of a former quarry has been confirmed - agree that archaeological remains will have been destroyed through this activity and recommend the cancellation of the condition previously recommended for the scheme (Refs apply: S/0746/15/OL, 20/03755/REM).

**6.23 Housing Strategy Team – Objection**

6.24 More information is needed on the total amount of affordable housing provision to be provided on the proposed development for 67 units as the viability statement is not clear whether the percentage (8%) of affordable would also be applied for the new RM application.

6.25 The Strategic Housing Team would request that an independent viability assessment is undertaken to confirm that only 8% affordable housing provision can be provided and specify what tenure. Within this, we would like to see the costs of the remediation and contamination works to clearly see how the scheme is unviable.

6.26 If the viability statement is proven to be accurate and only 8% of the units can be for affordable units, we would expect 3 x 1-bedroom houses (all for AR), 2 x 2-bedroom houses (1 for SO, 1 for AR). If the new viability statement comes back with a different amount or tenure of affordable housing provision, we would need to be re-consulted.

6.27 The affordable units proposed is not in line with the Council's preferred affordable housing tenure split. Affordable rented units should be maximised in size to provide more options for occupants.

**6.28 Landscape Officer – Objection.**

6.29 Landscape, Visual and Visual Amenity  
The site would have a negligible effect upon the wider landscape character, views and visual amenity

The development would result in significant harm to the local landscape character and views. The development would be contrary to policy NH/2 Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character and HQ/1: Design Principles.

- 6.30 **Green Belt**  
The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the adjacent Green Belt. The proposal is contrary to Policies S/4 and NH/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.
- 6.31 **Landscape**  
No details of street furniture have been provided, but can be conditions, hard surface details should reflect rural settlement character. Further soft landscaping details required and to be conditioned – planting schedule, planting specification, sections of planting pits, 3D cellular confinement systems, tree root barriers.
- 6.32 **Public Open Space**  
Welcome the location of the POS and play space. However, concerned that the layout has not been landscape led with little surveillance particularly from plot 3. Also concerned that ball games bouncing off the southern boundary of plot 3 will also cause a nuisance for future residents.
- 6.33 **General**  
Also raise concerns with regimental urban layout, clarity of boundary treatments for certain plots, drainage, retaining walls (insufficient information), car parking and bin storage and private amenity space.
- 6.34 Lead Local Flood Authority – No Objection**
- 6.35 The amended information / documents demonstrate that surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the use of permeable paving across all access and parking areas. Green roofs are proposed on the flat roofed areas. Surface water will be collected within the permeable paving system and conveyed to an infiltration tank in the west of the site. Due to made ground strata found below the site, the tank will be wrapped, allowing infiltration only through the base of the tank, which will be within the gravels below the made ground.
- 6.36 Local Highways Authority – No Objection**
- 6.37 Recommend conditions for surface water drainage arrangements, future management and maintenance of streets, access falls and levels, traffic management plan, condition survey of the adopted public highway, provision of a 2m footway link to the village and reference to the Traffic Regulation Order in respect to the extension of double yellow lines as shown on submitted drawings and an informative that planning permission does not permit works to or within the public highway.
- 6.38 Confirm that the Local Highways Authority will not seek to adopt any part of the development.

**6.39 Natural England – No Comments**

6.40 n/a

**6.41 Network Rail – No Objection**

6.42 Strongly recommends the developer complies with the following comments and requirements to maintain the safe operation of the railway and protect NR's infrastructure.

**6.43 Public Health England – No Comment**

6.44 n/a

**6.45 Section 106 Officer – Comments**

6.46 A LEAP is required and has not been provided in line with the Section 106 Agreement secured at outline stage.

6.47 Planning committee considered the application at the meeting on 6 July 2016 where the outline application was recommended for approval on the premise that a local equipped play area was to be provided.

6.48 Also comments made in respect of application 21/03045/S106A.

**6.49 Sport England – No Comments**

6.50 n/a

**6.51 Sustainable Drainage Engineer – Holding Objection**

6.52 Infiltration is to be allowed through the base only, however, it is not clear how this addresses our concern that infiltration is not to be allowed in made ground. It is also not known if the site has contamination issues which could affect potential for infiltration to be utilised.

**6.53 Sustainability Officer – No Objection**

6.54 Recommend a condition to secure the approved renewable / low carbon energy technologies as set out in the submitted Energy Statement.

**6.55 Transport Assessment Team – Comments**

6.56 Parking Provision  
No objection.

6.57 Site Access and Layout  
Refer to Highways Development Management comments.

6.58 Forecast Trip Generation  
Given the location of the site adjacent to Whittlesford Parkway Station and

the additional trips generated by the development compared to the existing use, the developer should provide the sum of £66,000 towards the Greater Cambridge Partnership Whittlesford Station Masterplan scheme secured as a S106 obligation to improve the surrounding sustainable transport infrastructure within the vicinity of the site and to facilitate sustainable travel to and from the development site.

**6.59 Residential Travel Plan**

Travel plan targets agreed, welcome travel packs will be provided to residents of each dwelling upon first occupation, monitoring will primarily comprise annual travel surveys and developer will fund the implementation of the travel plan throughout its lifespan.

**6.60 Trees Officer – No Objection**

6.61 An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (dated May 2021) has been submitted. This is sufficient for this proposal, trees and site and should be listed as an approved document

**6.62 Urban Design Officer – Objection**

6.63 Officers cannot fully support this application. It is acknowledged that improvements have been made to some aspects of the layout; there is a reduced number of dwellings; the long terrace of block D, which is in a very prominent position within the layout, has been reduced in length which is welcome. It is also welcome that the ground floor flats in Block D are now provided with their own entrances that can be accessed directly off the spine road which now creates an active frontage to animate the street-scene.

6.64 However, officers still have concerns about the layout, scale and character of the proposals. The proposals would result in an overdevelopment that leads to overlooking, poor outlook and inadequate amenity space issues harming the health and well-being of future residents.

6.65 It's a concern that the mews street area features a large area of hardstanding and the Locally Equipped Area of Play appears very cramped with play equipment spilling out onto the spine road in the layout drawing.

6.66 It's requested that street scene drawings and CGIs are provided for the spine road and mews street to enable officers to better assess these areas of the site.

6.67 The proposals are contrary to the design objectives set out in Chapter 12 of the 'National Planning Policy Framework' (2019) (NPPF), Policy HQ/1 of the 'South Cambridgeshire Local Plan' (2018) (Local Plan) and the design and residential amenity standards set out in the 'South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide' (2010) (DDG).

## 7.0 Third Party Representations

7.1 15 representations of objection have been received. Full redacted versions of these comments can be found on the Council's website. In summary the following concerns have been raised:

### Character / Design

- 64 dwellings per hectare, contrary to Policy H/8.
- Cramped, poor quality housing with limited space.
- Design does not enhance or match what is to be expected by Whittlesford residents, contrary to Policy HQ/1.
- Inadequate child play facilities.
- Lack of private amenity space.
- Overlooking within the development.
- Overly dense development which impacts resulting quality of dwellings.
- Urban development in a rural village.

### Highways

- Additional parking on Station Road West is major congestion and safety concern.
- Assessments for traffic and parking should include both developments on the site.
- Double yellow lines will be required around the entrance to the site.
- Insufficient parking provision.
- Junction onto the A505 from Moorfield Road is already not fit for purpose for existing traffic.
- No cycle routes on Station Road, Moorfield Road or Duxford Road, increased traffic and pollution will make these roads more dangerous.
- Overspill of parking onto Station Road.
- Residential Travel Plan demonstrates that the low frequency bus service is not an alternative car usage, contrary to Policy TI/2.
- Single access onto Station Road West, a narrow cul-de-sac with existing parking issues.

### Sustainability

- Additional strain on existing services.
- Whittlesford is a Group Village where normally developments of a maximum of 8 dwellings are permitted.

### Other Matters

- All medium proposals of the Whittlesford Station Masterplan should be completed prior to completion of the proposal.
- Contamination issues on site.
- Existing boundary treatments to properties should not be removed.
- Not clear what level of affordable housing is provided, if any.
- Outline application was for 60 housing units.
- Surface water and drainage concerns.
- There is now an adequate 5-year land supply available, there is no justification for increasing the number of units approved from 60 to 75.

## **8.0 Member Representations**

8.1 None.

## **9.0 Local Groups / Other Organisations**

9.1 None

## **10.0 Assessment**

10.1 The application comprises the submission of the matters for approval that were reserved when outline planning permission for the development of the site was granted. Those matters that were reserved are set out in condition 1 of outline consent S/0746/15/OL and form:

- Details of access to the site.
- Details of the layout of the site.
- Details of the scale of buildings.
- Details of the appearance of buildings.
- Details of landscaping.

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

“access”, in relation to reserved matters, means the accessibility to and within the site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding access network; where “site” means the site or part of the site in respect of which outline planning permission is granted or, as the case may be, in respect of which an application for such a permission has been made;

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

“scale” means the height, width and length of each building proposed within the development in relation to its surroundings.

“appearance” means the aspects of a building or place within the development which determines the visual impression the building or place makes, including the external built form of the development, its architecture, materials, decoration, lighting, colour and texture.

“landscaping” means the treatment of land (other than buildings) for the purpose of enhancing or protecting the amenities of the site and the area in which it is situated and includes; (a) screening by fences, walls or other means; (b) the planting of trees, hedges, shrubs or grass; (c) the formation of banks, terraces or other earthworks; (d) the

laying out or provision of gardens, courts, squares, water features, sculpture or public art; and (e) the provision of other amenity features.

### **10.3 Principle of Development**

- 10.4 The principle of residential development on the site was established under outline planning consent S/0746/15/OL, granted in August 2018. A Section 106 dated 10 August 2018 is attached to the outline consent.
- 10.5 Condition 3 of the outline consent secured a single approved plan; the site location plan (drawing number X1129-000).
- 10.6 The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are therefore compliance with the outline planning permission, housing provision (including affordable housing), the reserved matters (access, layout, scale, appearance, landscaping), residential amenity, biodiversity, flood risk and drainage, highway safety, highway network and parking, heritage assets, renewables / climate change, noise, lighting, contamination and other matters.

### **10.7 Compliance with the Outline Planning Permission**

- 10.8 Condition 2 of the outline consent required the submission of an application for the approval of the reserved matters within three years of the date of approval (i.e., by 14 August 2021).
- 10.9 The reserved matters application was received by the Local Planning Authority in May 2021.
- 10.10 Condition 3 of the outline consent secured a single approved plan; the site location plan (drawing number X1129-000).
- 10.11 The site boundary for the reserved matters application is consistent with the approved location plan.
- 10.12 The application therefore complies with conditions 2 and 3 of the outline consent.

### **10.13 Housing Provision**

- 10.14 The 2018 outline consent granted permission for the redevelopment of the site for residential use with all matters reserved. The outline consent did not impose a restriction on the number of residential units that could come forward at reserved matters stage by way of the description of the outline development, a planning condition or through the Section 106 legal agreement associated to the consent.
- 10.15 A review of the supporting documents submitted at outline stage indicates that the outline application intended the development of up to 60 residential units, given the information submitted on the application form and illustrative layout plan. There is also reference to up to 60 units within

the Section 106 agreement on page 2 where recital 5 states “an application has been made for planning permission for residential development of up to 60 dwellings on the Property pursuant to application no S/0746/15/OL”.

- 10.16 However, as no threshold was secured by way of description, condition or legal agreement the reserved matters proposal can provide for an unrestricted level of residential development.
- 10.17 The reserved matters description, as amended, sets out that the application proposes the erection of 67 residential units. However, review of the plans submitted indicates the erection of 66 residential units comprising 13 dwellinghouses and 53 apartments.

#### Housing Density

- 10.18 Policy H/8 of the Local Plan details that housing developments will achieve an average net density of 30 dwellings per hectare in Group Villages but that the net density on a site may vary from this figure where justified by the character of the locality, the scale of the development, or other local circumstances.
- 10.19 The site measures approximately 1.17 hectares in area. The provision of 66 residential units across this area would equate to a density of approximately 56 dwellings per hectare.
- 10.20 The proposed density far exceeds the average standards of Policy H/8 and cannot be said to be justified by the character of the locality, which comprises relatively low density rural residential housing to the west of the site.
- 10.21 The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy H/8 of the Local Plan.
- 10.22 However, consideration must be given to the outline consent, which accepted a higher density on the site than the average required by adopted policy (including that adopted at the time the outline permission was granted), based on an indicative scheme for up to 60 dwellings.
- 10.23 Paragraphs 47 and 48 of the outline report presented to the Planning Committee in July 2016 set out:

The application proposes a relatively high density of development at 54 dwellings per hectare. Although policy HG/1 requires new developments to make best use of the site by achieving average net densities of at least 30 dph unless there are exceptional local circumstances that require a different treatment. Policy H/7 of the Draft Local Plan confirms that density requirement, but states that it may vary on a site where justified by the character of the locality, the scale of the development or other local circumstances. In this case the costs of developing the site necessitate a higher density of development than perhaps would normally be expected due to the development cost issues associated

with developing this site. Again, this factor must be weighed against the removal of a particularly unneighbourly use and the benefits to the wider amenity of the village.

The developer has submitted a comprehensive viability report which sets out the costs associated with the reclamation of the site for the purposes of residential which is detailed later in this report. These figures are based on a 60 unit development. A lower density would not be cost effective in ensuring that a reasonable developer profit could be delivered and whilst being able to mitigate the risks taken in developing a site of this nature.

- 10.24 Taken within this context the density proposed is akin to that accepted at outline stage, albeit the outline consent did not place a maximum level of development on the site at 60 units that was envisaged.
- 10.25 However, although there is no in-principle objection to a high density development on the site given the provisions of the outline consent, any development must be design-led and responsive to the site's context. Matters of design are discussed later in this report.

#### Market Housing Mix

- 10.26 Policy H/9 of the Local Plan states that a wide choice, type and mix of housing will be provided to meet the needs of different groups in the community including families with children, older people, those seeking starter homes, people wishing to build their own homes, people seeking private rented sector housing, and people with disabilities.
- 10.27 Policy H/9 of the Local Plan requires market homes in developments of 10 or more homes to consist of a mix of at least 30% 1 or 2-bed homes, 30% 3-bed homes and 30% 4 or more bed homes with a 10% flexibility above each category.
- 10.28 However, the outline consent did not impose a condition that requires the details of the housing mix (including both market and affordable housing) to be provided at reserved matters stage in accordance with local planning policy or demonstration that the housing mix meets local need.
- 10.29 The application, as amended, provides for 66 market properties and would incorporate a split of 49x1&2-bed apartments, 7x3-bed properties (comprising 4 apartments and 3 dwellinghouses) and 10x4-bed dwellings.
- 10.30 This equates to a market mix of 74% 1 or 2-bed homes, 11% 3-bed homes and 15% 4 or more bed homes.
- 10.31 The proposed mix would not accord with Policy H/9(1) of the Local Plan. However, there is no requirement to do so within the outline consent.
- 10.32 Furthermore, the supporting text to Policy H/9 sets out in paragraph 7.37 that the district's housing stock has traditionally been dominated by larger

detached and semi-detached family houses. Whilst recent developments have helped to increase the stock of smaller properties available, the overall imbalance of larger properties remains.

- 10.33 The proposed development weighs strongly in favour of delivering smaller scale units through the provision of 49 one and two bed apartments, 74% of the development.
- 10.34 Acknowledging that no housing mix condition was imposed at outline stage and that the development weighs in favour of the provision of smaller properties, for which the adopted development plan notes there is a need, officers do not consider that it would be reasonable to refuse the reserved matters application on the mix of units provided.

#### Affordable Housing

- 10.35 Policy H/10(1) of the Local Plan requires all developments of 11 dwellings or more, or on development sites of less than 11 units if the total floorspace of the proposed units exceeds 1,000sqm, to provide that 40% of the homes on site will be affordable to address evidence of housing need, although more recent paragraph 63 of the NPPF sets the threshold for affordable housing at 'major developments' (i.e. 10 dwellings or more).
- 10.36 Policy H/10(2) does make three exceptions to this requirement where it can be demonstrated that the level of affordable housing sought would make a development unviable, off-site provision of affordable dwellings can be demonstrated to have benefits, or it can be demonstrated that it is not possible or appropriate to build affordable homes on-site or off-site, in which case the development will provide a financial contribution towards the future provision of affordable housing.
- 10.37 The provision of affordable housing on the site was dealt with at outline stage and secured within the Section 106 Agreement associated to the outline consent, closely linked to the contaminated remediation requirements of the site.
- 10.38 Notwithstanding the details of the outline consent, as noted in the comments of the Council's Housing Strategy Team, the applicant has submitted a viability assessment to support the reserved matters application, which has been amended during the application. Both versions set out that the applicant is unable to deliver affordable housing provision in line with Policy H/10 of the Local Plan.
- 10.39 However, the applicant, despite viability issues, has indicated a willingness to provide a small percentage of affordable housing (less than 10%), although both viability reports submitted are based on earlier iterations of the scheme (75 units) rather than 66 units as proposed, so it is unclear what is now intended.
- 10.40 Irrespective of the viability assessments submitted at reserved matters stage, it is not within the gift of the reserved matters application to secure

affordable housing as that is already dealt with through the Section 106 Agreement attached to the outline consent.

- 10.41 In short, The Second Schedule, The Obligations, Part I: Affordable Housing of the Section 106 Agreement requires the developer to, subject to the actual costs of dealing with the contamination issues on the site against figures contained in the legal agreement, provide:
- a) The payment of an affordable housing commuted sum or
  - b) An on-site provision of affordable housing in accordance with a scheme approved by the Council and which must reflect and be consistent with the improvement in the viability...
- 10.42 Therefore, acknowledging what was agreed at outline stage and secured by the associated Section 106 Agreement, the reserved matters application is acceptable in terms of affordable housing provision.

#### Residential Space Standards

- 10.43 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.
- 10.44 Officers note that several of the units would fail to meet the required standards of Policy H/12 of the Local Plan, with several apartments falling short of the required double bedroom standards by 1 to 2 square metres, as noted in the comments of the Council's Urban Design Officer.
- 10.45 However, given that the outline planning consent did not require the dwellings to be built to meet the residential space standards and this matter does not fall under the definition of the reserved matters for layout, appearance or scale, the development would not need to accord with national space standards and Policy H/12 of the Local Plan.

#### **10.46 Reserved Matters**

##### Access

- 10.47 The application proposes a single point of vehicular access to the site from Station Road on its southern boundary, which would be provided following the demolition of no.39A Station Road.
- 10.48 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment, which includes drawing 19214-MA-XX-XX-DR-C-0003-P05. The plan provides an illustration of the access location and demonstrates that the required visibility can be achieved at the access. The access has been designed with 6 metre radii and such that parking proposed along the access road is located away from the immediate vicinity of the site access.
- 10.49 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Local Highways Authority who raise no objection to the access arrangements of

the development, following the submission of amended and additional information.

- 10.50 In consultation with the Local Highways Authority officers are satisfied that the proposed development would provide an acceptable and safe means of vehicular access to the site.

#### Layout

- 10.51 The layout of the site seeks to deliver 66 residential units, incorporating 13 residential dwellings in the form of three terraces of three units and two pairs of semi-detached properties alongside three apartment buildings comprising 53 apartments.
- 10.52 As noted above, the proposal represents a high-density development. The quantum of development has a clear and direct impact on the layout of the site and as a result is considered to have compromised the overall design quality of the scheme.
- 10.53 The typology and character of the development is extremely urban, exacerbated by its layout (and scale) with a straight spine road and secondary roads which lead to poor terminating vistas with no visual interest. The residential units are tightly arranged in an orthogonal manner which does not relate to the development pattern of the village and the more informal rural character of the area.
- 10.54 In particular, the large central apartment building comprising Blocks D and E provides a continuous built form approximately 55 metres in length and forms the central building within the site. As a result, the built form and mass of this building dominates the spine road and central views through the site, presenting a distinctly urban and dominant form of development within a largely rural area.
- 10.55 Furthermore, the layout of the site, by virtue of its high density, forces the built form of development onto the edges of the development site. Although this is broadly acceptable along the eastern boundary of the site adjacent to the railway line it results in a detrimental impact on the surrounding character and landscape, considered in more detail below.
- 10.56 Comparatively, the existing residential development to the west of the site along Station Road West and associated cul-de-sacs including The Moraine and Knights Orchard are arranged in a low density informal rural arrangement, with variations to property frontages and set backs from the public highway, with open green frontages being characteristic. Dwellings typically comprise detached and semi-detached forms with some sporadic examples of terraced arrangements.
- 10.57 Notwithstanding these existing arrangements, officers acknowledge that a higher-density development has already been accepted on the site and therefore a layout is unlikely to mimic would mimic existing residential development. Nonetheless, development should still respond to its context

and it is notable that an indicative layout supported the outline scheme and showed how a more informal and rural arrangement of 60 detached, semi-detached and terraced properties could be achieved.

- 10.58 Officers also acknowledge the development to the east of the site and railway line, which comprises large industrial buildings, hotel and car park. However, the railway line clearly acts as a divide between two distinct characters and cannot be said to provide a basis for the layout and character of the application site.
- 10.59 Car parking for the site has been well integrated, with most of the parking located below ground level, significantly reducing the potential for its visual prominence within the site.
- 10.60 As amended, a Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP), as required by the outline Section 106 Agreement, has been incorporated towards the northern portion of the site. Although the area provides the minimum required in terms of size and equipment, it appears forced and contrived within an already cramped layout and fails to make the positive contribution that such an area should within a development of this scale.
- 10.61 Limited areas of other open space are provided within the layout, with a small section of informal open space shoehorned into the south western corner of the site. Two areas of open space or communal gardens are provided between the easternmost apartment buildings while small private gardens areas are incorporated for each residential dwelling.
- 10.62 The comments of the Council's Urban Design Officer are acknowledged, which raise concern over the tight orthogonal arrangement of the site, the built form on apartment Blocks D and E and how the LEAP has been arranged within the site.
- 10.63 Overall, officers do not consider that the proposed layout would make a positive contribution to its local and wider context and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the local area and be compatible with its location in terms of layout, density, form and siting.
- 10.64 The layout of the development would be contrary to Policies S/2, S/7, HQ/1 and H/8 of the Local Plan and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

#### Scale

- 10.65 The scale and character of the existing residential development to the west of the site presents a mixture of two storey, one and a half storey and single storey properties of varying designs and footprints. In general properties are typically good-sized detached dwellings with some examples of semi-detached and occasional terraced arrangement. Ground level falls from west to east along Station Road West towards the railway line.

- 10.66 The area to the east of the site beyond the railway line comprises industrial units of a two storey scale, the Red Lion Hotel as a modest two storey building, a single storey chapel, a small number of two storey residential properties and a three and a half storey hotel adjacent to the A505.
- 10.67 The application proposes the erection of a mixture of dwellings and apartment buildings. The proposed dwellings would comprise a mix of two and a half to three storey semi-detached and terraced properties. The apartment buildings incorporate two storey and three storey elements with maximum heights of approximately 9.5 metres and 10.5 metres including gable elements.
- 10.68 Again, the high-density nature of the proposal has compromised the overall design quality of the scheme, with the quantum of development having a direct impact on the scale of the buildings within the site. The proposal presents a distinctly urban form of development, exacerbated by its scale (and layout).
- 10.69 Officers acknowledge that ground levels within the site would be lowered slightly given the likely contamination and remediation works enquired. Nonetheless, the scale of development would stand in stark contrast to the scale of residential development in the area and would also exceed the height of the industrial buildings to the east of the site.
- 10.70 Notwithstanding the levels of the site, concern is raised over the three-storey design approach to most of the development within the site and how these buildings respond (or fail to respond) to the context of the site and how this stands in context with surrounding development. Furthermore, together with the tight orthogonal layout of the site, the scale of the proposed buildings would tightly enclose areas of the site to the detriment of the quality of development, lacking any significant response to the sites rural setting.
- 10.71 Several supporting documents contain visualisations to illustrate the proposed development. These clearly show that the scale of the buildings, particularly those on the boundaries of the site, sit well above the scale of buildings in the surrounding area, appearing as dominant and incongruous additions to the character of the area. While immediate views from Station Road West on approach to the site from the west may be limited, although glances of rooftops may be available, public views of the development from the south and east of the site would be readily available. Longer distance views from the north, west and east would be available, as would transient views from the south along the A505.
- 10.72 The scale of development, in terms of its height, fails to respond to the character of the area and would appear out of context with its surroundings.
- 10.73 It is also important to note that the matter of scale extends beyond a simple consideration of height, it also includes the width and length of

each building proposed within the development in relation to its surroundings.

- 10.74 The apartment buildings provide a footprint that is uncommon within the area, aside from the industrial buildings to the east of the site, which cannot be said to be representative of the rural context of the site. As noted above, the central apartment building (Blocks D and E) provides a built form of development that is approximately 55 metres in length, an incongruous scale of development.
- 10.75 The comments of the Council's Urban Design Officer are acknowledged, which raise concern over the scale and massing of the development.
- 10.76 Overall, officers do not consider that the proposed scale of development would make a positive contribution to its local and wider context or provide a place-responsive design, failing to preserve or enhance the character of the local area and be compatible with its location in terms of scale, mass, form and proportions.
- 10.77 The scale and massing of the development would be contrary to Policies S/2, S/7, HQ/1 and H/8 of the Local Plan and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

#### Appearance

- 10.78 The development is distinctly urban in character and appearance, with a limited range of styles, design or detailing that would add interest and integrate the development with its surroundings. The appearance of the dwellings is at odds with the general design and appearance of dwellings within the wider area while the appearance of the apartment buildings is completely divorced from the context of the site, forming large flat roofed buildings of significant bulk and mass. The appearance of Block E that forms the northern end of the large apartment Block (D and E), which has been developed in response to initial objections to the proposal, is contrived while the northern elevation of Block D, which would be visible upon entry to the site, provides a harsh and featureless façade.
- 10.79 Although no strong objection is raised to palette of external materials proposed, which do draw on some of the materials in the surrounding area including the Village Vet building to the south of the site, the scale and layout of the development significantly compromises the appearance and quality of the development.
- 10.80 Overall, officers do not consider that the distinctly urban appearance of development is compatible with its location and to provide an incongruous form of development, exacerbated by the scale of development proposed and cramped layout of the site.
- 10.81 The appearance of the development would be contrary to Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

## Landscaping

- 10.82 The application is supported by a landscape masterplan and a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (CSA Environmental, May 2021).
- 10.83 The landscape masterplan highlights key landscape details within the site. This includes indicative soft landscape planting within the site, sustainable drainage features, communal open space, biodiversity enhancements and entrance avenue and street trees.
- 10.84 In general, the amount of soft landscaping provided within the development is limited given the quantum of development the proposal seeks to accommodate. Areas of soft landscape are largely confined to the northern and western perimeters of the site and small communal areas of open space and private garden areas for the proposed dwellings. A LEAP is provided in the northern portion of the site and a small area of open space shoehorned into the south west corner.
- 10.85 In terms of the landscape provisions within the site, the arrangements are limited and fail to respond to the character of the area. The existing dwellings to the west of the site are characterised by soft landscape frontages and set back from the public highway. In contrast, the proposed development is built hard against the few roads within the site and the amount of built form dominates the site with limited opportunities for the landscape arrangements to enhance the amenities of the site. Again, officers acknowledge a higher density development has been accepted on the site and large soft frontages are therefore unlikely, but the landscape elements incorporated into the proposal appear as an afterthought.
- 10.86 The landscaping details within the site are not considered responsive to the rural context of the site.
- 10.87 Consideration is also given to how the development would appear within the wider landscape setting of the site.
- 10.88 The site abuts the edge of the Cambridge Green Belt on its western and northern boundaries. As noted above, the high-density cramped form of development forces development towards the edge of the site, which, in combination of the excessive scale of development, results in a built form that would be evident in local and wider views.
- 10.89 Policy NH/2 of the Local Plan sets out that development will only be permitted where it respects and retains, or enhances, the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape.
- 10.90 Policy NH/8 of the Local Plan details that development on the edges of settlements which are surrounded by the Green Belt must include careful landscaping and design measures of a high quality.
- 10.91 The proposed development, as illustrated on the landscape masterplan, provides a modest landscape buffer along the northern and western

boundaries of the site, shown to comprise a single row of trees. Again, visualisations provided in support of the application show that the development would be evident in close range and longer-range views across the countryside, irrespective of the projected growth of the limited landscape buffer on the edges of the site.

- 10.92 Officers acknowledge that the existing industrial buildings to the east of the site already have a presence within wider views. However, the proposed development would exceed the scale of those existing buildings and would have a greater and detrimental impact on the surrounding landscape.
- 10.93 Officers consider that the proposed landscaping around the edge of the site fails to provide a meaningful buffer that would integrate the development within its surroundings and open rural edge, particularly given the excessive scale of development proposed within the site. As outlined in the supporting Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Whittlesford is a well treed village and development has failed to provide sufficient landscape space to accommodate large long lived trees to soften views of the development and integrate into its surroundings.
- 10.94 The comments of the Council's Landscape Officer are acknowledged, which raise concern over the visual impact of the development on the wider surroundings, along with the overall landscape quality within the site.
- 10.95 Overall, officers do not consider that the landscaping of development would make a positive contribution to its local and wider context and would fail to successfully integrate the development within its surroundings.
- 10.96 The landscape arrangements of the development would be contrary to Policies S/2, S/7, HQ/1, NH/2 and NH/8 of the Local Plan and paragraphs 130 and 174 of the NPPF.

#### Conclusion

- 10.97 The reserved matters would provide a safe means of vehicular access to the site.
- 10.98 The reserved matters would not provide a form of development that has a layout, scale, appearance and landscape that would be of a high quality design that would make a positive contribution to its local and wider context.
- 10.99 The reserved matters proposal would therefore conflict with Policies S/2, S/7, HQ/1, NH/2, NH/8 and H/8 of the Local Plan and paragraphs 130 and 174 of the NPPF.

## **10.100 Residential Amenity**

### Neighbouring Properties

- 10.101 The proposed development would be located to the rear of nos.31 to 37 Station Road West, which are the properties with the greatest potential for impact arising from the proposed development. Most notably the southern elevation of apartment Block D would be in closest proximity to these existing properties.
- 10.102 However, despite the scale of the proposed development proposed, the existing and proposed buildings are relatively well separated, with the southern elevation of Block D being approximately 40 metres from the northern elevation of no.37 Station Road west. No upper floor windows are proposed on this elevation, aside from windows serving non-habitable areas. Consequently, the proposed development is not considered to result in significant harm to the amenities of existing residential development adjacent to the site.

### Future Occupiers

- 10.103 Consideration is given to the amenities of the future occupiers of the site, with the amenities of several plots considered to be compromised by the internal arrangements of the site by virtue of the cramped layout and scale of development proposed.
- 10.104 The private garden area for Plot 3 is approximately 10 metres in length and immediately adjacent the eastern side elevation of Plot 4, a two and a half storey dwelling set approximately 12 metres from the rear elevation of Plot 3. As a result, the private garden area of Plot 3 is enclosed, and the quality of the amenity space lessened by the overbearing impact of Plot 4.
- 10.105 The private garden for Plot 10 is relatively cramped and hard against the retaining wall along the western boundary of the site. Officers are therefore concerned about the quality of the amenity space provided to this Plot.
- 10.106 The private garden for Plot 13 is adjacent to apartment Block D and E. Officers note that the area immediately adjacent the garden area for Plot 13 has been reduced to a single storey element. However, given the general two and a half to three storey scale of Blocks D and E, the garden area of Plot 13 would be significantly compromised in terms of light, privacy and overbearing impact by the adjacent apartment building.
- 10.107 In terms of the amenities of the apartment buildings, ground floor apartments are provided with small private amenity spaces while upper floor apartments have private balcony areas. In addition, communal areas of amenity space are provided between the proposed buildings.
- 10.108 Given the number of buildings proposed and the fact Block D is separated from the communal garden by the main spine road, as highlighted in the

comments of the Council's Urban Design Officer, concern is raised over the quality of amenity space afforded to the occupiers of the apartment buildings.

10.109 Overall, internal arrangements within the site are such that the development would not provide future occupiers with satisfactory amenity space that protects the health and amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses from development that is overlooking, overbearing or results in a loss of daylight.

10.110 The development is therefore contrary to Policy HQ/1(n) of the Local Plan.

#### **10.111 Biodiversity**

10.112 The application is supported by an Ecological Impact Assessment (CSA Environmental, May 2021). The Assessment identified badgers, invertebrates, and breeding birds as potential constraints to works. Additional surveys for reptiles were also conducted but no reptiles were found within the boundary of the site. A badger licence would need to be agreed with Natural England.

10.113 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Ecology Officer who raises no objection, recommending a condition securing the ecological measures within the submitted Assessment and a condition relating to works that could damage or destroy the identified badger sett. The conditions would be reasonable as part of any reserved matters consent.

10.114 Officers acknowledge the ecological considerations at outline stage, with condition 13 (ecological enhancement) and condition 14 (breeding birds) providing further ecological requirements and compliance as part of the development of the site.

10.115 The proposal would accord with Policy NH/4 of the Local Plan.

#### **10.116 Flood Risk and Drainage**

10.117 The site is located in flood zone 1 (low risk) with some areas of the site identified as being at risk from surface water flooding.

10.118 Drainage is largely a matter dealt with at outline stage when establishing the principle of development, with reserved matters applications requiring supporting details to demonstrate that drainage arrangements could be provided appropriately within the proposed layout of the site, being linked to matters of layout and landscaping.

10.119 Outline consents typically impose a condition requiring a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, along with details of its maintenance. A discharge of conditions application then provides the full technical details, calculations, maintenance details etc., as required by the

condition, to discharge the relevant requirements and approve an appropriate drainage scheme for a development in full.

- 10.120 In this instance, condition 8 of the outline consent requires the submission of a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site prior to the commencement of development the along with details of the management and maintained of the system for the lifetime of the development.
- 10.121 In terms of foul water drainage, condition 7 of the outline consent requires the submission of a scheme for foul water drainage by way of a pre-commencement condition.
- 10.122 The reserved matters application is supported by, as amended, a Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy (Markides Associates, October 2021) a Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy (Markides Associates, January 2022) and a Markides Associates Response to LLFA Objection Letter, November 2021). These documents set out how a drainage strategy could be accommodated with the proposed arrangements of the reserved matters site.
- 10.123 The application has been subject to formal consultation with Anglian Water, the Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer.
- 10.124 Following the submission of additional and revised information, no objection is raised to the reserved matters proposal by Anglian Water, the Environment Agency or the LLFA.
- 10.125 The holding objection of the Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer is noted. However, those comments do not account for the updated submission of the letter responding to the LLFA objections and revised Flood Risk Assessment. Given that the LLFA are the lead drainage authority on drainage matters for major applications and the revised information submitted, officers are satisfied that the proposed development could accommodate a suitable drainage system.
- 10.126 Officers are satisfied that the proposed development could provide an appropriate drainage and flood risk solution, a scheme that would need to be formally agreed prior to commencing through the discharge of condition 8 of the outline consent.
- 10.127 The proposal would accord with Policies CC/7, CC/8 and CC/9 of the Local Plan.

#### **10.128 Highway Safety, Highway Network and Parking**

- 10.129 The matter of access has been considered above and found acceptable, in consultation with the Local Highways Authority.
- 10.130 The internal layout of the site has also been considered and found acceptable in highway safety terms. The Local Highways Authority has

recommended several conditions as part of any permission, including the future management and maintenance of streets, access falls and levels, which would be appropriate as part of any reserved matters permission.

- 10.131 However, conditions for a traffic management plan, condition survey of the adopted public highway and the provision of a 2m footway link to the village are not suitable for reserved matters stage and are details relevant to the outline stage.
- 10.132 Officers note that condition 9 of the outline consent requires the provision of a traffic management plan prior to commencement. However, there is no requirement for a condition survey nor is there any reference to the provision of a new 2 metre footway to the village by way of condition or as part of the Section 106 Agreement. These details cannot now be secured at reserved matters stage as it would be inappropriate to do so within the context of the application.
- 10.133 The Local Highways Authority also provide reference to the Traffic Regulation Order in respect to the extension of double yellow lines, which could be included as an informative on any reserved matters permission.
- 10.134 The proposal is considered acceptable in highway safety terms.
- 10.135 Consideration of the impact of the development on the wider highway network is also a detail for the outline stage and therefore does not form part of the assessment of the reserved matters proposal.
- 10.136 The comments of the Transport Assessment Team are noted. However, a reserved matters application cannot secure a financial sum towards highway network improvements as such details are relevant to outline stage. Therefore, the request for a sum of £66,000 towards Greater Cambridge Partnership Whittlesford Station Masterplan cannot be secured as part of any reserved matters permission.
- 10.137 Officers acknowledge that condition 21 of the outline consent secures the submission of a Travel Plan prior to occupation.
- 10.138 In terms parking, Policy TI/3 of the Local Plan sets out that car parking provision should be provided through a design-led approach (with reference to Policy HQ/1) and in accordance with the indicative standards set out in figure 11 of the Plan. This requires the provision of 2 spaces per dwelling, with 1 space to be allocated within the curtilage.
- 10.139 In design terms, as noted above, most of the car parking is provided underground and therefore has been found acceptable.
- 10.140 Each dwelling has been provided with 1 car parking space within an integral garage and 1 further space within the layout. A condition requiring the integral garages to be retained for parking provision only is considered appropriate, given the parking arrangements proposed and the parking issues in the wider area (to prevent the development adding to the issue).

- 10.141 Each apartment has also been provided with 1 car parking space, with 67 spaces provided within an underground parking arrangement, including 8 disabled spaces. Noting that the application site is located adjacent to a train station and provides predominately 1 and 2-bed apartment units, the proposed car parking provision is considered acceptable.
- 10.142 The concerns raised locally in respect of parking are noted. However, the site is required to provide car parking associated to the proposed development only and is not required to resolve existing parking issues that may exist in and around the area.
- 10.143 For cycle parking provision, policy TI/3 requires this to be provided at a ratio of 1 space per bedroom.
- 10.144 Cycle parking has been provided within the underground parking arrangements for the apartment buildings, cited to be 119 cycle parking spaces within the Planning Statement. However, the plan provided does not clearly illustrate adequate provision for the apartments, while the arrangement for the proposed dwellings is also unclear. However, this can be adequately addressed by a condition requiring details of cycle parking prior to occupation.
- 10.145 The proposal would accord with Policy TI/3 of the Local Plan.

#### **10.146 Heritage Impact**

- 10.147 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
- 10.148 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving the (listed) building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- 10.149 Policy NH/14 of the Local Plan sets out support for development proposals when they sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as appropriate to their significance and in accordance with the NPPF. Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan also requires development to conserve or enhance important natural and historic assets and their settings.
- 10.150 The site is not located in or near to a conservation area. To the south east of the site are two listed buildings: the Red Lion Hotel (Grade II) and the Chapel of Hospital of St John the Baptist (Grade II\*).
- 10.151 The application is supported by a Heritage Statement (CSA Environmental, May 2021), which identifies the relevant heritage assets that could be impacted by the proposed development and concludes that the residential development will not adversely impact any designated heritage assets as a result of alteration to setting.

10.152 The built form of development proposed is located approximately 90 metres from the Red Lion Hotel. As set out above, the layout and scale of development is not considered to be compatible with the character of the area. However, in terms of the impact of the development on nearby heritage assets, there are several large existing buildings between the development site and listed buildings. As such there is limited intervisibility between the two and the proposed development is not considered to infringe on the setting of the relative heritage assets.

10.153 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Historic Environment Team and Historic England and no objection has been raised on heritage grounds.

10.154 Noting the comments of the Council's Historic Environment Team and Historic England, officers are satisfied that the proposal would preserve the setting of nearby heritage assets.

10.155 The comments of the County's archaeology team are noted, and the proposal is acceptable in archaeological terms.

10.156 The proposal would accord with Policy NH/14 of the Local Plan and associated guidance / legislation.

10.157 **Renewables / Climate Change**

10.158 The application is supported by a Sustainability Statement (ensphere, May 2021), an Energy Strategy (ensphere, May 2021) and a Water Conservation Strategy (Markides Associates, May 2021). These supporting documents provide details of several approaches to the sustainable construction of the proposed development including passive and energy efficient measures, energy efficient low/zero carbon and renewable technologies and water efficiency.

10.159 Based on the details submitted the proposed low/zero technologies should ensure the development achieves a carbon emissions reduction of more than 14.81%. The applicant has also provided a copy of Part G water calculations which demonstrate that the proposed dwellings will use no more than 106.3 litres of water per person per day, in line with Local Plan Policy CC/4.

10.160 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Sustainability Officer who raises no objection, recommending a condition securing the renewable/low carbon energy technologies as set out in the Energy Statement.

10.161 Condition 10 of the outline consent requires, prior to the commencement of development, the submission of a scheme for the provision of on site renewable energy to meet 10% or more of the projected energy requirements of the development, already securing the submission of details as noted above.

10.162 The proposal would accord with Policy CC/3 of the Local Plan.

**10.163 Noise**

10.164 The application site is located adjacent to a railway line.

10.165 Policy SC/10 of the Local Plan sets out that planning permission will not be granted for development which would be subject to unacceptable noise levels from existing noise sources, both ambient levels and having regard to noise characteristics such as impulses whether irregular or tonal.

10.166 The outline application was supported by a full noise acoustic assessment which provided details of the levels of noise anticipated within the site. A large range of acoustic/noise mitigation measures proposed were considered acceptable in order to mitigate the impact of noise on the new dwellings and across the site.

10.167 The reserved matters application is supported by a Noise and Vibration Assessment (phlorum, May 2021). The Assessment considers the potential noise impact upon the development and future residents and provides recommended mitigation measures for internal spaces through fabric and window detailing while external amenity spaces would not be adversely impacted by existing noise sources.

10.168 The assessment concludes that providing the mitigation measures considered in the Assessment are implemented, noise levels within the proposed properties should meet the internal noise level criteria specified in ProPG and the guidelines in BS4142:2014+A1:2019 for plant noise and BS8233:2014 for noise in amenity areas.

10.169 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Environmental Health Team, who raise no objection to the proposal.

10.170 The outline consent does not include a condition requiring details of noise mitigation measures beyond those associated to any plant and/or equipment (including renewable energy provision). Therefore, a condition requiring compliance with the submitted Noise and Vibration Assessment would be appropriate as part of any reserved matters permission.

10.171 The proposal would accord with Policy SC/10 of the Local Plan.

**10.172 Lighting**

10.173 Policy SC/9 of the Local Plan sets out that development proposals which include new external lighting will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposed lighting scheme and levels are the minimum required for reasons of public safety, crime prevention / security, and living, working and recreational purposes, that light spillage and glare are minimised and there is no unacceptable adverse impact on the local amenity of neighbouring or nearby properties and road users.

- 10.174 The application has been subject to formal consultation with the Council's Environmental Health Team, who raise no objection to the proposal.
- 10.175 Condition 11 of the outline consent restricts the installation of external lighting other than in accordance with a scheme that has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, to minimise the effects of light pollution on the surrounding area.
- 10.176 The proposal would accord with Policy SC/9 of the Local Plan.

#### **10.177 Contamination**

- 10.178 The contaminated land issues associated to the site were considered in detail at outline stage, which was supported by a Phase I Desk Top Study and Chemical Interpretive Report, with further information deemed necessary to confirm that the site can be made suitable for residential use without posing unacceptable risks to receptors.
- 10.179 Condition 20 of the outline consent requires the submission of documents and assessments that relate to several rounds of contaminated land investigation and remediation, prior to commencement of development and prior to occupation of the development.
- 10.180 Officers also acknowledge that condition 6 of the outline consent restricts methods of piling or other foundation designs and investigation boreholes using penetrative methods being restricted without prior agreement with the Local Planning Authority to protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants.
- 10.181 No objection is raised by the Council's Contaminated Land Officer to the reserved matters submission and officers are satisfied that matters of contamination are adequately addressed through the conditions imposed on the outline consent.
- 10.182 The proposal would accord with Policy SC/11 of the Local Plan.

#### **10.183 Other Matters**

##### Air Quality

- 10.184 The comments of the Council's Air Quality Officer are noted. However, a condition requiring a low emission strategy compliance condition is not necessary at reserved matters stage, noting the conditions imposed on the outline consent.

##### Third Party Comments

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

10.186 Whittlesford Parish Council raise concern that the only real public transport is the trains as other public transport in terms of buses is inadequate. Matters of the sustainability of the site were dealt with at outline stage and do not form part of the assessment of the reserved matters application.

### **10.187 Planning Balance**

10.188 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

10.189 Officers consider the matter of access to be acceptable and that the development would not result in harm to highway safety.

10.190 Officers do not consider that the matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping would be acceptable and would fail to comply with the policies of the adopted Local Plan, national planning policy and associated guidance.

10.191 The proposal would fail to provide a high-quality scheme that would make a positive contribution to the local and wider context of the site and the character of the area, failing to be responsive to its location and wider setting or to provide a good level of amenity to the future occupiers of the site.

10.192 The reserved matters proposal would therefore conflict with Policies S/2, S/7, HQ/1, NH/2, NH/8 and H/8 of the Local Plan and paragraphs 130 and 174 of the NPPF.

10.193 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the statutory requirements of section 66(1) and section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for refusal.

### **10.194 Recommendation**

10.195 **Refuse** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its cramped layout, excessive scale, height, mass, design and appearance would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, promoting an incongruous urban typology and character in a rural area and a scale of development that is discordant and not in keeping with the scale and character of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore fail to promote a high-quality and place-responsive design that would retain or enhance the character of the area and make a positive contribution to its local and wider context.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies S/2, S/7, HQ/1 and H/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 which require development to be of a high quality design, with a clear vision as to the positive contribution the development will make to its local and wider context and to be compatible and responsive to its location in terms of layout, scale, mass, form and design.

2. The proposed development, by virtue of its layout, scale, height, mass and design would be harmful to the adjacent Green Belt and surrounding landscape, appearing as a dominant and incongruous form of development in the immediate and wider landscape which fails to provide sufficient and meaningful perimeter landscaping to integrate the development with its surroundings.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies HQ/1, NH/2 and NH/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and paragraphs 130 and 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 which require development to preserve or enhance the character of the local area, natural setting and distinctiveness of the local landscape.

3. The proposed development, by virtue of its cramped layout, scale, height, mass and design, would fail to provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants of the site.

The private garden areas for Plots 3, 10 and 13 would be adversely affected by way of an overbearing impact, loss of light and loss of privacy from adjacent units within the site and groundwork terracing while insufficient accessible amenity space has been provided for the occupants of the apartment buildings, in particular Block D.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy HQ/1(n) of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 which requires development to protect the health and amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses from development that is overlooking, overbearing or results in a loss of daylight and promote health and well-being with a high standard of amenity for future users.

NOTE: Plans to be listed on refusal notice:

B100 Rev 1 (Site Location Plan)  
B101 Rev 1 (Site Plan)  
B102 Rev 1 (Proposed Plans)  
B103 Rev 1 (Parking)  
B104 Rev 1 (Site Sections)  
B105 Rev 1 (Retaining Wall Sections)

A101 Rev 1 (Building E Floor Plans)

A102 Rev 1 (Building E Elevations)  
A103 Rev 1 (Building E Sections)  
A103 (Building B and C Floor Plans)  
A104 (Building B and C Elevations)  
A105 (Building B and C Sections)  
A105 Rev 1 (Building D Floor Plans)  
A106 Rev 1 (Building D Floor Plans)  
A107 Rev 1 (Building D Elevations)  
A108 Rev 1 (Building D Sections)  
A108 (3 Bed House Plans)  
A108 (3 Bed End House Plans)  
A109 (4 Bed End House Plans)  
A109 (4 Bed End House 1 Plans)  
A109 (4 Bed End House 2 Plans)

CSA/4568/117 Rev G (Landscape Masterplan)

### **Background Papers:**

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
- South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)
- Planning File References: 21/02477/FUL, 21/02476/REM, 21/03045/S106A, 20/03756/FUL, 20/03755/REM and S/0746/15/OL