

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 10th May 2006
AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

S/1846/04/F - Longstanton

Balancing Pond and Scheme of Ditch Widening to serve Approved Residential and Commercial Development, Land west of Longstanton for Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd.

Recommendation: Approval

Site and Proposal

1. The 2.3 hectare application site lies in the countryside to the north west of Longstanton adjacent to the C191 Gravel Bridge Road. The land is at present in agricultural use. There are no significant trees affected by the proposal.
2. The full application, received 2nd September 2004, proposes the construction of a surface water balancing pond to cater for run-off from the commercial and residential development envisaged in the Illustrative Master Plan for the land west of the High Street, and included as allocated land in the Inset No.67 (Longstanton) of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. The application site is outside the allocated land and is north of the consented village bypass. The pond is triangular in shape, with sides of approximately 170 metres length. It is intended to have a storage volume of 20,000 cubic metres.
3. This flow-balancing pond will accommodate flows within Longstanton Brook whilst Webb's Hole Sluice is closed during periods of high water levels in the River Great Ouse System. The application includes measures to regrade the existing ditch, which is an award drain, that extends to Longstanton High Street, in accordance with the consent issued by the Environment Agency.
4. The application conforms to the approach indicated in the previously agreed 'Statement on Principles of Storm Water Drainage, Development at Home Farm, Longstanton for Persimmon Homes East Midlands Ltd'. This statement has been accepted by South Cambridgeshire District Council, the Environment Agency and the Middle Level Commissioners.
5. The application is accompanied by landscaping proposals to the balancing pond, ecology statements including a water vole survey and an archaeological evaluation.
6. I have issued a screening opinion to the effect that the application is not required to be accompanied by a formal environmental impact assessment under the relevant regulations.

Relevant Planning History

7. Planning Permission for this development was granted by Decision Notice dated 11th November 2005. On 6th February 2006 the High Court issued a Consent Order quashing the Planning Permission and remitting for re-determination by this Council. The application for judicial review by Peter Stroud, the landowner, cited that the

planning permission had been granted notwithstanding that the resolution of 2nd February 2005 Committee to require a Section 106 Agreement to secure payment of a commuted sum to cover increased maintenance costs along the award drain resulting from the development had not taken place.

8. Outline planning permission **S/0682/95/O** for the provision of B1050 bypass, 21ha housing, 6.3ha business park, 2.8ha recreation area extension and related provision was granted 16th October 2000. The application was accompanied by an Illustrative Master Plan. Condition no.9 of the consent states: '*No development shall commence until a phased scheme for the disposal of foul and surface water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and no development shall take place other than in accordance with the approved scheme*'. Condition no.18 states, '*Within each phase none of the dwellings or business premises shall be occupied until the surface water drainage in accordance with details approved in accordance with condition 9 and required to serve that phase, shall have been constructed in accordance with such approved details*'. An informative attached to the permission states, '*Full details of surface water flow attenuation and associated storage areas will be required. Any designs should allow for an equivalent maximum discharge of 3 l/s/developed hectare within 1:100 year long and short duration storms being considered in terms of water volume produced*'.
9. **S/1762/03/RM** – 91 dwellings and ancillary works (Phase 1) approved 22.12.03
10. An appeal against refusal to vary Condition 16 of **S/0682/95/O** to allow the construction of more than 500 dwellings was dismissed on 29th November 2004.
11. **S/2069/04/RM** – reserved matters application for 153 dwellings (Phase 2) following refusal of S/0696/04/RM for 200 dwellings by Members at the Development and Conservation Control Committee on 6th October 2004 was approved on 5th May 2005. An appeal against the refusal of the reserved matters for 200 dwellings was allowed on 23rd August 2005. The Inspector granted consent for the erection of 196 dwellings.
12. **S/0625/06/RM** - reserved matters application for 87 dwellings and ancillary works (Phase 3A) is pending.

Planning Policy

13. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003: **Policy P6/4** (Drainage): new development will be expected to avoid exacerbating flood risk locally and elsewhere by utilising water retention areas or other forms of sustainable drainage systems for the disposal of surface water run-off.
14. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: **Policy CS5** (Flood Protection) – planning permission will not be granted for development where this is likely to increase flood risk in areas downstream due to additional surface water runoff, unless it is demonstrated that the effects can be overcome by appropriate alleviation and mitigation measures, and secured by planning conditions or planning obligation providing the necessary improvements which would not damage interests of nature conservation.
15. The proposal is designed to cater for surface water runoff from land allocated for residential and commercial development in the Inset Plan 67 (Longstanton) **Policies 1, 2 and 3** of the Local Plan 2004.

Consultation

16. All consultees have been re-consulted. Their comments are reported below:

17. **Longstanton Parish Council** - recommends refusal. It comments as follows:

"The current drainage plan for Home Farm, including balancing pond, was approved on the basis of its suitability to serve 500 homes whereas it now has to serve 43 further homes (the increase agreed for Phase 2) and potentially significantly more than that. It would therefore be reckless to approve any drainage strategy that cannot cope with more than 500 homes. One of the results of the Phase II appeal was that the planning inspector concluded that PPG3 should be applied to a reserve matters application even though the outline consent had been granted prior to PPG.

By direct consequence to this precedent, PPG25 should also apply to all new Home Farm applications. Therefore, hard engineering solutions such as a balancing pond (that the developers' own engineer described as requiring "expert tuning") are not preferred. The reasoning in PPG25 is clear: such solutions may fail over time. Mechanical solutions, where the correctness on the "tuning" will not be proven until a flood event, are clearly a danger in the short term as well as for longer term maintenance. Given that the houses have still been given consent to be built in a flood risk area, the only sensible way to providing a failsafe flood risk mitigation solution to Home Farm is to divert Longstanton Brook.

The Longstanton Parish Council therefore recommends the following:

- (a) A new drainage strategy needs to be approved by the District Council which is compliant with PPG25 as outlined above. Specifically, the drainage plan must be strategic, not merely reactive to each new application that pushes the total housing stock higher.
- (b) The District Council should now re-evaluate this new drainage application in light of currently-proposed housing numbers. Only at that point can approval of any further development applications be entertained.
- (c) No housing (whether already approved or not) must be permitted to be developed until the approved drainage system is fully operational."

18. **Bar Hill Parish Council** – recommends approval of the application.

19. **Over Parish Council** - makes no recommendation.

20. **Willingham Parish Council** - makes no recommendation. "It is well outside the Parish boundary and appears to have little impact on Willingham Parrish."

21. **Swavesey Parish Council** - recommends approval but comments: "Building work on the new dwellings continues rapidly, however, the drainage arrangements are still not finally approved or even started. A condition of the planning permission would have been that drainage arrangements are to be in place before any dwellings are moved into, will this still be the case?"

22. **Environment Agency** – comments:

"The Environment Agency is satisfied, in principle, that the proposal offers a prudent method for surface water drainage to serve the proposed development. Please also see earlier comments made in respect of the application.

It is essential, to protect third parties from the increased risk of flooding, that the balancing pond construction and the full ditch widening works are undertaken, without further delay, and preferably prior to further residential development on the Home Farm Site."

In response to **Longstanton Parish Council's** comments, the Agency comments:

"Whilst the Agency's policy is to recommend and encourage sustainable drainage, wherever possible, at present we unfortunately have no power to insist upon a specific methodology.

Currently, the Agency comments upon the integrity of a developer's proposal with the view of achieving a system which is capable of adequately serving the development, and reducing the risk of flooding to existing property.

It should also be noted that in some instances, due to geology and other site constraints, wholly sustainable drainage systems are not appropriate.

In respect of the Home Farm site, the balancing pond is part of the drainage strategy which includes widening of the watercourse, which in itself offers a degree of sustainability. A maintenance scheme will also be secured through a legal agreement, I have no reason to believe that this will not be entirely satisfactory.

Finally, in respect of the site's location within the indicative floodplain, the maps are wholly indicative and only intended to be used as guidance. The floodrisk assessment originally submitted with the Home Farm application satisfactorily demonstrated that the site was at minimal risk of flooding within the design parameters required by PPG25."

23. **Middle Level Commissioners** – supports the application. Although the site is outside the Board's area, there are possible implications for flooding from the tributaries of Swavesey Drain. It further comments:

"Previously, the Environment Agency has indicated that this watercourse is close to capacity during high rainfall events and any additional unregulated discharges could exacerbate flooding the Board's area due to overtopping of the adjacent flood defence embankments.

The Commissioners, on the Board's behalf, agreed suitable land drainage/flood defence negotiations with the applicant's consultant and the Environment Agency to ensure that this development does not detrimentally affect the Board's area. It has been agreed that a flow-balancing pond will be constructed near Gravel Bridge to accommodate flows within Longstanton Brook whilst Webb's Hole Sluice is closed during periods of high water levels in the River Great Ouse System.

During the above

24. **Old West Internal Drainage Board** – no comments.

25. **Cambridge Water Company** – no objection to the resubmitted application. It was pleased that the pond has been off-set to avoid the line of its 12" cast iron water

main. However, it suggests trial holes be set out to ensure that the ditch widening does not affect the water main.

26. **Ecology Officer** - refers to previous comments. He is satisfied that the working procedures and design of the pond, and proposed planting are acceptable. He recommends a condition that the developer should provide monthly position updates to enable the Local Planning Authority to monitor the mitigation works.
27. **English Nature** - has no further comments to add to previously submitted comments, which were that the proposed working methods for the balancing pond and ditch widening are appropriate to safeguard the presence of water voles on this site. EN recommends that a condition be attached to any permission granted to ensure the works are implemented as proposed.

28. **County Archaeological Office** – comments:

"An archaeological evaluation was conducted in the area of the balancing pond last September (05) which revealed only very few unimportant archaeological remains. We do not consider it necessary to conduct any further archaeological work in advance of the balancing pond and indicated this viewpoint to you in relation to the former application when we recommended that the archaeological condition be discharged. Similarly, it is our opinion that the archaeological mitigation schemes for the houses and access/service roads for the new settlement areas to the south will provide satisfactory mitigation of the archaeological resource known to exist in this area and that the ditch widening scheme can be regarded as secondary to those mitigation schemes, bringing little more to add to the overall interpretation/reconstruction of prehistoric to Medieval land use.

We do not consider that an archaeological scheme would be required on any planning consent awarded to this development."

29. **Council's Landscape Design Officer** has no objections.

30. **The Council's Land Drainage Manager**, has commented as follows upon the views of Longstanton Parish Council:

"Regarding the overall number of properties within the development area, as we discussed, this has not changed. The overall strategy (agreed with the Environment Agency and checked and approved by the Middle Level Commissioners on behalf of the Swavesey IDB) is still applicable and original calculations will not need to be modified unless the overall impermeable area has altered.

With regard to the brook diversion, the developers have demonstrated to the Agency and local IDB that the scheme will not increase the flood risk to the village. A diversion would indeed improve the situation but the Home Farm scheme does not depend on a diversion or require one to be put in place.

I can only assume that the 'expert tuning' referred to by the Parish related to the level of the weir crest at the balancing pond. This is to be monitored by the Agency and if required, slight modifications will be made to the crest level. This is a relatively minor matter and the scheme would not have received approval if it was likely to have a serious impact on the overall strategy."

31. **Fire and Rescue Service** has no comments on the application.

32. **The Trees and Landscape Officer** has no objection. The balancing pond should be able to accommodate the hedgeline, which abuts an existing drain on the northern boundary. The field has been cultivated in the past and consequently ploughing would have affected any rooting systems that were present.

Representations

33. Marron's Solicitors, acting for Peter Stroude, landowner, comments:
- "1. Our client has no objection in planning terms for the construction of a balancing reservoir and associated works as described in the planning application made by Persimmon Homes.
 - 2. It is our view that the Committee originally required, as a pre-condition to the development, that appropriate provisions were in place prior to the commencement of development to ensure the future maintenance of this facility.
 - 3. This balancing reservoir will serve not only the development presently under construction by Persimmon (91 houses) but also the remaining 410 and possibly considerably more as well as the business park and the other facilities approved by the outline planning permission for the Longstanton development in October 2000. In such circumstances it is important that the facility to which the adopted surface water system on site will drain should be adopted by the authority and maintained in accordance with its statutory powers.
 - 4. Persimmon Homes have a contractual right to construct and maintain the facility in the future. It is entirely inappropriate that the drainage requirements of an extensive area should be maintained and discharged by Persimmon when they will have no future interest in the site, or correspondingly, by the Council acting simply as an agent for a private company.
 - 5. Persimmon have made no attempt to consult our client, Peter Stroude, about the future maintenance of this facility. In our view it is inappropriate that the landowner has not been included in the arrangements for future maintenance. His property rights are immediately adversely affected by such an arrangement. The contractual right is expressed in general terms and none of the details required for satisfactory maintenance are set out. The ultimate responsibility and immediate liability will be with Mr Stroude as the owner of the facility.
 - 6. The future maintenance of this facility should be dealt with as follows:
 - (i) The contributions referred to in paragraph 7 of the Land Drainage Advisory Group's report of 14th October 2005 can be paid to the District Council.
 - (ii) Mr Stroude, as the owner of the land, will give consideration to entering into an agreement with the District Council which confers all of the appropriate powers by contract in addition to those which the District Council has by statute. The agreement will identify access arrangements and deal with liabilities and insurance as well as the

maintenance schedule which you have proposed in your letter of 8th March."

34. One resident of High Street understands that the development of the site was conditional on adequate drainage and balancing ponds being constructed. As the development was on a flood plain there could be repercussions for houses in the village. If work cannot now take place no more building or occupation of houses should continue until the ditches and pond are completed. An enforcement order could be issued until the condition of development is met.
35. A second resident of High Street comments as follows:

"This drainage scheme is dependent on the Swavesey Drain for removing water from all its associated ditches and balancing pond to the River Great Ouse via the Webbs Hole sluice. The Swavesey Drain also carries water from the Longstanton Brook to the River Great Ouse plus all the additional water after Gravel Bridge.

The Swavesey Drain/Longstanton Brook primary use now is as a storm drain and its secondary use is that of land drainage. The intended use when it was built in the 19/20 century must have always been for it to drain the agricultural land in the area. It was never designed to carry storm water for all the developments that have occurred since its construction. It is the speed of run-off of water from all the areas that have been built on, covered in concrete and road building that is now the cause of problems. Because of this change of use it cannot cope with existing storm water volumes and so would not be able to support removal of the additional storm water that will be generated by the Home Farm development.

See photographs taken in the Spring of 2005. Over Road/High Street and Home Farm development (attached to the application file).

It is development of a comprehensive plan beyond Gravel Bridge that is required to make the above application a viable proposal.

Balancing Pond

The proposal states that as the water levels in the Swavesey Drain builds up to close to the "spilling over bank" levels the excess water will bleed into the balancing pond. This will deal with storm water surges in the area and from Home Farm development, and will prevent flooding as long as the excess water still has access via Webbs Hole sluice to the River Great Ouse.

When the Webb Hole Sluice is closed due to high water levels in the Great Ouse River, usually wintertime, when the expected rainfall in the local area is going to peak, flooding is a possibility. With the additional 20,000 sq.m. of "flood plain" provided by the balancing pond, this risk is reduced by the capacity of the balancing pond. This must be beneficial to the drainage scheme in the area.

What must be considered is Home Farm development putting more water into the drainage system than the balancing pond can take, therefore increasing the risk of winter flooding.

As a short term expedient to prevent flooding it should be approved and be included in any long-term solution to the removal of surface water.

Ditch Widening

Ditch widening will be useful in that it will provide an additional capacity for surge water and for water storage during periods when the flood plains become operative. The only draw back to ditch widening is that the water flows more quickly and this causes scouring of the banks. Instances of this can be seen in the Longstanton Brook, between 750 and 1000mm has been lost from the brook sides. Some time in the future the path to No. 70 and 72 High Street will require remedial work due to bank erosion caused by scouring.

The Proposal

This proposal should be approved as an interim solution to help to prevent flooding due to storm surges and for the removal of water for phase 1 and phase 2 of the Home Farm development.

The proposal may not be able to deal with the volumes of water and storm surges created by the 3 phases of the Home Farm development.

Consideration

If the Longstanton Brook was to be joined to the proposed drainage system south of Longstanton, water from Bar Hill could be diverted from Longstanton thus reducing the risk of flooding.

Conclusion

The underlying problem to drainage in the area and also drainage for the Home Farm development remains the Swavesey Drain beyond Gravel Bridge and up to Webbs Hole sluice. Like roads, which are re-designed to deal with the increase in volume of traffic they have to carry, ditches, drains and watercourse need to be widened, made deeper and new watercourses built to carry the extra volumes of water that development creates. This has not happened in the past.

A local proposal to solve a development's drainage problem without considering an overall solution creates flooding. The Swavesey Drain cannot handle water volumes at the moment so pushing more water into it is not the solution. The authorities should be looking at finding a scaleable scheme to deal with increasing volumes of water that Home Farm and future developments will create."

36. A resident of Few Lane comments:

"We understood that a balancing pond and ditch widening was an essential part of this scheme in order to provide proper drainage for the Home Farm site which is being built on a flood plain as well as preventing further flooding by holding back excess water from Swavesey. If this is the case then surely development on Home Farm Phase 1 Persimmons site 91 homes and Phase II George Wimpey, Kingsoak etc. should be halted until this is sorted? The houses are being built very quickly and occupied almost immediately. We also understand that the overall figure for dwellings on this entire estate is likely to exceed the original 500 homes. Therefore an efficient flood drainage system constructed with the additional capacity to cope with extra housing is of the utmost importance. It is better to have a pond that is larger than one that is too small. This winter has been exceptionally dry and the Longstanton Brook is very low but that can quickly alter should we have a spell of high rainfall.

Many residents suffered flooding to their homes in October 2001 when the High Street was turned into a river. The damage caused to homes and gardens by surface water and sewage is something that local people are naturally anxious should not happen again. To allow all these houses to be built on a site without the required flood defences and water management schemes is foolhardy to say the least. We hope that the District Council will ensure that proper measures are taken by these developers to safeguard the new and existing homes of the residents of Longstanton from any increased risk by flooding from the overdevelopment of Home Farm even if this means putting a halt to any more building on this site until the previously agreed planning conditions are in place."

37. A resident of Station Road objects and includes photographs of floods in October 2001. The ground of objection are summarised as follows:
- (a) Balancing Pond and ditch widening will increase the risk of flooding in Longstanton. Webb Hole Sluice (WHS) gate is closed when water levels rise in the River Great Ouse. This will happen more frequently in the future due to climate change and predicted wetter winters.
 - (b) The proposed by-pass will create more bridges over the Brook and ditches and will add more culverts. This will create further problems within Longstanton brook, will reduce the size of the floodplain and put many more houses at risk of flooding.
 - (c) The Balancing Pond will prevent adjoining land from being drained properly and such land will be environmentally affected by the Balancing Pond.
 - (d) the Home farm Planning Permission should be reconsidered and reviewed through the LDF inquiry, given that it is inter-connected with the Northstowe Area Action Plan and proposals to promote land west of Station Road as part of Northstowe.
 - (e) Therefore, it will be premature to consider the application for a balancing pond, as it does not take into account the other proposed developments south east and north of Longstanton that will increase water flow within the Longstanton Brook.

Planning Comments

38. The main issue raised is whether the proposed works are sufficient to cater for the consented residential and commercial development pursuant to outline planning permission S/0682/95/O. This issue has been examined in detail by the developers, and their conclusions as set out in the 'Statement on Principles of Storm Water Drainage, Development at Home Farm, Longstanton for Persimmon Homes East Midlands Ltd (revision 1)' has received the agreement of this Council as a Drainage Authority, Environment Agency and Middle Level Commissioners.
39. The statement on Principles of Storm Water Drainage makes it clear that the volume of storage available within the attenuation pond is equivalent to the maximum storm water discharge from a 100 year storm event for the whole of the Home Farm Development, arising over a period of three weeks. On that basis the Drainage Authorities have approved the scheme in compliance with condition 9 of the outline planning permission.

40. Moreover, the Environment Agency would wish to enter a Section 30 Agreement under the Anglian Water Authority Act 1977 with the landowner to ensure protection of the balancing system in perpetuity with the development.
41. The outline planning permission (see Paragraph 8 above) was limited by conditions to no more than 500 dwellings and 12,500 sq.m. business floorspace. Approvals of reserved matter consents for Phases 1 and 2 residential fall within the 500 dwelling limit. Once that limit is reached, any further development will require planning permission and an assessment of drainage and other infrastructure requirements. No application has been approved, which would involve the construction of more than 500 dwellings.
42. The approved drainage scheme does not rely on any diversion of Longstanton Brook. Planning Policy Guidance 25 (PPG), "Development and Flood Risk", indicates at Paragraph 41 that:

"The restriction and reduction of surface water run-off from new developments can be encouraged by the provision of surface water storage areas, flow limiting devices in conjunction with surface or sub-surface storage or, where ground conditions permit, the use of infiltration areas or soakaways."

This scheme accords with this objective by the provision of a surface water storage area and flow-limiting device. It also accords with Policies P6/4 of the Structure Plan and CS5 of the Local Plan.

43. Moreover, advice in PPG25 upon sustainable drainage systems does include a range of options, including basins and ponds. There is no reason to re-evaluate this approved drainage scheme. I am re-assured in this view by the comments of the Environment Agency, Land Drainage Manager and Ecologist.
44. Development is proceeding on site and houses are being occupied. At the January 4th meeting, Committee authorised that appropriate enforcement of condition 18 of the outline planning permission be undertaken in two months time, if necessary. Notices will have been served by the date of this meeting to prevent further occupation until the scheme approved in accordance with Condition 9 of the same permission has been implemented.
45. The Council's Land Drainage Manager has prepared a specification for maintenance works to the proposed pond and associated award drain. It has been agreed with Persimmon. This follows this Council's decision to agree to adopt the maintenance of the Balancing Pond at Home Farm, Longstanton on the payment of a commuted sum to be agreed. Two contributions have been agreed with Persimmon Homes Ltd; the first for Pond and Control Structures; and the second for Drain and Ditch works.

The maintenance specification has been sent to Marrons Solicitors, acting for Peter Stroud, for comments. His position is that a properly drawn maintenance agreement is necessary where he is relieved of all liability and indemnified against risk by an authority acting under statutory powers. Indeed Marrons will be drafting an agreement.

46. The commuted sums for future maintenance currently offered by Persimmon can be incorporated into such an agreement, as well as access arrangements.
47. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed balancing pond and ditch widening will increase the risk of flooding or prevent adjoining land from being drained. Finally

Northstowe will be drained by means of a sustainable system taking surface water eastwards to a series of balancing lakes or lagoons parallel to the former St Ives railway line. Natural drainage is hence to the north east. There is no connection with the proposed Home Farm Balancing Pond.

Recommendation

48. Subject to the prior completion of the necessary maintenance, commuted sums and access agreement between the Council, as Drainage Authority, Persimmon and Peter Stroud, as land owner, approve as amended by drawing EO459/65 Rev E franked 10th October 2005, subject to:
1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 5 years from the date of this permission.
(Reason - To ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development which have not been acted upon.)
 2. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping (Drawing JBA 03/120 08A as amended by the substitution of seed mix EM3 for EM1) shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the completion of the development; and any plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.
(Reason - To enhance the quality of the development and to assimilate it within the area.)
 3. Within an appropriate survey season (May to October), a Water Vole Survey shall be undertaken of the Longstanton Drain within the application site in order to establish **the current** distribution of the species, particularly with respect to the connection between the balancing pond and the Longstanton Drain. Should water voles be found to be present then:
 - 1) A Water Vole Mitigation Scheme shall be presented to the Local Planning Authority for written approval prior to the connection of the balancing pond to the Longstanton drain, or the completion of works to the Longstanton Drain.
 - 2) Subsequent to works commencing, an ecologist shall be employed by the applicant to ensure that the Water Vole Mitigation Scheme is suitably implemented. Bi-monthly position statements shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority until such time that all works associated with the development are completed.
 - 3) Following completion of the works (to both the balancing pond and the Longstanton Drain) a Water Vole Survey of the Longstanton Drain shall be undertaken in the next suitable survey period in order to monitor the impact of the implemented works. Should the Water Vole Mitigation Scheme be found to have been inadequate then appropriate habitat compensation measures for water voles should be proposed in order to address any shortfalls of the Water Vole Mitigation Scheme.

- 4) Any variation from the approved Water Vole Mitigation Scheme shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to being implemented.
 (Reason - To minimise harm and disturbance to the water vole, a protected species and to ensure compliance with Local Plan 2004 Policy EN13 and PPS9.)
4. The balancing pond, hereby permitted, shall not be constructed in phases and shall not be constructed other than in its entirety to provide the approved 20,000 cubic metres of storage volume specified on approved drawing EO459/65/E.
 (Reason - To provide a satisfactory surface water drainage scheme for Home Farm development and to avoid exacerbating flooding downstream.)

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:
P6/4 (Drainage)
 - b) South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004:
CS5 (Flood Protection)
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations, which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - **Surface water disposal**
 - **Ecological impact**
 - **Flooding**

General

Environment Agency and Land Drainage Manager's comments.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Applications S/0682/95/O, S/1762/03/RM, S/2069/04/RM, S/0696/04/RM and S/1846/04/F;

Contact Officer: David Rush - Development Control Quality Manager
 Telephone: (01954) 713153