

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

3 November 2010

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director (Operational Services)/
Corporate Manager (Planning and New Communities)

S/1297/10/F - CROYDON

**Change of Use to Holiday Lets with Ancillary Swimming Pool and Games Room at
Croydon Farm, Lower Road for Mr and Mrs Moon**

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 11 October 2010

Notes:

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination, as the Officer recommendation is contrary to the response from the Parish Council on material planning grounds

Site and Proposal

1. The application site measures approximately 0.33ha of land comprising unused agricultural buildings. The majority of the courtyard buildings are single storey and of timber construction. The two buildings to the south of the site are open storage buildings comprising concrete posts with corrugated metal sheet roofing. The site is located on the south of the B1042 in the Parish of Croydon outside of the village framework boundaries. It is close to the Parish of Tadlow, although again some distance from the Tadlow framework boundaries. The sites situation in the countryside and the existing character is reflective of its old use. The site is accessed from the north off the B1042 and shares access with a livery yard and car repair use located to the east of the application site. To the west is Croydon Farm House, this was once associated with the farm use but is now a stand alone residential dwelling. To the north and south is open countryside. The neighbouring uses are all closely knitted together and it is apparent to see that this was once one large site that has since been split up into different uses. It still retains a very agricultural character.
2. The full application received 5 August 2010 proposes the change of use of the agricultural buildings to holiday lets. The application proposes the existing buildings be converted into four separate units with a total of 11 bedrooms. The change of use also includes a games room/store/office building and an indoor swimming pool, both of which are to be used in connection with the holiday lets. The scheme provides 11 parking spaces on site, including 1 disabled parking bay and two for staff/owner. Submitted with the application are a draft legal agreement, a landscaping plan, Design and Access Statement, Bat, Owl and Ecology surveys, Structural Statement, Foul Sewerage and Utilities assessment, Phase One Desk Study, and a Planning Statement.

Planning History

3. **S/1092/08/F** – Change of use from agricultural barn to residential dwelling – Refused.

4. **S/0425/07/F** – Extension and change of use from agricultural barn to Swimming pool – Refused.
5. **S/2335/06/F** – Extension and change of use from agricultural barn to Swimming pool – Refused.
6. **S/1068/05/F** – Conversion of Agricultural Buildings to 4 Holiday lets – Approved subject to S106 Agreement.
7. **S/1190/01/F** – Stables, Tackroom and Menage (Retrospective) and proposed exerciser for horses – Approved.
8. **S/0307/93/F** – Conversion and Extension to Existing workshop to 3 light industrial units – Approved.
9. **S/0308/07/F** – Change of use from agricultural buildings to light industrial – Approved.

Planning Policy

10. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD, adopted July 2007:

DP/1 - Sustainable Development

DP/2 - Design of New Development

DP/3 - Development Criteria

DP/7 - Development Frameworks

ET/10 - Tourist Facilities and Visitor Accommodation

NE/6 – Biodiversity

11. Supplementary Planning Documents, adopted 2009:

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted July 2010

District Design Guide SPD – Adopted March 2010

12. **Circular 11/95 (The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions)** - Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.
13. **Circular 05/2005 (Planning Obligations)** - Advises that planning obligations must be relevant to planning, necessary, directly relevant to the development to be permitted, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respects.

Consultations

14. **Tadlow Parish Council** recommends refusal, stating:

At a parish meeting on 20 September 2010, there was unanimous consent to requesting that the Planning Application either is:

15. **REJECTED** - on the basis that the traffic on the B1042 being at an unregulated speed (i.e. the national limit) it would be unsafe for existing traffic and additional traffic to be joining and leaving the carriageway, including during the construction period.

Previous planning applications in the village that required to access the B1042, and were within the 50mph limit, have been rejected on the basis of road safety. Therefore approval of this application would be unjust and inequitable.

Or

16. **APPROVED** - subject to a Section 106 agreement being entered into and agreed prior to approval being given by the Council, that the following traffic calming measures be funded and undertaken, before any part of the proposed development is commenced:
- (a) Reduction of the current 50mph limit to 40mph on the B1042
 - (b) Extension of the above said speed limit on the B1042, to at least 400 metres to the East of the proposed development, extending to its current end point at the West, close to the County boundary
 - (c) To lay double white lines to the full extent of the whole of the area in which the new 40mph speed limit is operable, i.e. from the current end near the County boundary, in the Parish of Tadlow, to the Eastern-most point of the 40mph speed limit, which would lie within the Parish of Croydon.

Notes:

17. The basis for forming the conclusion that the B1042 is unsafe is based on the following:
- (a) There have been 2 fatal accidents on the B1042 since 2008, between the A1198 and the County boundary
 - (b) In about the same period, there has been one fatal accident on the B1042, in Eyeworth, in the County of Bedfordshire
 - (c) Other accidents have occurred, which have not been fatal, leading to costs and damage to road users, adjoining residents and also to the County Council, from repairing road signage
 - (d) The costs of the above measures will be met by the property owner/applicant, who shall provide an legal undertaking to the Council, and place sufficient funds to carry out the works in a separate bank account monitored by trustees, to be jointly agreed and appointed by the Chairs of the Parishes of Tadlow and Croydon.
18. The reason for promoting road-calming measures is:
- (a) Frequent traffic offences are occurring in Tadlow Parish, from speeding above the current 50mph and 60mph limits, and overtaking across the current double white lines, leading to accidents, costs and fatalities.
 - (b) Traffic calming will enable businesses to locate safely to the Parish, leading to a stable future and prospects for local employment from small and medium enterprises (SME) locating in Tadlow
 - (c) There will be prospects for the village to be able to sustain future growth, and to provide funding for services in the future, if SMEs are encouraged to locate, or relocate into the Parish.

- (d) Tadlow is one of the five smallest Parishes in South Cambridgeshire, and therefore unlikely to figure highly on the District's priorities for funds, therefore we need to be self-sustaining.
19. **Croydon Parish Council** recommends approval but also states the following:
- "Whilst the Council has no significant objections to the development the B1042 is a fast and dangerous road and access and exit to the site will be extremely hazardous. During the speed limit review, the 50MPH limit should be extended from Toll Bar Cottage to Tadlow and long visibility splays added, before the site is operational. Bat and owl boxes should be erected as Council is concerned about loss of habitat for these creatures."
20. **Ecology Officer** - I am happy to accept the findings of the Barn Owl and Bat surveys. Whilst it is accepted that there are no Barn Owls nesting at the site a barn owl nest box should be secured through condition to ensure that the application delivers enhancements.
21. **Environmental Health Officer** - raises no objections with regards to noise or environmental pollution.
22. **Environmental Health Officer (Contaminated Land)** - I wish to confirm that I have received a copy of the above application, in particular the "Phase One Desk Study Report, June 20102" by Richard Jackson, and have considered the implications of the proposals.
- The above report has been sent to an external consultant for review (see attached) and I am in agreement with their recommendation that further information is required. I therefore recommend that no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until:
- (a) The application site has been subject to a detailed scheme for the investigation and recording of contamination and remediation objectives have been determined through risk assessment and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- (b) Detailed proposals for the removal, containment or otherwise rendering harmless any contamination (the Remediation method statement) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- (c) The works specified in the remediation method statement have been completed, and a validation report submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the approved scheme.
- (d) If, during remediation works, any contamination is identified that has not been considered in the remediation method statement, then remediation proposals for this material should be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
23. **Environment Operations Manager** has not commented to date. Members will be updated on any comments received prior to the Committee meeting.
24. **Local Highways Authority** - Raises no objection and provides the following comments:

Prior to commencement of the development visibility splays with dimensions 2.4 metres by 215 metres as measured from and along the nearside edge of the carriageway shall be provided on both sides of the access. The area within each

splay shall be kept clear of any obstruction exceeding 600mm in height at all times. A condition should be added requiring that the access be provided as shown on the approved drawings and a width access of 5 metres provided for a minimum distance of ten metres from the highway boundary and retained free of obstruction.

25. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** has not commented to date. Members will be updated on any comments received prior to the Committee meeting.
26. **Trees Officer** - Raises no objections
27. **Landscape Officer** - I should like landscape conditions applied. I suggest that on the north side the patio areas should be enclosed by hedge rather than picket fence. However the subdivisions could be created from the picket fence. Hornbeam would be satisfactory. The same arrangement should apply to the rear patios on the south side of the development. Hedges will unify the scheme, concealing the paraphernalia of holidaymakers.
28. **Building Control Manager** – The report by Gawn Associates of the structural suitability of the above barns is a reasonable analysis of the existing buildings. A more detailed programme of works would be requested before work commences.
29. **Police Planning Liaison Officer** - I have not been to see the site, but the photos within the application gives a good indication of a farmyard in decline. The original plans show a gate, whereas the plans submitted for the holiday lets shows no such barrier. In view of the location, the perimeter is not easily accessible from outside from the south/west and eastern elevations; therefore the planned boundary treatment would be fine.
30. Having looked at the plans and elevations, I note with interest the planned defensible space, especially that leading from the northern elevation. I suppose picket fencing would be a reasonable treatment albeit would suggest a) it be of sufficient height (1.4m) & b) that it be possible to secure the gate from inside. Otherwise it would be possible to walk off the green to the front and into the two apartments via open French doors.
31. The only other thing of note is the cycle storage area. I feel the location of the farm with the main route outside it is probably unlikely too many will cycle. However Sheffield style hoops within a covered cycle space would be fine. Would parking for four cycles be adequate given there are 2 x 2 b/r, 1 x 3 b/r and 1 x 4 b/r apartments proposed.
32. There would be no grounds to object to this proposal from a crime reduction or community safety perspective. However I would recommend the following:
 - (a) Gate leading from B1042 be retained/updated to enable the site to be shut off, particularly 'out of hours'
 - (b) That external doors meet PAS 24 standards
 - (c) Windows meet BS 7950 standard and be fitted with restrictors to minimise gap when in open position.

Representations

33. One representation has been received from the occupier of Croydon Farm located to the west of the application site. The dwelling is the original farmhouse to the site. This was later split from the redundant barns when Mr and Mrs T Foulds sold the barns to a third party following the receipt of planning consent under S/1068/05/F. The following objections have been raised:

1. **Noise and disturbance**
 - (a) from the users of the holiday lets
 - (b) Loss of privacy
 - (c) Patio areas noise and privacy problems
 - (d) Proposed screening inadequate
2. **Access and Parking**
 - (a) Existing access already heavily used
 - (b) Intensification of vehicles unacceptable
 - (c) Noise and odour pollution from further car use
 - (d) Safety hazard with all vehicles using single access
 - (e) Over provision of parking facilities – unsustainable and not very ‘green’
3. **Application Content**
 - (a) Proper high fencing is required along the shared boundary
 - (b) Application is incorrect that it is not near a water course, a water course runs directly behind the proposed swimming pool area
 - (c) No evidence that there is a reduction in floor area
 - (d) No detailed number of employees given
 - (e) No details of opening hours for the games room/swimming pool. Who will be responsible for keeping things under control? Will staff be there 24/7?
4. **Usage**
 - (a) The application states the site will be controlled via a S106 Agreement, how will this be monitored?
5. **Lighting**
 - (a) Not keen on the central light for the courtyard as it will be visible through our upstairs window and will disturb us if left on.
6. **Contractors**
 - (a) Protection is required during construction and demolition
 - (b) We are very exposed to noise and dust unless protective boarding is erected along our boundary
7. **Plans**
 - (a) The boundary at the southern end of the site is drawn in the wrong place; my boundary is 1.9 metres off the corner barn. This means that the proposed patio opening will be opening onto my garden boundary, which will cause noise and disturbance.
8. **Conclusion**
 - (a) How can it be assured that potentially many more people who are not staying in the holiday lets are not using these facilities?
 - (b) Negative impact on the quality of life and loss of privacy that the change of use will bring.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

34. The key issues to consider in this application are the principle of development, the impact on neighbour amenity, impact on highway safety, impact on the character of the area and the control over the change of use proposed.

Principle of Development

35. Planning Policy ET/10 of the LDFDCP supports changes of use of this kind subject to meeting specific criteria. Planning consent has already been granted for this

under S/1068/05/F and therefore the principle is clearly already established. The structural report indicates that the buildings are still worthy of conversion and the earlier consent could still be implemented under the above reference. The circumstances have marginally changed from the original approval as the site now includes more land to the south to include provision for a games room and swimming pool by utilising the existing building structures to the rear of the site. Additionally, the site is no longer linked with the main dwelling house, Croydon Farmhouse. The application site has since been separated from the unit. At present this property is occupied by family members of the applicant of the original and still extant planning consent.

36. There are design changes to the internal and external layout from the previously approved scheme. All of which have been discussed with officers during pre-application discussions. There are still some reservations with regards to landscaping and fenestration though it is considered by officers that the principle of development is well established and the units are still capable of being used productively. The securing of the units to be used only as holiday lets is an area that needs to be carefully addressed to ensure the impact on the countryside and neighbour amenity is not adversely affected and this is discussed later in the report. It is considered by officers to be a vital part of this scheme if Members are minded to approve the development proposed.

Residential amenity

37. The design of the development has attempted to take on board the separation of the units from the residential farmhouse. The units are very close together and the proper separation of them has to be carefully considered so as not to compromise character without failing to address neighbour amenity.
38. The west facing elevation has no more openings than what was approved under the earlier consent that overlook land in the applicants' ownership. No overlooking is considered possible from these windows if the right level of screening is agreed. It may be possible for the owners of the neighbouring farmhouse to view into the patio area of the holiday let from the first floor. The distance between the two measuring approximately 15metres.
39. There is, however, a new patio area on the west elevation close to the rear garden area of the neighbouring property. This is proposed to be appropriately screened and is considered to present no more disturbance than neighbouring residential properties would. In light of the proposed use, it is very likely to be used less than a regular rear garden patio area. The plan shows the patio area being no deeper than 2.5 metres and opens up to the rear of the site to the south. It is likely that the users of this unit will sit on the area that overlooks the countryside to the south, however, as land in the ownership of the applicant it would seem odd not to incorporate it into the design of the scheme. Whilst it is appreciated this is close to the garden of Croydon Farmhouse officers do not consider this part of the scheme to have an adverse impact on neighbour amenity if the boundary treatment is appropriately agreed.
40. The north facing elevation proposes 6 new openings. This includes two sets of doors opening up to patio areas for units 1 and 2. This is an increase to the originally approved scheme and patio areas were not then included. The distance between the closest patio area to the neighbouring property is approximately 2.5 metres. The proposed boundary treatment along this shared boundary comprises post and rail fencing. An existing boundary of trees and bushes currently separate the site though this is sparse, has large gaps and the front elevation of the house is clearly visible at ground level. It is agreed by officers that this proximity could cause a conflict in neighbour amenity and post and rail fencing may not be appropriate for

the first few metres of this shared boundary. Closer inspection of the plans confirm that the patio area for unit 2 could be moved away from the shared boundary to provide for additional planting that may help towards noise mitigation.

41. The proposed lighting in the centre of the courtyard is not detailed in the application and could be designed to ensure minimal neighbour disturbance. There are windows at first floor of the neighbouring unit that look into the courtyard of the proposed scheme and excessive lighting could have a negative impact on the amenity of the occupiers if not appropriately agreed. Officers consider lighting should be conditioned if members are minded to approve and that the environmental health team are involved in the scheme to be finally agreed.
42. The swimming pool areas and games room are located much further away from the neighbouring property compared to the units. The neighbouring property is approximately 43 metres from the swimming pool building and 38 metres from the proposed games room. The swimming pool will have to be built in accordance with current building regulations and appropriately insulated. Additionally the pool plant area has been specifically located in the furthest part of the building from the neighbouring residential unit. The games room is marginally closer though the units between the house and the proposed games room will mitigate potential noise coming from the building.
43. Whilst it is agreed that the circumstances have changed since the separation of the dwelling and the agricultural units, neighbour amenity issues would have had to be considered during the determination of the previous scheme. Previous correspondence shown on the earlier file between the Council and Heckford and Norton, the then acting solicitor for the applicants, clearly indicated that the applicant would be selling the converted units on to a third party and that the dwelling house was not part of the scheme. This clearly shows that the determination of the previous scheme considered the change of use without tying the dwelling house to the use of the units and thus the impact on neighbour amenity was also considered.
44. Small details to the proposed scheme can help improve neighbour relationships, the majority of which can be conditioned as part of an approval. It is the view of the officers that neighbour amenity will not be adversely affected provided boundary treatment and lighting are appropriately conditioned and the level of holiday use agreed.

Impact on Highway Safety

45. As per paragraph 24 the Local Highway Authority (LHA) do not raise any objections with regard to the proposal subject to the applicant being able to meet the required visibility splays. The Parish Council of Tadlow raise objection to this scheme unless further enhancement to the road can be achieved through a specific S106 Agreement. In light of these requests I have sought further advice from the LHA who give the following additional comments:

“The proposal to require the applicant to reduce the speed limit to 40mph cannot be delivered as the process of doing so is undertaken by a third party, in this case the Highway Authority, under separate legislation, which provides no guarantee of success. Not only that neither the applicant or the Planning Authority has any powers to insist that the Highway Authority undertake the work. If suitable inter-vehicle visibility splays for the current application can be provided, the Highway Authority would be unable to sustain an objection at appeal on the grounds of highway safety.

However, I would suggest that it may be possible to require that the applicant fund and undertake a speed survey to see if the reduction in speed limit as proposed by

the Parish Council would meet the criteria of the Highway Authority. If these were the case, then it might be possible to require the applicant to fund the advertisement of the speed limit reduction and assuming that this in turn were successful, fund the required works. As you will see changing the speed limit has a number of processes to go through and may at any stage fail."

46. Tadlow Parish Council has been appraised of these comments. It wishes to sustain its objection on highway safety grounds and adds the following for consideration:

"In the light of the Highways comment, which you have attached, the Parish's view is that the application should be refused for consistency with previous refusals by South Cambridgeshire, which has been made on the basis of the speed and dangers of the B1042.

Additionally, there was a serious RTA in the evening of 13 October 2010, which resulted in the road being closed for 3 hours. This caused considerable problems for residents of Tadlow and other road users. I have yet to be informed by Cambridgeshire Police, as to whether this was a fatal accident.

In addition to the attached, I have received the comments below regarding the B1042, which are relevant to this application:

- (a) In the last 2 years, motor vehicle accidents have resulted in 2 fatalities on the B1042 between its junction with the B1198 and the county border. There was another fatality on the B1042 in Bedfordshire in the same period.
 - (b) Other incidents involving foot traffic and push bicycles, do not happen as locals realise it is a far too dangerous to use. There is no footpath at all.
 - (c) Overtaking regularly occurs across double white lines
 - (d) Driving misdemeanours take place most frequently in the morning and evening rush hours and at weekends
 - (e) With increasing traffic volumes, another catastrophic accident is more probable
 - (f) Business based planning permissions have been turned down by the local authority due to the speed and frequency of passing traffic, which result in businesses being dissuaded in locating or investing in the parish
 - (g) Further traffic entering and leaving the B1042 will increase the risk of accidents, unless the speed on the B1042 can be successfully lowered.
 - (h) Other villages have either a 30mph or 40mph speed limit
 - (i) By constructing more dwellings, this increases traffic movements, onto and exiting the B1042.
 - (j) As these dwellings are to be holiday lets, people will be unfamiliar with the excessive speeds on the B1042, and this increases risk
 - (k) Pedal cycle storage is indicated in the plans submitted to this application, whereas it is believed that use of pedal cycles is absolutely dangerous to life on the B1042."
47. It is clear to see that there are still major concerns with regard to the development of the holiday lets and the impact on it will have on highway safety.
48. The site was once a working farm and large slow vehicles would have used this access regularly. The level of activity and speed of vehicles has changed over time; however, the location of this site in relation to the village frameworks for both Croydon and Tadlow is some distance away. This is a rural country road and not a high street. Whilst it is appreciated that the road can be dangerous and vehicles do move at high speeds along this stretch of road, drivers do so along the majority of the neighbouring country roads and the Council have little power over the control of this. Driver's familiarity of roads such as these can be very dangerous though it is

considered unreasonable to refuse a scheme where the speed of the vehicles cannot be directly controlled by the applicant and their proposal.

49. The previous application under S/1068/05/F also considered the highway safety implications of this site and took on board the additional uses on the neighbouring sites. The neighbouring garage business is primarily for renovation rather than for repair so the tenant is primarily the only person using the entrance on a daily basis for this specific business use. The Flying Cat Livery Yard next door is a use expected to be in this countryside location and the comings and goings are reflective of its use. The level of use this scheme proposes is very likely to be lower than that of a B1/B2 business use, and far more neighbour friendly than that of a light industrial use that was granted consent in 2007 under planning reference S/0308/07/F
50. The conclusion of officers is that highway safety be appropriately addressed by ensuring the correct visibility splays, as required by the LHA. Anything over and above this is down to whether the applicant wishes to improve the safety of the road for its future users of the holiday lets in line with the LHA specifications.

Impact on the character of the Area

51. The design has tried to keep the scale of the proposed scheme as close to that of the original as possible. The fenestration of the development has changed considerably and the floor to ceiling openings in the previously approved scheme that looked into the courtyard has been changed to smaller openings. There is potential for a higher number of visitors on site than previously approved with an increase of approximately 4 visitors.
52. The parking is contained within the courtyard area and this was also considered an option in the earlier approved scheme. This ensures parking is not visible from outside the site and protects views of the wider countryside. The courtyard is large enough for the required manoeuvrability and by keeping the cars within this courtyard area also allows for natural surveillance, providing a level of security to those using the holiday lets.
53. The buildings to the south of the site are currently shells, with concrete posts and a metal roof. The buildings proposed to replace these will be using materials in keeping with the agricultural surroundings and windows facing the open countryside will be kept to a minimum.
54. Officers are of the view that the proposed designs are in keeping with the surrounding character of the area. Landscaping and lighting will be fundamental to this and this will be conditioned to ensure that urban/alien features are avoided in the vicinity.

S106 Agreement

55. The application was submitted with a draft S106 Agreement detailing the proposed level of use. This is very similar to the agreement that was completed for the previous scheme. However, officers now consider that the wording of that agreement is not appropriate and allows for little control over the level of use of the proposed holiday lets. The wording of the current draft agreement states that the units shall not be occupied at all (meaning no personal possessions other than those of the owner shall remain there) for the period of two consecutive weeks in January in every year or such other two week period as shall have been agreed with the Council in writing. It is considered that this period is too short and a more limited use be given, particularly in light of the separation of the units from the

neighbouring property. It is considered by officers that the agreement, in part, should read as follows:

1. The holiday lets shall not be used or occupied by any person(s) permanently as his/her or their home nor occupied or let upon any terms which provide or confer security of tenure; and they shall not be occupied at all (meaning no personal possessions other than those of the owner that are associated with the holiday lets, shall remain there) for a period of more than 4 consecutive weeks by the same person(s) unless previously been agreed with the Council in writing. Evidence of this will be required from the owner when Council monitoring takes place following the commencement of the use, hereby permitted.
56. Officers consider the above wording allows for a more restricted use, though it still allows the applicant to get the most out of the site and strictly for holiday let purposes. The more constrained agreement also allows for a potentially better neighbour relationship.

Other Matters

57. The employee question on the application has not been answered, as the applicant is unaware of how many staff are likely to be employed at this site at such an early stage of the development. Staff may be employed for cleaning and maintaining the site before and after guests arrive, though at present the number is unknown. There will be no full time accommodation on site for staff and therefore it is considered reasonable that staff are likely to be present on site during normal working hours (8am –6pm). The employment opportunities on site are likely to be predominately cleaning and maintenance and this is unlikely to cause too much noise and disturbance once the development is completed.
58. It is likely that the opening hours of holiday lets are not restricted other than in accordance with the legal agreement over the level of use. It is common with holiday lets that the owner will provide welcome packs with the units to advise of the neighbour situation and that guests respect the neighbours around them, particularly with horses on site next door also.
59. It is agreed that construction noise should be kept within the prescribed timeframes due to neighbour amenity and neighbouring uses.
60. Boundary queries raised by neighbour have been passed on to the applicant and further feedback will be provided to Members once clarification of boundaries has been received.

Recommendation

61. Delegated powers to approve/refuse subject to the approval of the details of the legal agreement agreeing terms of use and the following conditions:
 1. Sc1 – Full Planning Permission time limit
 2. Sc95 – Approved Plans
 3. Sc13 – Materials
 4. Sc5 – Landscape Scheme
 5. Sc6 – Landscape Implementation (Rc6)
 6. Sc27 – Contamination (Rc27)
 7. Sc38 – Noise during construction (Rc38)
 8. Sc23 – Foul Water
 9. Sc24 – Surface Water
 10. Sc20 - Vehicle Visibility (2.4m x 215m)

11. Sc54 – Bird Nest boxes

12. Sc58 – Lighting

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Development Control Policies adopted July 2007.
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, adopted January 2007.
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Supplementary Planning Documents: Biodiversity; District Design Guide.
- Circulars 11/95 and 05/2005.
- Planning File Refs: S/1068/05/F and S/1297/10/F

Contact Officer: Saffron Garner– Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713256