

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

11 May 2011

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

S/1487/10 - FOWLMERE
Ten Affordable Dwellings - Land Adjacent to 4, Cambridge Road
for Mr Darren Blake, Circle Anglia Ltd

Recommendation: Approve Conditionally

Date for Determination: 22 June 2011

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination at the request of the Local Member

Site and Proposal

1. The site is located outside the designated Fowlmere village framework. The site lies outside the Cambridge Green Belt, the boundary of which is located to the eastern side of Fowlmere Road, set to the east of the site. The Cambridge Green Belt continues to the southern side of the rear gardens of the properties to the south side of Thriplow Road.
2. The land currently forms paddock/grassland that is a portion of the "triangle", an area of land located between Thriplow Road, Cambridge Road and Fowlmere Road. The west boundary of the site forms the boundary with the rear gardens of 4 Cambridge Road and Triangle Farm House. There is no physical feature on the site to denote the eastern boundary. To the south of Thriplow Road are a number of dwellings located within the village framework, and to the north of Cambridge Road is a dwelling and yard located outside the framework.
3. The full application, received on 31st August 2010, seeks the erection of ten affordable dwellings on the site. This would represent an "exceptions site". Access would be gained from Cambridge Road. The site has a width of approximately 30m, with a proposed 2m landscaping belt along the eastern edge. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, Housing Need Survey Results, Phase 1 Drainage Strategy, a Building for Life Applicant Checklist, a Code for Sustainable Homes Ecological Assessment, a Phase 1 Geoenvironmental Report, and an Archaeological Evaluation Brief. Amendments have been received dated 23rd March 2011, which show a revised red line to include the landscaping belt, submission of a Site Investigation report, and changes to the site plan and house types.

Planning History

4. There appears to be no planning history for the site.

Policies

5. **Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2007: ST/6** Group Villages
6. **Local Development Framework Development Control Policies (LDF DCP) 2007: DP/1** Sustainable Development, **DP/2** Design of New Development, **DP/3** Development Criteria, **DP/4** Infrastructure and New Development, **DP/7** Development Frameworks, **HG/1** Housing Density, **HG/5** Exceptions Sites for Affordable Housing, **SF/6** Public Art and New Development, **SF/10** Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments, **SF/11** Open Space Standards, **NE/1** Energy Efficiency, **NE/3** Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development, **NE/6** Biodiversity, **NE/9** Water and Drainage Infrastructure, **NE/10** Foul Drainage – Alternative Drainage Systems, **NE/11** Flood Risk, **NE/14** Lighting Proposals, **NE/15** Noise Pollution, **TR/1** Planning for More Sustainable Travel & **TR/2** Car and Cycle Parking Standards.
7. **Open Space in New Developments SPD, Public Art SPD, Trees and Development Sites SPD, Affordable Housing SPD & District Design Guide SPD.**
8. **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.
9. **Circular 05/2005 - Planning Obligations:** Advises that planning obligations must be relevant to planning, necessary, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respect.

Consultations

10. **Fowlmere Parish Council** recommends approval of the originally submitted plans, but wish to seek information regarding guarantees the dwellings will be for local people, the retention of the hedge along Thriplow Road, guarantees of parking numbers, a footpath to be provided linking the site to the village, an extension to the 30mph zone, zero light spillage from the site, a condition regarding bird and bat boxes, information as to how the dwellings would be heated, use of green technologies, and provision of a bin shelter to prevent the loss of the hedge along Thriplow Road (there is currently two openings in the hedge for bins to be collected along Thriplow Road). The design of the dwellings is praised.
11. The **Council's Housing Development and Enabling Manager** notes the 2007 Cambridgeshire ACRE housing needs survey demonstrated there were 28 households in need of affordable housing. The recent January 2011 housing register showed this figure to be 30. The proposal does not exceed local need. All 10 proposed would be social rented, the tenure with the greatest demand in the District. The housing mix is also supported. The site is considered to be well related to the village, and the Design and Access Statement notes Code Level 3 would be met. The application is supported.

12. The **Council's Trees Officer** notes the site has a rural aspect that should be retained. The mature tree to the rear garden of 4 Cambridge Road will be compromised by the access, and a condition seeking an Arboricultural Implication Assessment is requested. There are no objections to the removal of the small newly planted trees at the front of the site. The hedge along Thriplow Road should be retained and not fragmented by paths
13. The **Local Highways Authority** has concerns about the amount of parking to plot 1 of the original plan, and notes that manoeuvring is likely to take place on the adopted public highway. Conditions are requested regarding the retention of vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays, the removal of permitted development rights to allow vehicle access off Thriplow Road for plots 7-10, the drainage of water to ensure it does not affect the public highway, and the material to be used for the highway. An informative regarding works to the public highway is also recommended. In a separate comment, the Local Highway Authority have also added the need for footpaths linking the site to the junction between Cambridge Road and Thriplow Road along both roads.
14. The **Council's Scientific Officer (Contaminated Land)** notes the Desk Study provided and requests a standard contamination condition be added if the application is approved.
15. The **Environment Agency** notes the site is within flood zone 1, and there are no other Agency matters in respect of the scheme. Informatives are proposed.
16. The **Council's Drainage Manager** notes no objections subject to local concerns.
17. The **County Archaeology Team** notes the site has a high archaeological potential, and recommends a standard condition ensuring a scheme of investigation be provided.
18. The **Council's Landscape Officer** seeks to ensure the proposed boundary hedge is within the application site. Some suggestions regarding the landscaping are provided.
19. The **Council's Ecology Officer** has no objection to the scheme, but wishes Natural England to be notified given the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) that lies approximately 75m to the north. This is an aquifer related site that contains specialist plants. The use of soakaways should not adversely impact upon the natural ground water re-charge. A scheme of nest boxes should be sought. There is evidence of barn owl roosting on site, although it appears unsuitable for nesting. Two roost/nesting boxes are also suggested. There are no signs of bats on the existing sheds.
20. **Natural England** states the site is within 70m of the Whittlesford-Thriplow Hummocky Fields SSSI, which contains a series of hollows which are periodically flooded and support rare plants and invertebrates. There is no direct hydrological link from the application site, and little risk of impact upon the water quality. A condition regarding details of ground water contamination prevention is recommended.

Representations

21. The occupiers of **4 Cambridge Road** have concerns regarding increase in noise levels resulting from the construction and the number of residents, highway safety, the lack of footpaths in the site, light spillage, the bin storage area adjacent to the boundary, parking provision, loss of habitat, loss of character, the date of the housing needs survey, and overlooking into rear garden areas. They wish to increase their garden depth to allow further distance between them and any new dwellings.
22. The occupiers of **Triangle Farm, Thriplow Road** object on grounds of inadequate sizes of the plots, and noise and disturbance.
23. The occupiers of **Walnut House, Thriplow Road** object on grounds of the housing needs survey being out of date, the availability of other sites in Fowlmere rather than this green field area, the size of the development (more than 8 dwellings), the loss of landscape features and hedgerows, a lack of parking on the site, impact upon the adjacent SSSI, and highway dangers as the roads are used as a rat run from the M11.
24. The occupiers of **Wetherlee, Thriplow Road** object on grounds of the lack of public consultation, a high density inappropriate for the village, the lack of effort blending the development in with the landscape features, the removal of trees, the importance of the grazing land for wildlife and plants, the lack of a full hydrology survey, the lack of parking on the site, and highway safety issues given the lack of traffic calming measures.
25. The occupiers of **Linburn, Thriplow Road** object to the access to the rear of plots 7-10 on grounds of the loss of the hedge, and the safety of residents. There are also concerns about parking levels on site and the loss of habitat
26. The occupiers of **5 Cambridge Road** note there is a need for affordable housing in the village, but have concerns regarding the amount of parking at the site, and the speed of traffic using Cambridge Road. Traffic calming is suggested.
27. The occupiers of **1 Fowlmere Road** object on the grounds of the design of the dwellings and its density, lack of on site open space, lack of parking provision, segregation of the community and potential crime, ecological implications, flood risk, and loss of agricultural land.
28. The occupiers of **2 Cambridge Road** object on grounds of the density of development, and highway safety given the speed of traffic
29. The occupiers of **Burnaby, Thriplow Road** note concerns regarding the date of the housing needs survey, the size of development, the density of development, the unwelcome precedent of increasing the village envelope, impact upon the rural approach to the village, insufficient parking, the lack of relationship with the rest of the village, the lack of provision for footpaths or traffic calming, and the loss of the hedgerow.
30. The occupiers of **14 Fowlmere Road, Thriplow** object on grounds of the size of development, inadequate parking, flooding, and loss of habitat.

31. The occupiers of **Pear Tree House, Thriplow Road** object on grounds of the size of development, the loss of habitat on the site, parking provision, and highway safety concerns.
32. The occupiers of **Oakleigh House, Lynch Lane, Royston** object on grounds of the size of development, lack of public consultation, inappropriate parking, highway safety, loss of habitat, and the ability for the dwellings to be occupied by persons without a local connection.
33. The occupiers of **35 School Lane, Royston** object on grounds of the loss of habitat, inadequate parking, and flooding.
34. The occupiers of **4 Middle Street, Royston** object on the lack of public consultation, highway safety, and loss of habitat. It is noted that infill sites should be considered first.
35. The occupiers of **Twentypence, High Street** are generally in favour of the scheme, but have concerns regarding parking provision, highway safety, the lack of footpaths, overcrowded development and the upkeep of the hedge.
36. The occupiers of **15 Ryecroft Lane** have written in support of the scheme, with emphasis on local need, redevelopment of unused land, the retention of hedgerows and trees, good design, and the lack of bats in the area.
37. The occupiers of **Lynch Lane** state there is no footpath linking the site to the village, and no street lighting along Cambridge Road. It is also noted parking provision appears low on site.
38. The occupiers of **28 Chapel Lane** have written in support of the scheme, stating it would be an asset to the village.
39. The occupiers of **1 Pine Cottages, Rectory Lane** have written in support of the scheme, although there are concerns about the opening of the hedge for bin collection to plots 7-10.
40. Comments to Fowlmere Parish Council have been received in support of the scheme from the occupiers of 11, with particular emphasis on the local need.
41. Members should also be aware that a petition signed by 40 residents opposing the scheme has been received.

Planning Comments

42. The key issues to consider in this instance are the principle of development, the impact upon the amenity of occupiers of adjacent properties, design and the impact upon the street scene, highway safety and parking provision, open space provision, and ecological and landscape impacts.

The Principle of Development

43. The application site is located outside the designated Fowlmere village framework, and the application is therefore an exceptions site to allow 100% affordable housing to meet the identified local housing needs. This need has

been confirmed by the Council's Housing Development and Enabling Manager. The development represents a density of approximately 40 dwellings per hectare. Fowlmere is classified as a Group Village, with some local facilities within the village. Policy HG/5 of the LDF DCP 2007 states that exceptions sites for affordable housing should be on small sites within or adjoining villages. The Affordable Housing SPD quotes "rural exceptions sites that have been approved in South Cambridgeshire since the requirement for "small" sites, having regard to local circumstances, typically range from about 6 to 20 dwellings". The scheme seeks 10 dwellings and therefore is considered to be "small" having regard to Policy HG/5. Local objections to the size and density of the scheme are noted, but it is nonetheless considered appropriate to the Group Village.

44. Policy HG/5 sets out a number of criteria that exceptions sites should achieve. Criterion 1a and 1b seek the securing of affordable housing in perpetuity and the number, size, design, mix and tenure of dwellings should all be confined to, and appropriate to, the strict extent of the identified local housing need. This would be secured through a Section 106 Agreement and the applicant is aware of this. Criterion 1c seeks the site to be well related to the built-up area of the settlement and in scale with the size and character of the village. It is located adjacent to the designated village framework with existing housing on three sides. As described above, the size of the scheme is considered appropriate.
45. There has been local concern regarding the date of the housing needs survey, which was completed in 2007. However, the figures are backed up by the January 2011 Housing Register. The Housing Development and Enabling manager has confirmed there is local need for the dwellings.
46. Criterion d relates to the relationship of the scheme to the facilities and services within the village. Fowlmere Primary School is located approximately 765m from the site. The public houses/restaurants of the Chequers, Swan Inn and the Queens Head, are located closer at 540m, 580m and 660m respectively. There is a post office function within the Queens Head. St Marys Church is located 405m from the site. The village hall is located at the southern edge of the village, some 1,200m from the site. Given the village as a whole, I consider it is well related to these facilities and would promote walking and cycling as an alternative means of transport to the private car.
47. Criterion e seeks development to not damage the character of the village or the rural landscape. This aspect will be partially covered in the impact upon the street scene section below. The development does alter the character of the site. However, this is not considered to damage the character of the area. In line with the criteria, the proposal is considered to meet the aims of Policy HG/5.

Impact upon the Amenity of the Occupiers of Adjacent Properties

48. 4 Cambridge Road is a large detached property, which has a single storey rear extension and conservatory not shown on the site plan. The property has a number of ground and first floor windows in its rear elevation facing the site. The original plan shows the road running approximately 1.4m from the proposed boundary fence at its closest point, extending out to 3.2m to allow further planting by the boundary. Plots 3 and 4 are located approximately 13m from the shared boundary. The original design of the plan showed one first

floor window in each plot, both serving a bedroom. Plot 5 originally had a bedroom and bathroom window facing the neighbour. There was concern regarding potential overlooking from these windows.

49. The amended plan retains the distance from the shared boundary, but has rearranged the room layout. There remains one bedroom window facing the site in plots 3 and 4 although the windows have been reduced in size. New first floor facing windows have also been added, which serve bathrooms, and these can be obscure glazed. Plot 5 retains one bedroom window. The amended plan shows the road moved to 3.6m away from the western boundary for the length of the shared boundary, allowing more space for planting. 13m is quite tight for overlooking. However, in this instance, the ability to replace some boundary planting is considered appropriate, and no serious overlooking should result to the occupiers of 4 Cambridge Road. The distance between units at first floor level is over the 25m suggested within the District Design Guide SPD. Moving the road from the boundary also provides a buffer to prevent noise disturbance from vehicles using the access.
50. To the south of 4 Cambridge Road is Triangle Farm House. This is again a large detached property, which is currently screened from the site by large leylandii hedging, although there are some small gaps in this hedge. This hedging would need to be removed or significantly reduced to enable the access way into the site to be constructed. Plots 5 and 6 were originally located just 9m from the shared boundary, with plot 5 having a bedroom and bathroom window, and plot 6 having two bedroom windows at first floor level facing Triangle Farm House. The amended plans have shifted these dwellings to 12.6m from the shared boundary, and altered the room layout to just one facing front window to each property, both serving bedrooms. Again, this distance is quite tight. However, given the potential for boundary planting, the proposal is not considered to cause serious overlooking to Triangle Farm House.
51. The end of terrace plot 10 would be located 2.1m from the boundary with the rear garden of Triangle Farm House. This dwelling has been reduced in both span (6.5m) and height (4.3m and 8m to the eaves and ridge respectively) to the main terrace. Whilst it will be visible from Triangle Farm House, its reduced size combined with the size of the rear garden means the proposal would not appear overbearing. A condition is required to ensure no windows are added to the side elevation of plot 10, which is currently blank.
52. The terrace comprising plots 7-10 would be located between 10 and 14m from the southern boundary of the site. The development should not seriously impact upon the occupiers of the dwellings to the south side of Thriplow Road. Again, there is a 25m gap between the dwellings in line with the District Design Guide SPD.
53. Within the site, there would be some mild overlooking into rear gardens, although this is effectively unavoidable given the shape of the plot and the number of dwellings proposed. Permitted development rights should be removed to prevent further windows being added to the side of plot 3, with the landing window being obscure glazed.

Design and the Impact upon the Street Scene

54. The design of the proposal is considered key given the size and shape of the plot. It has attempted to retain some frontage to both Cambridge Road and Thriplow Road, whilst retaining a cul-de-sac feel. Plots 2 and 3 have been designed as dual-fronted dwellings. This is particularly important for plot 2 which will easily be visible from Cambridge Road but is important at the start of the access road. No bland elevations are provided in this location, to the benefit of the development. There are interesting features of dormer windows and canopies, the themes of which continue throughout the site, giving it a character in its own right.
55. The terrace of plots 7-10 does provide a larger bulk of development. Plot 10 has been reduced in height and span, and it is proposed to be constructed with weatherboarding rather than brick. This would add some variety and also become a focal point when entering the site from Cambridge Road. The reduction in size also breaks up the terrace, as well as benefiting the occupiers of Triangle Farm House. Subject to conditions regarding the materials to be used, the design of the scheme is considered appropriate, a thought echoed by the Parish Council. It is considered to sit well within the street scenes of Cambridge Road and Thriplow Road, and would create an appropriate street scene of its own within the site.

Highway Safety and Parking Provision

56. The development is accessed from Cambridge Road, which is a 60mph road entering the village from the east. The 30mph signs are located approximately 20m west of the proposed access point. The Local Highways Authority seeks the retention of 2.4m by 43m vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays. However, the applicant has shown 215m splays are achievable (although they are not clearly shown) given the large grass verge area. Further discussion will be held with the Local Highways Authority to ensure the correct splays are retained. There is no considered need to add traffic calming along Cambridge Road.
57. The Local Highways Authority had concerns regarding the access to plot 1 of the original plan. This was to be served by an individual access from Cambridge Road, and would have resulted in vehicles reversing out onto this road. The amended plan has removed this access, with plot 1 now being served from the main access. This also benefits the setting of the site by retaining the verge outside this plot. The Local Highways Authority also recommends conditions removing the ability to add vehicle accesses from Thriplow Road to plots 7-10, drainage details, and details of the material to be used for the access road. These can be added to any approval accordingly.
58. The Local Highways Authority has also requested a footpath along the southern side of Cambridge Road and the northern side of Thriplow Road. The Parish Council also request the Cambridge Road path, and local comments note concern about the lack of such a path. The applicant, in an e-mail dated 14th April has confirmed they would agree to providing a footpath, but have concerns about how this could be achieved. A condition could ensure that a path is provided. I do not consider a footpath along Thriplow Road could be justified from this development as there are no main openings, and the land may not be within highways ownership. A footpath along Cambridge Road, whilst removing the green verge, would integrate the scheme better into the village and would provide a safer walk to and from the site.

59. With regards to parking, the amended layout plan shows 18 parking spaces on the site. Each unit has at least one designated space, with three visitor spaces shown. The Council's maximum parking standards seeks 1.5 spaces per dwelling plus provision of short-term parking. In line with this standard, a maximum of 18 spaces should be provided, and a condition should ensure these are retained in the future. The development therefore meets the requirements of the policy. There is justified local concern regarding the need to park on Cambridge Road or Thriplow Road, which may cause highway dangers. Such parking should not be encouraged given the speeds vehicles are travelling, especially on Cambridge Road. There are other potential spaces available on site that short-term users could use without blocking the access road. The Local Highways Authority have not stated the need for the relocation of the 30mph signs to the east side of the access.
60. Each plot is shown to have a shed in the rear garden. This would allow the secure storage of a bicycle as required by the standards for cycle parking provision.

Open Space Provision

61. The applicant has stated in their letter submitted with the application dated 24th August 2010 that they are aware of the need for a contribution in line with open space provision, and associated legal fees from a Section 106 Agreement (which would also incorporate the affordable housing aspect). There is no on-site provision of open space. Whilst this is not ideal, given the shape of the plot and the road nearby, it has been difficult to design in whilst retaining the number of needed dwellings. I consider an off-site contribution to be satisfactory in this instance. There is a surplus of sport and play space in the village, and therefore the required figure would take this into account..
62. Pre-application discussions on the site started prior to the need for provision of community infrastructure. However, there is a justifiable requirement in the village. Therefore, if no open space provision is considered necessary given the surplus, a community benefit could be in the form of contributions towards upkeep of community facilities.

Ecological and Landscape Impacts

63. The site currently has planted boundaries along the north, west and south boundaries of the site. The development will require the removal of a number of trees and hedges on site. Along the north boundary, boundary vegetation and small trees would need to be removed to allow for the access and frontage to plots 1 and 2, along the west boundary, planting would need to be removed or cut to allow the erection of the boundary fence and the road, and along the southern boundary, the existing hedge would need to be cut back and would also be cut to allow two accesses for bins for plots 8 and 9. It is important to note that none of the vegetation affected is protected in its own right.
64. With regard to the northern boundary, a hedge is proposed to grow along the proposed picket fence, which will retain some softening of the site. Removal of the individual access to plot 1 retains the tree on the highway verge. There is a large tree to the northeast corner of the garden of 4 Cambridge Road. The Tree Officer notes there is potential for it to be compromised by

construction of the access and therefore a condition can be added to ensure development does not harm the root system of this tree, which is considered important in the street scene. A landscape condition can ensure appropriate planting takes place along the northern boundary.

65. The west boundary borders the rear gardens of the dwellings of 4 Cambridge Road and Triangle Farm House. The fencing proposed would be a 1.8m high panel fence. Some boundary vegetation would be lost, significantly the leylandii by Triangle Farm House. The amended site plan does show planting along this boundary that should mitigate the loss of the existing planting. This would again need to be secured through a landscape condition.
66. The southern boundary of the site is currently a large hedge that runs along Thriplow Road for the length of the site. It is slightly overgrown with an unkept appearance, and is quite deep at times. The original scheme proposed to reduce this significantly, with four pedestrian accesses punched through to allow access for bin collection from Thriplow Road. The amended plan has retained a wider strip of the existing hedge, measuring 2m in width, with two of the bin collection gaps filled in, with two remaining. This hedge adds a green rural character when entering the village, and its retention is important in the approach to the village. I do not consider two bin collection points would significantly harm the character of the area. The Parish Council's concerns are noted, and if Members insist the hedge remains fully intact, then it may be possible to negotiate with the applicant to ensure a form of rear access to plots 8 and 9 so bins are collected along the access road.
67. At present, there is no physical feature on the site that the proposed eastern boundary of the site follows. A 1.8m high panel fence topped with 300mm of trellis is proposed. This is not in itself appropriate for the countryside boundary. However, the site plan shows a 2m strip of landscaping beyond the fence but within the application site that will help to soften the new urban edge that will be created. This should consist of a hedge with random spacings of trees within. This would then provide a more rural edge to the site. I consider this hedge is imperative to blend the development into the area.
68. The application was submitted with an ecological assessment that has been assessed by the Council's Ecology Officer. There has been evidence of Barn Owls roosting in the existing shed on site that would be removed. A scheme of mitigation to include two roosting boxes is requested. This could be achieved within the red line of the application site, and a condition can be added to ensure this is the case. A scheme of other nest boxes is also requested and can be added as a condition.
69. There have been concerns regarding the proximity of the site to the SSSI of Whittlesford-Thriplow Hummocky Fields located to the north east of the site on the opposite side of Fowlmere Road. The comments from Natural England regarding this site are noted, and no significant impact is expected. However, the recommended condition regarding groundwater contamination shall be added to any approval to ensure any risk is minimal. A full hydrology survey is not considered necessary.

Other Matters

70. The comments from the Environment Agency, the County Archaeology Team and the Council's Scientific Officer are noted, and the suggested informatives and conditions would be added to any approval. There are local concerns about flooding given the local hydrology. However, appropriate drainage of the site is considered appropriate.
71. Policy NE/3 of the LDF DCP 2007 seeks all residential schemes greater than 10 dwellings would need to include technology for renewable energy to provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements. Whilst there is no obligation for a scheme of 10 dwellings, the applicant has stated the development will achieve a minimum level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, and thermal efficiency would be in excess of current Building Regulations. The use of air source heat pumps are being considered together with solar panels. These would be encouraged into the design of the scheme.
72. A bin collection point is proposed to the west side of the access road, specifically for plot 1 given the lack of space available for collection from their dwelling. The proposal shows this to be screened. This should ensure there is minimal impact upon the street scene. A condition can ensure a suitable screen is provided and retained.
73. There has been local concern regarding light spillage from the site. The proposal seeks two lighting columns as shown on the site plan. Assuming standard spillage, this should not result in serious light pollution from the site.

Conclusion

74. The application complies with Policy HG/5 of the LDF DCP 2007 relating to an exceptions site for the provision of 100% affordable housing. The proposed tenure of the dwellings meets the strict extent of an identified local need. The various local concerns raised as part of the consultation exercise have been addressed in the report. Whilst the scheme will inevitably have some impact on the existing character and appearance of the village, officers are satisfied that amendments to the proposals mean it can be supported.

Decision/Recommendation

The application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions relating to the time period for implementation, the approved plan numbers, materials for the exterior of the dwellings, landscaping and landscaping implementation, a scheme securing the affordable housing in perpetuity, archaeological investigation, land contamination investigation, obscure glazing of bathroom windows to the front elevation of plots 3 and 4 and the landing window to plot 3, removal of permitted development rights to the front elevation of plots 3-6 and the side elevations of plot 3 and 7, the retention of parking spaces for the future, the provision of appropriate vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays, the removal of permitted development rights to allow further pedestrian or vehicle access from Thriplow Road, details of drainage from the access, materials to be used for the access, provision of a footpath along Cambridge Road, a scheme to reduce the risk of groundwater contamination to the adjacent SSSI, a scheme of nesting boxes to be provided (including boxes for Barn Owls), foundation details for the access and an Arboricultural Implication Assessment to ensure retention of the existing tree at 4 Cambridge Road, provision of public open space, times of use of

power operated machinery during construction, and details of the bin collection area screen.

Informatives as requested from the Environment Agency and Local Highways Authority can also be added, and a further informative regarding the amount of open space provision would also be required.

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

- **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy.**
- **Local Development Framework Development Control Policies 2007.**
- **Open Space in New Developments SPD, Public Art SPD, Trees and Development Sites SPD, Affordable Housing SPD & District Design Guide SPD.**
- **Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions.**
- **Circular 05/2005 - Planning Obligations.**
- **Planning File ref: S/1487/10.**

Contact Officer: Paul Derry – Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713159