

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

11 May 2011

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

S/0133/11 – GREAT SHELFORD
Erection of 13 Flats (Including 5 Affordable Units) Following Demolition of
Existing Public House with Flat Above
at The Railway Tavern Public House, Station Road for Manhattan Corporation
Ltd.

Recommendation: Delegated Approval/ Refusal

Date for Determination: 28th April 2011

Notes:

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination at the request of the Local Member following deferral from the April Committee.

Members will visit the site on 11th May 2011

Site and Proposal

1. The site is located within the Great Shelford village framework. It is a triangular shaped site that measures 0.12 of a hectare in area. The land rises above road level to the east and drops to the south. The Railway Tavern Public House is a two-storey, render and slate traditional style building that is situated on the southern part of the site. A large hard surfaced parking area is situated on the northern section. Vehicular and pedestrian access is to the south. A hedge runs partly along the boundary with Station Road and there is landscaping along the eastern boundary. A mature tree is located in the south eastern corner of the site. A wall forms the southern boundary.
2. Station Road bounds the site to the north and comprises a development of two-storey dwellings set back from the road with open front gardens opposite the site. The Cambridge to London Liverpool Street railway line runs along the eastern boundary of the site at road level with a level crossing to the north east. Leeway Avenue is a residential development that lies in an elevated position beyond. An office development with a building immediately adjacent the footpath along the Station Road frontage is situated to the south.
3. This full planning application, received 26th January 2011 and amended 5th April 2011, proposes the erection of 13 flats. Seven of the units would be available on the open market and five units would be affordable. The housing mix would consist of 4 one bedroom units (3 affordable) and 9 two bedroom units (2 affordable). The tenure mix would be 100% shared ownership. The layout of the development would comprise an L shaped building that follows the western boundary and part of the southern boundary of the site. The

building along Station Road would be set back 4 metres from the road and have a central open section at ground level that would comprise the access point to the parking area at the rear. The building at first floor level would be in three sections but have a continuous frontage with two gable features as part of the design. It would be two-storey in height with measurements of 6 metres to the eaves and 8.85 metres to the lower ridge and 9.55 metres to the higher ridge. The building along the southern boundary would be part two-storey in height and part three storey in height with measurements of 7.5 metres to the eaves and 10.5 metres to the ridge. A public amenity area would be situated in the south eastern corner of the site. 15 parking spaces including one disabled and one visitor space would be provided to the rear of the building. 14 cycle spaces would be provided within two cycle stores situated adjacent Flats 1 and 4. The refuse storage area would be located adjacent the northern pedestrian access. Landscaping is proposed to all site boundaries. Materials include a mix of gault brick, off-white render, and timber boarding for the walls, and slate for the roofs.

Planning History

4. None relevant.

Planning Policy

5. **Local Development Plan Policies**

South Cambridgeshire LDF Core Strategy DPD, 2007:
ST/4 Rural Centres

South Cambridgeshire LDF Development Control Policies DPD, 2007:

DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments
DP/7 Development Frameworks
HG/1 Housing Density
HG/2 Housing Mix
HG/3 Affordable Housing
ET/6 Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses
NE/1 Energy Efficiency
NE/3 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development
NE/6 Biodiversity
NE/11 Flood Risk
NE/12 Water Conservation
NE/15 Noise Pollution
SF/1 Protection of Village Services and Facilities
SF/6 Public Art
SF/10 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments
SF/11 Open Space Standards
TR/1 Planning for More Sustainable Travel
TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards

South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Open Space in New Developments SPD - Adopted January 2009
Public Art SPD - Adopted January 2009
Trees & Development Sites SPD - Adopted January 2009

Landscape in New Developments SPD - Adopted March 2010
District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010
Affordable Housing SPD - Adopted March 2010
Great Shelford Village Design Statement- Adopted February 2004

6. **National Planning Guidance**

Planning Policy Statement 1 (Delivering Sustainable Development)
Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing)
Planning Policy Guidance 13 (Transport)
Planning Policy Guidance 24 (Planning and Noise)

7. **Circulars**

Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations
Circular 11/95 The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions

Consultation

Original Plans

8. **Great Shelford Parish Council** – Recommends refusal and makes the following comments: -

“No objections to the loss of the tavern as public house. Corrie Newell inspected the building in Sept 2009 at the request of the Parish Council and said that because of the alterations that had been made it was not a candidate for listing. She did however say that should the building be demolished the door case should be salvaged and if the building is made of clay bat, the clay should be retained for repairs to clay bat buildings and walls in the village. We believe the flint wall at the rear of the site is an attractive feature and should be retained. The tavern is a building which reflects the history of this site and complements the railway station and forms a group with the former Corn and Coal company building. Any replacement should seek to reflect the scale and proportion of these buildings and follow the guidance in the VDS...’New development should embody good design of its kind and relate intelligently to the character and context of the village

The proposed building is inappropriate for the site for the following reasons: The site rises by an average of 1.5m from the footpath to the rear. It is proposed to build up the western end of the site by some 0.6m so achieving an overall ground floor level of 19.4m. The proposed building along the frontage will have a ridge height of 10.4m giving a datum height of 29.8; this is on average 3.4m higher than the ridge height of the properties on the NW side of Station Rd. The building would therefore be dominant in the street scene and would be oppressive to these properties and the windows on the NW elevation would overlook their sitting and bedroom windows (This is shown in drawing 107.)

The semi-detached properties on the NW side of Station Road were said in a planning decision in 2001 to have a simple and uncluttered design which contributed to the visual character of the street. As reflects their history as commercial buildings, the buildings to the SW of the site are also of simple design. The proposed new building with its multiplicity of materials, projecting windows and harsh angular archway does not relate to the character and

context of this part of the village and runs contrary to advice in the District Design Guide. The 3 storey section in the south of the site will dominate the outlook across the adjoining courtyard, an elevation drawing with the existing buildings would show this and should be provided.

A sustainability level greater than 3 should be achieved for new buildings in the interests of the occupants and sustainable features such as photovoltaics should be included on the site. The choice of these features seems to have been driven by costs not effectiveness.

The District Design Guide (DDG) states that amenity space in new apartment development should be convenient to use and not affect internal privacy. If the first and second floor flats use the area to the rear of flats 1,2 and 3 they will adversely affect their privacy therefore 9 flats will use the small area in the SE corner of the site. This site is too small to meet the requirements of the DDG of 25m sq per flat. We would like to see a reduction in the number of units, an amended design and layout and suitable amenity space for the occupiers.”

9. **Local Highways Authority** – Requires conditions in relation to the provision of vehicular visibility splays measuring 2.4 metres x 43 metres in both directions that are kept clear from obstruction over a height of 600mm, that works to the ramp should not be within the public highway, surface water drainage measures for the access and ramp, and retention of parking and turning on site. Also request an informative in relation to works to the public highway.
10. **Conservation Officer** – Has no comments.
11. **Urban Design Officer** – Has concerns over the scale of the development and its impact upon the character and appearance of the area. Considers that the height should be reduced to be more in keeping with surrounding developments, that the design of the roof of the front elevation be symmetrical, that the cycle parking should be secure and re-located away from Flat 2, that the access should be overlooked, and that window frames should match the colour of the slate for the roof. The scheme should also be assessed against the Building for Life criteria and be to Lifetime Homes standards.
12. **Trees and Landscape Officer** – Has no objections and comments that the trees on the site are poor specimens. The arboricultural report provides tree protection measures that should be followed.
13. **Landscape Design Officer** – Requests a landscape condition to cover the proposed new tree and hedge planting. Has some concerns regarding the planting of a fruit tree in the northern corner and suggest an alternative.
14. **Acting Environmental Health Manager** – Comments that the noise assessment submitted with the application correctly identifies that the noise from the railway would fall within category C of PPG24 'Planning and Noise' that states planning permission will not normally be granted. The traffic noise is also said to fall into this category. In light of the above, concerns are raised in respect of the potential for disturbance to occupants of the proposed dwellings. It would therefore be prudent that mechanical ventilation is considered. I note that the inclusion in the report of the potential for an acoustic barrier would further attenuate railway noise as well as the glass

specifications provided. These factors are also prudent. An acoustic assessment in relation to the air conditioning units on the adjacent site should be carried out before further comment can be made in relation to this aspect. The passing trains may cause a degree of vibration to the units and a vibration assessment would be prudent. If the wind turbine is agreed as part of a renewable energy scheme, noise from this should also be considered. Suggests that conditions are attached to any consent to agree a scheme for protecting the proposed dwellings from noise from the railway and to limit the hours of use of power operated machinery during the periods of demolition and construction. Also requests informatives in relation to the use of pile driven foundations, the burning of waste on site, a demolition notice, and guidance notes in relation to the noise mitigation strategy.

15. **Land Contamination Officer** - Has considered the report submitted with the application and given the low level of contaminants identified, requests a condition to be attached to any consent for a detailed investigation into contamination.
16. **Housing Manager** – Supports the application and comments that there is a need for affordable housing in the district and the Council would seek at least 40% affordable housing. The scheme meets the level required and there is a separate access to the affordable units. The tenure mix of the affordable housing is to be agreed although there is a greater need for social rented rather than intermediate housing. A mix of 3 one bedroom flats and 2 two bedroom flats is acceptable. The properties should meet the Homes and Communities Agency, Design and Quality standards and Code 3 for Sustainable Homes to ensure they are grant compliant. There is no requirement for the units to be made available for people with a local connection to Great Shelford and they would be open to all applicants on the housing register.
17. **County Archaeologist** – Comments that the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential, as it is located close to the historic core of the village and in an area of medieval pottery. The site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation as a condition attached to any consent.
18. **Network Rail** – Comments that the view of the level crossing should not be blocked at anytime as a result of the development and that parking should be enforced to ensure that no vehicles would block the level crossing causing vehicles to queue over it. Further states that the potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity of the development to the existing railway should be assessed in the context of PPG24.
19. **Section 106 Officer** – Comments that the scheme includes a small area of communal space within the development that would be considered as informal public open space and would offset the capital contribution required to mitigate the impact of the development. Therefore, a contribution of £15,301.35 is payable (excluding the loss of existing accommodation) to the Council upon completion of the 6th unit for onward transmission to the Parish Council. The scheme is required to make an off-site contribution towards indoor community facilities. The 2009 audit identified a shortfall of community space within the parish with the village hall requiring improvements. Therefore, a contribution of £4,472.32 is payable to the Council upon completion of the 6th unit for onward transmission to the Parish Council. The

development does not reference the provision of public art on the site. Therefore, a contribution of £7500.00 towards off-site provision within the village is requested. In accordance with the RECAP Waste management Design Guide, the applicant would have to make provision towards waste receptacles is required at a cost of £150 per flat. Therefore, a contribution of £1950.00 is required.

20. **County Education Officer** – Comments that the proposed development would not be expected to accommodate any children of primary or secondary school age and there is sufficient pre-school accommodation in the area to cater for the expected demand. Therefore no education contributions are sought from the development.
21. **Valuation Consultant** - Comments are awaited.

Amended Plans

22. **Great Shelford Parish Council** - No comments received to date.
23. **Landscape Design Officer** - Comments that the revised landscape plan, The Huck Partnership drawing number 258-01 Revision D is acceptable.
24. **Trees and Landscapes Officer** - Has no objections.
25. **Local Highways Authority** - Considers that the amendments are acceptable notwithstanding that the current visibility splays do not meet the required standards.

Representations

26. The Local Member has concerns regarding the scale and overpowering nature of the development and its impact upon the street scene.

Original Plans

27. Eight letters have been received from occupiers of residential properties surrounding the site. The majority of respondents have no objection in principle to development of the site but consider that the current proposal is not acceptable. Comments include that the development would: - be too large in scale with a substantial height, dominate the street scene, be out of keeping with building heights in the area, have too high a density, be sited too close to the road, result in overlooking, a loss of light and an imposing outlook to neighbours, lead to significant vehicle movements and parking problems, result in the loss of a village facility, and have an impact upon air quality. One resident generally supports the application but has concerns regarding the accuracy of the traffic information submitted and the impact of the development. The owner of an adjacent commercial property raises non-planning consideration in relation to the blocking of an adjacent access, the state of the site, and safety implications for the tree. A resident of Stapleford supports the principle of housing in this location but considers that a footbridge should be incorporated into the proposal to allow easier access to the station.

Amended Plans

28. Five letters have been received from occupiers of residential properties surrounding the site. They do not consider that the amended plans have addressed their concerns regarding overlooking, loss of light, density, proximity, and parking. A representative for the owner of the adjacent commercial property believes that highway safety from a right of access is an issue that should be considered.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

29. The main issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to the principle of residential development on this site, the loss of a village service, housing density, housing mix, and affordable housing, and the impacts upon the character and appearance of the area including scale, height, mass, form, and materials, trees and landscaping, highway safety, and neighbour amenity.

Principle of Development

30. The site is located within the village framework of a 'Rural Centre' where there is a good access to services and facilities and residential developments with no limit on size are considered acceptable in principle subject to all other planning considerations. The existing building is not considered of significant historical or architectural merit to warrant its retention.

Loss of a Village Service

31. The proposal would result in the loss of the existing public house on the site. This is currently vacant. The property has been advertised for sale at a cost of £465,000 and for lease at a cost of £35,000 per annum for a period of approximately 14 months. The method of advertisement has been through an agent's board on the site, marketing particulars forwarded to all commercial agents in the area, internet advertising via the Cheffins website and EG property link, and regular advertisements in the local newspaper. During the marketing period, approximately 50 parties showed an interest in the property for uses such as offices, restaurant, public house, residential, or redevelopment of the site. Three offers were received but all rejected as they did not meet the agent's valuation. A number of parties had concerns about the amount of work required to the building and considered that it would not be financially viable to operate as a business.
32. Although it is noted that the existing poor state of the building would not make it an attractive place to visit, it is considered to have potential, as it could easily be improved. The location of the pub within the centre of the village is considered to be easily accessible to number of residents and nearby businesses and it's location immediately adjacent Great Shelford railway station may attract visitors from further afield.
33. However, there are five public houses within a 0.6 mile radius of the site that provide a similar alternative to the existing public house. There are also a number of restaurants and other community facilities within close proximity. Access to the majority of these premises would be easy by walking or cycling.
34. The public house has been closed for 15 months. Information has been submitted with the application that the Year to Date Net income figures for the previous three years the premises were open to business. Over that period of

time, the income of the business decreased from £32,506 in 2005 to £22,454 in 2007. This shows that trading was unlikely to make a profit.

35. The Council has instructed an independent consultant to assess the impact of the loss of the public house to the village. The result of this evaluation will be reported to the committee.

Density

36. The site measures 0.12 of a hectare in area. The erection of 13 flats on the site would equate to a density of 108 dwellings per hectare. This would make the most efficient use of previously developed land and comply with the requirement of at least 40 dwellings per hectare as set out under Policy HG/1 of the LDF for sustainable settlements.

Affordable Housing

37. There is an identified local need for affordable housing across the whole district. Five of the flats would be allocated for affordable housing. This would comply with the minimum 40% requirement outlined in Policy HG/3 of the LDF and contribute towards meeting the local need. A mix of 3 x one bed units and 2 x two bedroom units is acceptable. The tenure mix of the scheme is all shared ownership units, as there were no viable offers from any housing associations. This has been agreed with the Affordable Housing Manager. The affordable units would be open to all residents across the district and not limited to local people with a connection to Great Shelford. The units would remain affordable in perpetuity by condition of any consent.

Housing Mix

38. The remaining eight flats available for sale on the open market would comprise a mix of 7 x two bedroom units and 1 x one bedroom units. Whilst it is noted that there would not be any larger properties within the scheme as recommended under Policy HG/2 of the LDF, this mix is considered acceptable, as there is a greater need for smaller market units across the district. The proposal is therefore considered to provide a range of types, sizes and affordability of flats to meet local needs.

Character and Appearance of the Area

39. The L-shaped building on the site would result in a layout that would follow the character of the existing commercial developments to the south of the site that are located close to the road, and the position of the existing building on the site to the south.
40. The scale of the development as amended is considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area that comprises mainly two-storey buildings. Whilst it is noted that the building would be higher than the residential dwellings on the opposite side of Station Road, it would not be significantly out of scale, form and density of surrounding commercial developments on the same side of Station Road to the extent that it would result in harm. The building would also create a landmark feature due to the prominent location of the site at the entrance to the village from the railway station.

41. The mass of the front elevation would be visually reduced at first floor level by three separate elements that would have different roof heights and the fenestration surrounds that would have different materials, and at ground floor level by the open archway and planting.
42. The design of the building would be contemporary in nature. Although it would not reflect the character of the nearby dwellings or adjacent commercial development, it is considered acceptable given the varied character and appearance of the area. It would incorporate both hipped and gable roofs and gable features on the front elevation that are local to the context of the site. This would create an innovative development in itself with a sense of place.
43. The use of materials such as gault bricks and light render for the walls and blue/grey slate for the roofs are not considered to be inappropriate and would respect both with traditional style dwellings, and modern developments in the village such as Halatte Gardens.

Trees and Landscaping

44. The proposal would not result in the loss of any important trees that contribute to the visual amenity of the area. The mature tree in the south eastern corner of the site would be retained and its visual contribution to the environment enhanced as a result of the siting of the adjacent amenity area. The tree would be protected during construction.
45. The proposed landscaping scheme is considered acceptable. The hedge along the frontage of the site would soften the impact of the development and enhance the appearance of the street scene.

Highway Safety

46. Station Road is a straight road with a 30 mph speed limit. It has traffic lights at the crossroads with Tunwells Lane/ London Road to the south and a level crossing leading to Hinton way to the north.
47. Although the existing traffic generated from the public house is not known, it is believed that the use and amount of parking would have resulted in a significant number of vehicle movements on to Station Road. The traffic generation for the proposed development has been calculated using the TRICS 20101(b) trip generation database and whilst there may be a greater flow of traffic at peak times, it is considered to result in a similar level of traffic per day to the existing use.
48. The shared access to the site would measure 6 metres in width. Vehicular visibility splays measuring 2.4 metres x 43 metres on both sides of the access need to be provided to ensure the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety. The current visibility splay of 2.4 metres x 33 metres to the south is not acceptable. Pedestrian visibility splays measuring 2.0 metres x 2.0 metres would be provided on both sides of the access. The access and pedestrian splays would meet Local Highway Authority standards and their provision and retention would be a condition of any consent.
49. Whilst it is acknowledged that the level of vehicle parking provision on the development would fall short of the Council's average parking standards under Policy TR/2 of the LDF, it is considered appropriate, as it would still

provide one space for each flat plus a disabled parking space and visitor space. This would be unlikely to result in on-street parking that would cause a hazard to the free flow of traffic along Station Road, due to the busy nature of the road. The site is also situated in a very sustainable location with good accessibility to public transport (trains and buses) and within walking and cycling distance of the main services and facilities within the village. One cycle space would be provided for each flat that would accord with the recommended standards, and amended plans have been sought to provide these spaces in secure buildings.

Neighbour Amenity

50. The building would be located a distance of 20 metres from the front elevation of the dwellings in Station Road, 20 metres from the side elevation and 13 metres from the boundary of No. 2A Shelford Park Avenue, and 30 metres from the boundary of No. 2 Leeway Avenue. The development is considered acceptable in terms of the impact upon the amenities of neighbours through massing and privacy, given that the relationships between the dwellings are front to front, front to side or more than 30 metres back to back. The buildings would be orientated to the east of the dwellings in Station Road and south east of No. 2A Shelford Park Avenue and would not lead to a significant loss of light through overshadowing.
51. The existing railway line adjacent to the development is likely to result in noise, disturbance and vibration to future occupiers of the flats from trains using the railway line, the level crossing alarm, vehicles along Station Road, and the adjacent air conditioning unit. However, the proposal is only considered acceptable subject to acoustic and vibration assessments being carried out and an appropriate noise mitigation strategy as a condition of any consent that includes mechanical ventilation and particular glass specifications to the windows of the dwellings in addition to an acoustic fence.

Developer Contributions

52. The South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study 2005 identified a shortfall of sport and play space within Great Shelford. Approximately 100 square metres of informal open space would be provided on site. However, this would not offset the increase in demand for sport and playspace as a result of the development and therefore a financial contribution of £18, 827.94 (index linked) is also required towards the provision and management of open space off-site and within the village to comply with Policy SF/10 of the LDF. This would be secured via a legal agreement that would be a condition of any consent. The agent has confirmed that the applicant would be willing to contribute towards this requirement.
53. The South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Assessment 2009 states that Great Shelford has indoor community space that is of a good standard, although there is a shortfall of such space and some investment in the near future may be required. Due to the increase in the demand for the use of this space from the development, a financial contribution of £4,104.32 (index-linked) is sought towards the provision of new facilities or the improvement of existing facilities in order to comply with Policy DP/4 of the LDF. This would be secured via a legal agreement that would be a condition of any planning consent. The agent has confirmed that the applicant would be willing to contribute towards this request.

54. Policy SF/6 of the LDF encourages the provision of publicly accessible art, craft and design works. No public art has been provided on site as part of the development. Therefore, a financial contribution of £7500.00 towards the cost of the provision of public art within the village and its maintenance is sought to make the development acceptable. The agent has confirmed that the applicant would be willing to contribute towards this request.
54. South Cambridgeshire District Council has adopted the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide which outlines the basis for planning conditions and obligations. In accordance with the guide developers are required to provide for household waste receptacles as part of a scheme. The current fee for the provision of appropriate waste containers is £150.00 per flat. The costs will be secured via a section 106 agreement and would be required to be paid upon completion of the agreement. The agent has confirmed that the applicant would be willing to contribute towards this request.

Other Matters

56. The District Design Guide recommends 25 square metres of communal amenity space per one or two bedroom dwelling. This would result in a total requirement for 325 square metres being provided on the site. The scheme provides approximately 230 square metres. This is considered appropriate, given the nature of the units, the proximity to the recreation ground, and that the amount of space is guideline and not a requirement to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.
57. The RECAP Waste Management Design Guide recommends that 320 litres storage capacity of waste to be provided per one bedroom unit and 420 litres per two bedroom unit. This results in a total requirement of 5060 litres for the development. The bin storage area would be of an adequate size to accommodate 5 x 1280 litre bins. It would be located adjacent the pedestrian access at a maximum distance of 25 metres from the entrances to the flats. This level of provision would therefore be a condition of any consent.
58. A Renewable Energy Statement has been submitted with the application that sets out the alternative options for such provision. These include solar powered systems, solar heating systems, wind turbines, biomass heating systems, and ground or air source heat pumps. The scheme indicates that photovoltaic panels would be installed on the south east facing roof slope of the building plus solar heating to achieve the 10% predicted energy requirements as set out under Policy NE/3 of the LDF. No measures have been confirmed and therefore the provision would be subject to a condition of any consent.
59. A Water Conservation Strategy has been submitted with the application that sets out the options being considered for the project. These include permeable road/parking areas, soakaways, underground tanks for surface water run-off, and water butts. No measures have been confirmed and therefore the provision would be subject to a condition of any consent.
60. The issue raised by the neighbour in relation to the right of access to the adjacent property is a legal matter that cannot be taken into consideration as part of the planning application decision making process. The health and safety of the tree on site is a civil matter between the parties involved. The

provision of a footbridge to access the station is not considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Conclusion

61. Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is considered that planning permission should be granted in this instance subject to the receipt of a satisfactory report from the Council's Valuation consultant, Local Highways Authority, and Acting Environmental Health Manager.

Recommendation

62. Delegated approval subject to conditions including provision and retention of visibility splays, parking, tree protection, approval of materials, landscaping, archaeology, contamination, noise assessment, contributions towards public open space, community facilities, public art and waste provision, details of waste storage, provision of renewable energy, and implementation of a water conservation strategy;

OR

Delegated refusal.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents: Open Space in New Developments, Biodiversity, Landscape in New Developments, and District Design Guide
- Planning Policy Statements 1, 3, 13, and 24.
- Planning File Reference: S/0133/11

Contact Officer: Karen Pell-Coggins - Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713230