

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

9 May 2012

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

S/0366/12/FL – THRILOW

Two Dwellings and Garage at Land to the South West of 8 Woburn Mews and 54 Woburn Place, Heathfield for Landmark Real Estate

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 20 April 2012

Notes:

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination as the officer recommendation conflicts with the recommendation of Thriplow Parish Council

Site and Proposal

1. The site is located within the Heathfield village framework. It comprises an open, roughly grassed strip of amenity land at the entrance to the Heathfield Estate adjacent to the A505. The land rises from north west to south east and is elevated above the level of the adjoining residential properties and communal parking area to the north east. The site lies within flood zone 1 (low risk). A service station and trees and a grass verge is situated on the opposite side of the road. The Duxford Imperial War Museum is located to the south east of the A505 within the conservation area.
2. This full planning application, received 16 February 2012 and as amended, proposes the erection of two dwellings. The dwellings would be sited in line with, and at the same ground level as, the existing dwellings in Woburn Mews. They would be two-storey in height and be constructed from red brick/ render for the walls and concrete pantiles for the roof. The housing mix would consist of 1 x 4 bedroom dwelling and 1 x 2 bedroom dwelling. The access would measure 4.5 metres in width and be situated centrally. It would lead to a garage and parking area that comprises two parking spaces for the 2 bedroom dwelling and three parking spaces for the 4 bedroom dwelling. A 1.6 metre high wall with a landscape strip would align the south west boundary.

Planning History

3. An appeal was dismissed for the erection of two dwellings and a garage on the site under reference **S/1679/09/F** on the grounds of the impact upon the character and appearance of the area.
4. Planning permission was refused for one dwelling on the site under reference **S/2013/08/F** on the grounds of the impact upon the character and appearance of the area, piecemeal development, and highway safety.

Planning Policy

5. ***Local Development Plan Policies***

South Cambridgeshire LDF Core Strategy DPD, 2007:
ST/7 Infill Villages

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
NE/6 Biodiversity
NE/11 Flood Risk
NE/15 Noise Pollution
CH/5 Conservation Areas
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
Development Affecting Conservation Areas - Adopted January 2009
Landscape in New Developments SPD - Adopted March 2010
Trees & Development Sites SPD - Adopted January 2009
Biodiversity SPD - Adopted July 2009
District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010

6. ***National Planning Guidance***

National Planning Policy Framework

7. ***Circulars***

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

Consultation

8. **Thriplow Parish Council** – Recommends refusal and comments that the majority of councillors object to the application. It was felt that there are serious issues regarding traffic, transport links and development of open land. Many agree with the points made by one councillor below: -

- i) The rear wall of the 4 bedroom house on the site plan is in a different location compared to the landscape drawing and visual images. The French door will not be able to open;
- ii) When landscaping matures it will reduce the visibility causing a safety issue. Who is responsible for maintaining it after the year has lapsed and what is the frequency that it will be maintained?
- iii) Plot 2 has no garden which is inconsistent with other houses. Where are the residents going to relax and play?
- iv) With a total of 6 bedrooms between the two houses, the number of parking spaces is insufficient to cater for the potential needs of the residents and their visitors. Inevitable this will lead to cars needing to be parked on the

- roadside, which will result in obstructing the traffic entering and exiting the Heathfield ward;
- v) If the properties are rented out, it is likely that the 4 bedroom house will have more than 2 cars. A similar house in Heathfield has 4 people sharing a 4 bedroom house and each has a car. No provision has been made or restriction put in the plans to prevent this from happening;
 - vi) If both parking spaces of either house are occupied, there is insufficient room to turn another car in the drive, which would mean any visiting vehicle would need to reverse out if it drove in forward;
 - vii) The application says that there are no parking restrictions on the road- are they seriously suggesting that the residents and visitors to these houses are to be freely allowed to park on the roadside in front of these houses and thus block the road leading to/from the adjacent traffic lights. On many occasions, the residents of Heathfield ward have requested that these sections of roads have parking restrictions applied yet the Council has steadfastly refused. Is it normal to allow cars to park quite so close to a junction and a set of traffic lights on a very narrow road;
 - viii) In addition to having a bus parked at this site, we often have car transporters (off loading and loading cars), a school bus, a minibus as well as Icenis who have large lorries entering and leaving the site. Having additional cars parked will result in a dangerous entrance to the Heathfield ward;
 - ix) In the Design and Access Statement, much is made of the fact that the land has previously been subject of a successful planning application, namely S/1891/90/F, which is then used to justify why the land is considered to be a "brownfield" site. From the memory of several longstanding local residents, application S/1891/90/F concerned the development of the entire Copywrite site. This parcel of unused land was on the periphery of the Copywrite site, and it was proposed to use this land for a grassed overflow parking area. This land has never been built on, even in the times of ownership by the RAF- it was a mix public open space and garden land, and even after S/1891/90/F was granted, this area of land was never developed and never actually put into service as an overflow car park; it was left as scrub land. On this basis, it is reasonable to consider this land to still be considered as "greenfield". As it stands, it could be considered that this parcel of land falls within the definition of LDF 2007 policy SE6, and as detailed below, Copywrite were more than happy to allow a bus shelter to be located on their land, thus making it available for public use;
 - x) When the land was owned by Copywrite, Copywrite granted TPC permission to site the bus shelter for the bus stop on the edge of the land. The bus shelter was sited there for 8 years, and has only recently been relocated after the site was acquired by Landmark Estates. Are the planning officers and Council committee aware that Landmark Estates threatened TPC (who paid for the bus shelter) to get the bus shelter removed from their newly acquired land, and then after a few days offered to rent the bus shelter sized bit of land back to TPC for £100 per week. To see that Landmark Estates are now proposing to site the bus shelter back in its original position looks like a cynical act to simply impress the planners and Council committee to make them look community spirited;
 - xi) The Planning, Design and Access Statement paragraph 5.4 says that the proposed housing follows the pattern established by the adjacent housing (Woburn Mews). None of the houses in Woburn Mews has a garage, therefore this statement is erroneous and confusing, and appears to be designed to justify the positioning of a garage on this site, when none of the adjacent houses have garages;

- xii) Plot 2 will obstruct the view of traffic entering and existing the former RAF housing section of the Heathfield ward;
- xiii) The street lights are not shown, neither are the traffic lights- they will all be intrusive through the windows of both houses;
- xiv) Entry and exit from the driveway will trigger the traffic sensor embedded in the road which will cause unnecessary stopping of traffic on the A505 whenever a car enters the property;
- xv) There appears to be no provision for storage or recycling of rainwater;
- xvi) The Heathfield sewage treatment plant is already overloaded beyond its design capacity and has to be relieved by tinkering raw sewage from holding tanks to another treatment plant a few miles away. More houses in the area will simply add to the existing problem and will result in additional more frequent tanker journeys to empty the holding tanks. This flies in the face of LDF2007 policy NE9;
- xvii) Although the applicant has consulted a planning officer and some members of TPC, they have failed to consult any of the parish councillors that live in the Heathfield ward, and thus better represent the views of the Heathfield ward residents. They have also failed to consult the Heathfields Residents Association;
- xviii) There is no natural gas supply to the Heathfield ward, and most of the houses are heated with oil fired heating. The proposed plan does not make provision for heating oil storage, and given the current regulations for the positioning of storage tanks, it is difficult to visualise how the tanks would be sited without having to reorganise the site;
- xix) LDF 2007 policy HG2 says that to meet the housing needs for South Cambridgeshire, 40% of a development should be 1 or 2 bed houses, 25% should be 3 bed houses, and 25% should be 4 bed houses. This would imply that there should be a 2 bed house and 3 bed house rather than a 2 bed house and 4 bed house to be in line with local needs and existing house types in the area, where there is a shortage of smaller houses; and,
- xx) LDF 2007 Policy SF10 contribution to playspace needs to be adequately addressed, especially when housing with a total of 6 bedrooms is being proposed.

Another councillor produced his own comments outlined below: -

This very lengthening story is frustrating. The appeal has been lost and yet it reappears again as a new application. However it is the same design with minor changes that do not satisfy the views of the appeal inspector who said "The development of this site requires a particularly sensitive and imaginative approach". Clearly, he didn't see it in application S/1679 of 2009 and I don't see it in application S/0366 of 2012. What we do still see is: -

- i) inadequate space allowed for each dwelling;
- ii) inadequate parking for such large houses;
- iii) potentially dangerous and annoying access provision to the highway for cars, with inevitable obstruction at busy times; and,
- iv) a cynical approach to letting it look like an agreement with the PC has been now been made when for years there has been antagonism and obstruction by Landmark Estates.

We see a design that is totally at odds with the houses that this development neighbours, in respect of garages, garden size, openness, and scale. There has been no consideration to sympathetic design. The two new houses do not fit in with the existing built environment for the reasons described in detail here: -

- i) Space- There is hardly any real garden shown in the application with about 1/3 of the area of the development given to car parking, garage and driveway and only 1/3 to garden including hedges. Look at the recently built house in Woburn Mews, where 2/3 of the total space of the plots is garden. Look at the

- original houses on Kingsway, where perhaps 80% of each plot area is garden. It seems that landmark are trying to build too many houses on their area.
- ii) Parking- In the current application, parking and the houses are hidden from view by hedges and there is a garage. Look at Whitehall Gardens, hardly anyone has a garage and all parking is communal on the street, there is plenty of it around the green. Look at Kingsway, all the cars are in front of the houses, readily visible from the road, providing an open frontage. In today's way of living, are five car parking spaces adequate for these dwellings, especially in light of the fact that parking on the public highway must be deemed dangerous or at least that it would cause obstructions. No, surely five spaces is inadequate for residents and visitors;
 - iii) Access- This has always been a major concern of local residents and the Parish Council. Nothing has been done to improve the access from the development to the public highway. The bus stop has been moved and is now in a safer position but many movements of large vehicles still occur on this side road (buses, car delivery trucks, sewage tankers, pallet lorries from Icen) and of course this is the only access to the outside world for residents of the whole Heathfield estate (now about 600 people with 400 cars). Sooner or later, the access shown in the application will be the cause of an accident; and,
 - iv) Relations with Parish Council- Are we really expected to believe that Landmark want to move the bus stop back to the location shown in the application after the aggravation over the urgent removal demanded by landmark when the last application was turned down? Can we believe that the "rank grass" currently on the plot will be transformed into lush cultivated gardens when Landmark have been solely responsible for maintaining the site for the past few years? Can we believe that the applicant will adhere to any approval restrictions when it cannot even prepare its previous appeal with the correct set of referenced documents? Can we trust this landowner at all?

This is the wrong development for this site. History suggests that it was intended to remain green space but a planner has recently said that it could be open for development. That doesn't mean it should be developed. This entrance to the estate is valuable open land, let keep it that way.

The councillor in the minority felt that the application addresses the concerns raised in the appeal decision dated 17 August 2011.

9. **Local Highways Authority** – Requires conditions in relation to the provision and retention of sufficient parking and turning on site, the provision of pedestrian visibility splays measuring 2.0 metres x 2.0 metres of each side of the access within the site area, the access being constructed from unbound material within 6 metres of the public highway, adequate surface water drainage measures for the access, the provision of temporary facilities off the public highway for parking, turning, loading and unloading of all vehicles visiting the site during construction. Also requests informatives with regards to planting outside the boundary wall having a minimum stem height of 2 metres and vegetation not exceeding 600mm in height, the access being constructed in accordance with local highway authority standards, the dimensions of the parking and turning spaces, works to the public highway, and public utility apparatus.
10. **Environmental Health Officer** – Concerned that problems could arise from noise and disturbance for the occupiers of the new dwellings. The noise survey submitted with the application highlights that the site is classed as NEC C. It is therefore imperative that if planning permission is granted, appropriate and stringent measures will have to be implemented in respect of attenuating noise from the dominant source identified as being adjacent the A505 and meeting the views in section 3.7 of the report. Requires conditions in relation to an acoustic scheme to protect the dwellings

internally and externally from noise from the A505 road and limitations on the use of use of power operated machinery during construction. Also suggests informatives in relation the acoustic scheme having regard to Planning Policy Guidance 24 (Planning and Noise), the burning of waste on site, and pile driven foundations.

11. **Land Contamination Officer** – Comments that the site is former military land and requests a condition in relation to a contamination investigation to ensure that the development would not pose a risk to human health.
12. **Trees and Landscapes Officer** – Has no objections as no significant trees are being compromised.
13. **Landscape Design Officer** – Comments are awaited.

Representations

14. The Heathfield Residents Association strongly object to the application for the same reasons put forward by Thriplow Parish Council.
15. Eight letters of objection have been received from nearby residents that raise the following issues: -
 - i) Insufficient on site parking that may lead to on-street parking close to a busy junction;
 - ii) Access position close to junction;
 - iii) Limited width of access to allow two vehicles to pass;
 - iv) Poor visibility from access;
 - v) Traffic congestion from number of vehicles and type of vehicles (buses, commercial vehicles and service delivery vehicles) using the access;
 - vi) Traffic generation;
 - vii) Lack of space for parking during construction;
 - viii) Pedestrian safety;
 - ix) Open amenity land at entrance to estate should be retained;
 - x) Lack of landscaping to east to soften views;
 - xi) Ecological value of site;
 - xii) Cramped plot;
 - xiii) Size and style of dwellings out of keeping with area;
 - xiv) Height of dwellings;
 - xv) Loss of light, overshadowing and overlooking of neighbour;
 - xvi) No justification of need for dwellings;
 - xvii) Flawed traffic survey as carried out at quieter time of year;
 - xviii) Impact upon drainage and roads; and,
 - xix) Damage to cables and manhole cover.
16. One letter of support has been received that comments the development would make good use of a poorly kept piece of land and provide two much needed homes.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

17. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are the principle of residential development on the site and the impacts upon the character and appearance of the area, highway safety, and the amenities of neighbours.

Principle of Development

18. The site is located within the village framework of an 'Infill Village' where residential developments of up to two dwellings are acceptable in principle subject to all other materials planning considerations.

19. The site measures 0.06 of a hectare in area. The erection of two dwellings on the site would equate to a density of 33 dwellings per hectare. This would comply with the density requirement of at least 30 dwellings per hectare for villages such as Heathfield as set out under Policy HG/1 of the LDF.
20. The proposal would provide one two bedroom dwelling and one four bedroom dwelling. This would fulfill the required housing mix of at least 40% smaller sized dwellings on sites comprising two or more market dwellings to meet local needs as set out under Policy HG/2 of the LDF.
21. One of the dwellings on the site needs to be provided as an affordable to meet Policy HG/3 of the LDF that requires at least 40% of dwellings to be affordable to meet local needs. Neither of the proposed dwellings is designated as affordable and both would be market dwellings. However, it is unlikely that a single dwelling would be taken on by a Housing Association and therefore subject to the applicants submitting information that demonstrates this would be the case, a contribution towards affordable housing off site would be acceptable. This would be secured by a legal agreement.

Character and Appearance of the Area

22. The site is currently an open amenity area that is located in a prominent position at the Heathfield Estate. Whilst it is acknowledged that it does provide some positive visual quality to the area, it is not considered a significantly important open piece of land that should be retained in its current state. The Council and the Inspector that determined the previous appeal consider that it could be developed providing the scheme retains some openness and landscaping along the south west boundary to provide a soft edge to the development. The Inspector specifically commented that "The site may have potential to provide some form of development although it may represent a challenge in design terms to ensure that the amenity of the occupiers adjacent to the site are safeguarded. The development of the site requires a particularly sensitive and imaginative approach to secure a satisfactory form of development. The site could remain an asset to the entrance to the estate with some form of development, with more attention being given to landscaping and the position of dwellings in relation to the road".
23. The proposed layout, as amended, shows Plot 1 sited in the same position as that previously submitted as amended. The proportions reflect that of the existing dwelling at 8 Woburn Mews and the siting, although slightly staggered, would be in keeping with the linear pattern of development. The Inspector when determining the appeal considered this to be acceptable by commenting that "The amendments made to Plot 1 significantly improve the appearance of the property against the adjoining dwelling". However, there was some concern in relation to inadequate landscaping. This would be a condition of any consent to ensure that adequate landscaping can be achieved.
24. The proposed layout, as amended, is considered to have addressed the reason for the appeal being dismissed. The Inspector when determining the appeal commented that "The dwelling on Plot 2 would have a bland and uninspiring flank elevation unrelieved by landscaping with the corner of the property almost at the back of the footway. Being detached, it would appear as an isolated afterthought, unrelated to the adjacent form of development and out of character with the immediate surroundings". Whilst it is noted that the dwelling would still be detached and its siting would be slightly staggered, it has been reduced in width to be more proportionate to the existing blocks of housing adjacent and would retain the linear pattern of development. The side elevation has also been improved with the provision of a feature bay window at ground floor level and two first floor windows, which would

create interest within the street scene. The dwelling has been moved further away from the footpath to create an open area with significant landscaping that would contribute positively to the visual amenity of the area.

25. The proposed dwellings would be situated at the same ground level as the existing dwellings at Nos. 54 Woburn Place and 8 Woburn Mews. The height of the dwellings, as amended, would be marginally higher than the existing dwellings at Nos. 54 Woburn Place and 8 Woburn Mews and therefore in keeping with the scale of buildings in the area.
26. The design and external appearance of the dwellings would take features and materials from the existing dwellings in the surrounding area. Both plots would have ridgelines parallel to the road in line with the design of the existing dwellings. The front elevation of Plot 1 would have a dormer window that would reflect the existing gable features in the design of the existing dwellings in Woburn Mews. Plot 2 would have a simple design that is dominant in the character of the existing dwellings in Woburn Place. The use of brick and render would replicate materials used on adjacent dwellings. The dwellings are therefore considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
27. Although it is noted that the majority of properties in the area do not have garages, the proposed garage is not considered to adversely affect the visual appearance of the street scene, as a result of its siting between the dwellings and away from the road, and its low scale.

Highway Safety

28. The increase in traffic generation from the proposal is not considered to be detrimental to highway safety given that the road already serves a significant number of dwellings and access and egress on to the A505 is controlled by traffic lights.
29. The proposed access would be positioned centrally and measure 4.5 metres in width. Its position is situated far enough away from the junction to not cause a hazard and its width would allow two vehicles to pass. Although it is noted that traffic waiting at the traffic lights to exit the Heathfield Estate may obstruct vehicles from entering the site when travelling from the A505, this is unlikely to significantly affect the free flow of traffic using the A505 as there is a separate right hand turning lane on to the Heathfield Estate at the junction. It may also be possible to have a keep clear restriction on the road that would address this issue.
29. Adequate vehicular visibility splays and pedestrian visibility splays can be achieved on the site in accordance with Local Highway Authority standards. Although the vehicular splays would measure 2.4 x 23 metres and these would be reduced from that normally required, evidence in the form speed and traffic surveys was submitted with the previous application to justify shorter splays. All splays will need to be unobstructed from low level planting above 600mm in height and stems that are lower than 2 metres in height. The retention of the splays clear from obstruction would be conditions of any consent.
30. The Council parking standards require a maximum of two car parking spaces on the site per dwelling. The scheme would provide three spaces for Plot 1 and two spaces for Plot 2. This would exceed the Council's standards and the proposal is therefore unlikely to result in on-street parking that would affect traffic flows from the A505 to the Heathfield Estate. This was supported by the appeal Inspector that stated "There is a need to ensure that the appeal site provides sufficient space for residents and visitors to park, and in my judgement the proposal would do so." It should be noted

that there are currently no parking restrictions on this road so vehicles could park there legally at present.

31. A condition would be attached to any consent in relation to the provision of space off the public highway for contractor's vehicles visiting the site during construction.

Neighbour Amenity

32. The proposed dwellings, as amended, are not considered to unduly harm the amenities of neighbours. Whilst the dwelling on Plot 1 would be set forward of the neighbour at No. 8 Woburn Mews, it would not obstruct a 45 degree angle of view from the windows closest to the boundary in the front elevation of that dwelling and not therefore result in a significant loss of outlook or light to those rooms. It would overshadow the front garden for a significant amount of time but this is not the main private amenity area. The main area is to the rear which would only be overshadowed in the evening. The loss of light to the bathroom window on the side elevation is not considered harmful, as it is a non-habitable room. Whilst the dwelling on Plot 2 would be set back behind the neighbour at No. 54 Woburn Place, it would not obstruct a 45 degree angle of view from the windows closest to the boundary in the rear elevation of that dwelling and not therefore result in a significant loss of outlook or light to those rooms. It would also not significantly overshadow the main private amenity area as it would only have a minimal set back and enjoy sunlight the majority of the day. The garage would be located adjacent the communal parking area and a significant distance from the neighbouring dwellings.

Developer Contributions

34. The South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study 2005 identified a shortage of playspace within Thriplow and Heathfield. No sport or public open space is shown within the development. The increase in demand for sport space as a result of the development requires a financial contribution of £6,503.80 (index linked) towards the improvement of existing open space in 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 applicant has agreed to this contribution through the submission of a Heads of Terms that would form the basis of a legal agreement.
34. The South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Assessment 2009 states that Thriplow has an excellent level of community facilities. However, due to the increase in the demand for the use of this space from the development, a financial contribution of £1074.84 (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. The applicant has agreed to this contribution through the submission of a Heads of Terms that would form the basis of a legal agreement.
35. 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 requested to provide for the household waste receptacles as part of a scheme. The fee for the provision of appropriate waste containers is £69.50 per dwelling. The applicant has agreed to this contribution through the submission of a Heads of Terms that would form the basis of a legal agreement.

Other Matters

36. The noise assessment submitted with the application states that the site is classified Noise Exposure Category (NEC) C due to its proximity to the A505. The Environmental Health Officer has no objections subject to appropriate and stringent

measures to attenuate the proposed dwellings from the noise source. An acoustic installation scheme to protect the dwellings from noise from the A505 would therefore be a condition of any consent. A limitation on the hours of use of power operated machinery during construction will also be a condition of any consent in order to protect neighbours from noise.

37. Private amenity spaces would be provided for each dwelling. Whilst they would not meet the guideline of 80 square metres for rural areas as set in the Design Guide, they are considered adequate in size. There are no policy standards in the LDF that would warrant refusal of the application on these grounds.
38. A condition will be attached to any consent in relation to foul water drainage to ensure that the method of disposal is satisfactory in accordance with Policy NE/9 of the LDF.
39. The provision for the storage and recycling of rainwater is not required in policy terms for this size of development.
40. The site is not defined as brownfield land, as it has not been previously developed. The need for the housing on the site does not need to be justified, as it is acceptable in principle in policy terms.
41. The proposal would not result in the loss of any protected species or important wildlife habitats.
42. Any prospective purchasers of the properties will be aware of the streetlights and traffic lights.
43. The bus shelter is not currently on the site and the provision of it on the site is not required to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The issue of the bus shelter is a matter between the applicants and Parish Council and is not a planning consideration that can be taken into account in the determination of this application.

Conclusion

44. 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.

Recommendation

45. Approval (as amended). The following conditions and informatives are suggested: -

Conditions

- i) Time Limit
- ii) Approved Plans
- iii) Materials
- iv) Boundary Treatment
- v) Removal of Permitted Development Rights for Extensions and Outbuildings
- vi) Hard and Soft Landscaping
- vii) Implementation of Landscaping
- viii) Materials and Drainage for Driveway
- ix) Parking and Turning
- x) Visibility Splays
- xi) Contractors Parking
- xii) Cycle Store
- xiii) Foul Drainage

- xiv) Contamination Investigation
- xv) Acoustic Scheme
- xvi) Power Operated Machinery
- xvii) Affordable Housing
- xviii) Developer Contributions

Informatives

- i) Planting within Visibility Splays
- ii) Works to Highway
- iii) Public Utility Apparatus
- iv) Burning of Waste
- v) Pile Driven Foundations
- vi) Acoustic Scheme

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy DPD 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents: Open Space in New Developments, Trees & Development Sites, Biodiversity, Landscape in New Developments, and District Design Guide
- National Planning Policy Framework
- Planning File References: S/0366/12/FL, S/1679/09/F, & S/2013/08/F

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