

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

5 December 2012

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

S/1725/12/OL – STAPLEFORD

Outline application, including means of access, for the erection of up to 44 dwellings, provision of formal and informal open space, including children's play equipment and associated parking and landscaping following the demolition of existing buildings and removal of hardstanding, at Welch's Transport Ltd, Granta Terrace for Welch's Group Holdings Ltd

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Date for Determination: 21 November 2012

Major Development

Notes:

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination as it is related to application reference S/1726/12/FL (this latter application being a Departure from the Development Plan for which the Officer recommendation is one of approval contrary to the recommendations of Duxford, Whittlesford and Ickleton Parish Councils)

Members of Committee will visit the site on Tuesday 4th December 2012.

To be presented to the Committee by Kate Wood

Site and Proposal

1. The 1.63 hectare application site is located within the Stapleford village framework at the southern end of Granta Terrace and is one of three separate parcels of land within the centre of Great Shelford and Stapleford that are owned and used in connection with the Welch's business. The site, referred to as Site A within the application, comprises Welch's main headquarters and is used for: road haulage, distribution and warehousing; truck and van sales; and vehicle and crane hire. There are three main buildings on the site (including 2600m² of warehousing and 650m² of offices). The central building comprises offices and a truck maintenance workshop, a building to the north contains dry storage and a crane maintenance area, whilst in the south-eastern part of the site, is an open-fronted steel-framed building mainly used for dry storage and vehicle wash-down. There are also a number of small storage buildings and car servicing at the north-western boundary, a truck wash in the centre and shipping containers in the south-west part of site used for vehicle parts storage. The remainder of the site is laid to hardstanding. The southern part of the site is located within an area of high flood risk, and beyond the industrial units to the west, is the Cambridge-London railway line.
2. The sole means of vehicular access to the site is via Granta Terrace, which enters the site from the west. Beyond the north-western boundary of the site are residential

dwellings fronting Granta Terrace whilst, on the opposite side of Granta Terrace to the west, are existing commercial/industrial premises. To the east, beyond a 2 metre high brick wall and tall conifer screen, is Aylesford Way (the properties within this street are bungalows) whilst the gardens of houses fronting London Road adjoin the site to the north. The River Granta lies to the south of the site, and beyond this is agricultural land that lies outside the framework and within the countryside and Green Belt.

3. The application seeks outline consent, with all matters other than the means of access reserved, for the erection of up to 44 dwellings on the site, together with the provision of open space (including children's play equipment) and associated landscaping. The application proposes the provision of two means of access to the site, namely Granta Terrace (as existing) as well as an additional access from Aylesford Way. The proposed access from Aylesford Way would be designed as a T-junction and would provide a 5.5 metre wide carriageway with footpaths to both sides.
4. The illustrative layout drawings indicate the roads (beyond the initial spur road from Aylesford Way) would have footpaths on just one side. The northern edge of the site would comprise a mixture of small terraced houses and apartments, whilst large detached and semi-detached houses would be located in the centre. The southern part of site, adjacent to the River Granta, would consist of an area of public open space (of just under 4000m²), with approximately 300m² of this area designated as an equipped Local Area of Play (LAP) (see paragraph 86). The dwellings on the southernmost part of the site are shown facing this area of open space. The properties at the south-western end, directly opposite the adjacent commercial premises (Wedd's), are illustrated facing eastwards, with approximately 15 metre rear gardens bounded by an acoustic screen to the rear/western boundary. The Design and Access Statement indicates that the dwellings would all be two-storey in scale, with some dwellings accommodating rooms within the roof space.
5. It is proposed that the dwellings would include 14 no. affordable units (4 x 1-bed flats, 2 x 2-bed flats, 6 x 2-bed houses and 2 x 3 bed houses) and 30 no. market units (3 x 3-bed houses, 4 x 2-bed houses, 23 x 4+ bed dwellings). 69 parking spaces would be provided at a ratio of 1 space per 1, 2 and 3-bedroom dwelling and 2 spaces per 4+ bedroom property.
6. As stated above, this site is one of three sites upon which the Welch's business is operated, and is referenced within the application as Site A. Separate applications have been submitted for residential development on the other two sites. Site B is located on the north side of London Road and is a 0.28 hectare site providing car parking for the Welch's garage site and is the subject of an outline application for 8 dwellings (Reference S/1727/12/OL). Site C relates to the car sales site on the opposite side of the road to Site B and is the subject of an outline application for 14 dwellings (Reference S/1728/12/OL). Welch's are proposing to relocate their entire operation to a new site in Duxford (Reference S/1726/12/FL). All applications are being considered at this Committee and it is essential that the proposals be determined and considered as a package.
7. The planning statement accompanying the application explains that Welch's currently operate on three separate sites within Great Shelford and Stapleford that are located within 100 metres of each other. They are a long-established local company (formed in 1934) and the business consists of the following elements: road haulage, distribution and warehousing; truck and van sales; crane and motor vehicle hire; and car sales. Welch's have 5 transport depots in total in the Eastern region (3 others in addition to those in Shelford and Stapleford) and employ a total of 150 people. There

are approximately 75 staff at the Great Shelford and Stapleford sites, around half of which live in Sawston or Duxford.

8. The applicants have advised that the following key issues currently seriously affect their business, and that, as a result, the relocation of the business is essential to the survival of its operation in South Cambridgeshire:
- The current access to the main haulage and distribution site is along a narrow, residential road (Granta Terrace). This road is unsuitable for 44 tonne articulated lorries, and taking this size of vehicle along a narrow residential street is becoming untenable.
 - Notwithstanding the above, the Government is reviewing existing maximum limits on vehicle sizes (European Directive 96/53/EC), which would allow an increase in trailer lengths from 13.6 to 15.7 metres. In due course, this longer length is likely to become the 'industry standard' to which all Welch's clients will require the company to comply. Such vehicles would not be able to use Granta Terrace, and this factor signals the demise of this site as a distribution location within the next three to five years.
 - The existing buildings at Granta Terrace would have been industry standard when built by Welch's in the 1950s, but are no longer fit for purpose and are coming to the end of their economic life.
 - Given the length of modern trucks, it is increasingly difficult to manoeuvre vehicles around the existing service yard, whilst avoiding other trucks and people.
 - Welch's cannot simply move to any business park, allocated industrial park or brownfield site in the District. The company's objectives are: close proximity to the existing base (an absolute necessity to retaining customers and staff); close proximity to the strategic road next work (particularly the A505 and the M11); and; a bespoke, new facility, that can be designed and built to the company's own specification, to address all the problems inherent within the existing sites.
 - Welch's have been looking for new premises since the early 1990s. This Council recognised this need as far back as 1993 when Granta Terrace was designated for residential use in the Local Plan, recognising Welch's difficulties and acknowledging the potential of Granta Terrace for residential use. Welch's have been trying to find this 'relocation to another site better related to the road network' for two decades. The company applied for planning permission for the redevelopment of Granta Terrace for residential use in 1993. This application was withdrawn, as Welch's could not find suitable alternative premises, and this problem has blighted the business ever since.

Planning History

9. C/0136/54 – Use as a transport site – approved
10. C/0109/55 – Erection of new transport depot – approved
11. C/0225/57 – Erection of a garage building – approved

12. C/0255/57 – Erection of new offices – approved
13. SC/0146/59 – Erection of two buildings for storage only – approved
14. C/0730/63 – Extension to existing transport stores- approved
15. C/0724/64 – Erection of joinery shop – approved
16. S/0523/74/F – Extension to warehouse – refused
17. S/2208/78/EU – Commercial use – refused
18. S/0571/93/O – Residential development – withdrawn. This coincided with the 1993 Local Plan allocation but the application was withdrawn as Welch’s could not find a suitable alternative site to relocate to.
19. S/0533/01/F – Vehicle wash unit – approved
20. S/0862/02/F – Storage building – approved

Planning Policy

21. National Planning Policy Framework 2012
22. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Core Strategy 2007:
ST/4: Rural Centres
23. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 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
 GB/3: Mitigating the Impact of Development Adjoining the Green Belt
 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/10: Foul Drainage – Alternative Drainage Systems
 NE/11: Flood Risk
 NE/12: Water Conservation
 NE/14: Lighting Proposals
 NE/15: Noise Pollution
 NE/16: Emissions
 CH/2: Archaeology
 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

TR/3: Mitigating Travel Impact

24. South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):
Open Space in New Developments – Adopted January 2009
Trees and Development Sites – Adopted January 2009
Public Art – Adopted January 2009
Biodiversity – Adopted July 2009
Landscape in New Developments – Adopted March 2010
District Design Guide – Adopted March 2010
Affordable Housing – Adopted March 2010
Health Impact Assessment – Adopted March 2011
25. 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.

Consultation by South Cambridgeshire District Council as Local Planning Authority

26. **Great Shelford Parish Council** – Recommends approval, stating it has no objections as long as issues such as overlooking and overshadowing of existing houses can be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.

In addition, no objections have been raised to the amended noise impact assessment providing the consultants' recommendations are followed in order to protect the amenities of occupiers.

27. **Stapleford Parish Council** – States that it has considered in detail the applications submitted by Welch's Group Holdings Ltd in respect of the sites at 29-35 and 32 London Road, and Granta Terrace, and recommends outline planning permission is approved for all three sites. Arising from the three applications, the Parish Council has raised a number of points which are listed below:
1. The Council has concerns over the ease of access onto London Road from both Granta Terrace and Aylesford Way.
 2. The Council wishes to question whether the visibility splay at the top of Granta Terrace is adequate?
 3. Overall safety would be improved by the introduction of interactive flashing signs on London Road, which will encourage drivers to slow down and think about pedestrians, cyclists etc.
 4. The need for a road crossing close to Dolphin Way should be considered as this is the most immediate route that will be used by parents, carers and children from the Granta Terrace site when heading to Stapleford primary school.
 5. Council expressed concerns about the position of the bus stop in the vicinity of 29-35 London Road. However, the amended proposal (dated 16 October 2012) covering access layout, visibility splays and the bus stop position (Fig SK51B) is a distinct improvement. Council has recommended approval of this amendment.
 6. The Council is aware that a number of residents from Aylesford Way have objected to provision of access via Aylesford Way. One of their concerns is that the road surface is not designed for heavy flows of traffic and the sewer is shallow. This is in contrast to Granta Terrace, which has been reconstructed at some point to cope with HGV's etc. in the light of these comments, it would be helpful to know what the Highways Department's view is on this issue.

At the public session of the Parish Council meeting, one resident raised concerns that Policy ET/8 states that employment sites should be retained for employment and not redesignated for housing. This was also a recommendation that arose in Stapleford's Parish Plan. The Parish Council considered this point but overall felt that the village benefits more from the planned developments and the improved traffic conditions, and that this outweighs the loss of potential employment in the village. The Council also recognises that the jobs are staying in the local area, as the site at Duxford is only 3 miles away.

28. **Sawston Parish Council** – Recommends approval.
29. **The Urban Design Officer** – Recommends approval, stating that the proposals are appropriately integrated with the existing adjacent developments and illustrate an outward looking development with views across the adjacent countryside, and the site planning maximises the site opportunities to create a coherent development that reinforces the street frontage. The public open space and play area as illustrated is overlooked providing good natural surveillance. The proposed access is appropriate. The building massing and form illustrated, namely 2 storey residential development, is also acceptable and in keeping with its neighbours.
30. **The Trees and Landscape Officer** – Raises no objections, stating that any trees to be retained must be afforded enough space so as not to become a nuisance. Any trees planted as part of a landscaping scheme must be provided with enough rooting volume to allow for establishment and retention into maturity.
31. **The Landscape Design Officer** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
32. **The Ecology Officer** – States that there are better design options that could be considered for the river Granta frontage. The river at this point will be immediately adjacent to the public open space. The current bank form appears to have been made up of dumped material with concrete rubble showing at many points. This bank is very high up from the water level. The Granta at this location appears to be impounded by Shelford Mill downstream and, as such, the river's velocity is reduced, leading to less scour on the bank than would be expected. Additionally, the main flood plain is the lower land on the opposite bank. It would be appropriate to lower the height and steepness of the bank so that the rubble can be removed, a safer bank profile achieved and the bank re-seeded with a wildflower mix. The drainage strategy explains that an outfall would be created in the bank. Details of the likely form should be provided as a large structure would significantly impact the meander of the river. Ideally it should discharge to the ditch where it would not affect the flow or lead to bank instability. It may be possible to integrate the outfall with bank re-grade options, and further discussion should be had on this point in consultation with the Environment Agency. The landscape proposals appear to show that small trees will be left on the river and ditch frontage. This is not entirely accepted – there are two medium-sized ash trees and two willow that should be retained as they will give strength to the bank and retain site biodiversity. The removal of the sycamore is accepted so that bank restoration can take place. The significant conifer hedge along one boundary of the site should be removed and replanted with a suitable native species mix. The general approach for the mix of wildflower planting and shrub planting is welcomed. Greenfield run-off rates will return surface water to the river and this is a gain for the river in terms of flow. A condition should be added to any consent to ensure that suitable protective fencing is in place along the ditch and the river to ensure that no debris enters the watercourse during the course of site demolition.

33. **Planning Policy** – The sites are generally suitable for residential development having regard to the LDF and national policy guidance. There is a need for additional housing in the District and a large unmet need for affordable housing which the development of these sites could partly address. Policy ST/2 states that provision will be made for 20,000 new homes to 2016. There were 9,285 completions to 31 March 2011, and the development of these sites would assist the provision of additional housing over the remainder of the plan period. Policy ST/4 identifies Shelford and Stapleford as a sustainable settlement for development and redevelopment within village frameworks without any scheme size limit. If the business was not relocating locally, redevelopment for housing would be contrary to policy. The relocation of the business to Duxford would protect local employment opportunities and add to the range of available local land and premises. There is also evidence that the operation of their existing business in the midst of a residential area is capable of generating a range of environmental problems and, if operated by another business, could generate similar or worse problems for local residents. As the relocation of the business is so important to make the proposal acceptable in planning policy terms, the development of the Duxford site should precede that of the residential sites and be secured by condition or legal agreement. The applications should also be considered as a package and determined at the same time.

The SHLAA Assessments of these sites conclude they have development potential and have therefore been included as development options in the Issues and Options document.

34. **Section 106 Officer** – Comments as follows in respect of the contributions that appear likely to be required having regard to the indicative housing number and mix. It should be noted that the recommendation of the s106 officer is that any section 106 agreement should include a formula mechanism for calculating the necessary contributions at the submission of each reserved matters application (the application before committee is outline only and is not specific as to the housing number and mix).

Education – these figures vary depending on the affordable housing tenure but a good assumption to work on is a total contribution for pre-school and primary school being in the region of £220,000 - £225,000.

Public Art – The statements submitted with the applications comment that a contribution is not necessary as this is not required by Policy SF/6. In January 2009, the Council adopted the Public Art SPD, and this states the provision of public art will be encouraged on schemes comprising 10 or more dwellings. Where a development does not include public art provision, a financial contribution will be required in order to fund the provision of a public art scheme elsewhere in the Parish (between 1-5% of the total construction cost). In recent years, a precedent has been set whereby the Council secures public art works/contributions of around £500 per dwelling and, based on this, the Council would look to secure a public art scheme to the value of around £35,000.

Public open space – The applicant has sought to combine the open space requirements for all 3 residential developments and provide all this on Site A. There are no objections to this so long as the delivery of Site A is secured. The applicant has suggested the provision of an onsite LEAP as per the Open Space SPD requirements. The location of the LEAP and the proximity to the houses does not accord with the SPD and is not therefore considered appropriate. This would result in the off-site open space contributions being a total of £184,996.27. If Stapleford Parish Council wishes to adopt the onsite open space, a further contribution would need to

be agreed to cover the maintenance of the area. The allocation of offsite open space monies between the two Parish Councils would need to be agreed.

Community facilities – Based on the total needs of the three development sites, a total contribution of £34,992.72 is required.

Household waste receptacles – A financial contribution of around £5000 would be required to provide all units with household waste bins.

Strategic waste facility improvements – A contribution is sought from all new dwellings towards upgrading existing/providing new Household Recycling Centres. The development lies within the catchment area for Cambridge, and the Milton HRC. Based on a contribution level of £190 per household, this amounts to £12,540.

Monitoring – A contribution of £5000 would be required towards monitoring of the planning obligations.

34. **Affordable Homes** – States that the proposed total provision of 14 affordable dwellings (comprising a mix of 4 x 1 bed flats, 6 x 2 bed houses, 2 x 2 bed flats, and 2 x 3 bed houses) is acceptable.
35. **The Arts Officer** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
36. **The Sustainability Officer** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
37. **The Environmental Health Officer** – No formal response has been received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
38. **The Environmental Health Officer (Contaminated Land)** – States that the reports indicate that remedial measures are required to be incorporated into the development for the protection of human health, comprising clean soil cover in the south west, upgraded water supply pipes and for services to be fitted with clean corridors. The reports indicate further site investigation is required following the demolition of buildings and removal of on-site tanks and further groundwater and gas monitoring. The majority of this work should be carried out prior to development, but the final elements will need to be carried out in parallel with construction works. Any consent should therefore be subject to a condition to secure this.
39. **The Environmental Health Officer (Air Quality)** – States that the Air Quality Assessment indicates that the proposed development will have negligible impact on the ambient air quality near the development site and that it is unlikely national air quality objectives will be exceeded. The magnitude of change caused by the development is considered to be imperceptible in accordance with the guidelines published by Environmental Protection (2010). This guidance is not statutory and should be used with caution. Emissions attributed to vehicles, mainly fine particles and nitrogen dioxide, can impact on health and quality of life. In order to mitigate the impact and contribute towards exposure reduction of these pollutants, the applicant should be encouraged to implement residential framework travel plans and consider provision for recharging electric vehicles either within garages or associated parking area. In conclusion, air quality impacts should not preclude the granting of planning permission, but the mitigation proposed in order to minimise the effect of vehicle emissions should be secured through conditions or a S106.

40. **The Environmental Health Officer (Public Health Specialist)** – Raises no objections, stating that the submitted Health Impact Assessment has been assessed as Grade B. This meets the required standard of the HIA SPD, which states that only grades A or B are acceptable. There are concerns relating to the proximity of the dwellings to the current residential area to the west and the potential for adverse health impact due to noise affecting these residents, and the EHO should be consulted with regards to location/layout and potential noise mitigation measures.
41. **The Drainage Manager** – Raises no fundamental objections. Any surface run-off directed to the Council's Award Drain will require the prior consent of the Council's Drainage Manager. Any consent should be subject to a condition requiring a detailed surface water design.
42. **The Environmental Services Department (Waste Management)** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
43. **The Environment Agency** – Initially commented that there is insufficient information to fully assess the proposals with regards to flood risk. The FRA is incomplete. The data used to assess the site appears inappropriate. An aerial photo from 2001 shows flood water up to at least the boundary of the site. In the absence of an acceptable FRA, the Environment Agency objects to the proposal and recommends refusal.

Following the submission of additional information (the 2nd part of the FRA), the EA withdraws its objection. The proposed development area would be on existing ground levels above the 1 in 100 year plus climate change allowance modelled flood levels. The majority of the public open space would not be at risk from extreme event flooding with the possible exception of a small area in the south-eastern corner where levels are below 16.00m ODN. Any consent should be subject to conditions requiring details of surface water drainage, preventing development within the public open space area, details of any landscaping/boundary treatment of the open space, contamination investigation and remediation, details of penetrative foundation design.

44. **Anglian Water** – States that there are assets owned by Anglian Water within or close to the site that may affect the layout of the site. This should be made clear through an informative within any decision notice.
45. **The Local Highways Authority** – Objects to the application. It should be demonstrated that the proposed access provides suitable visibility splays as per manual for streets. Therefore empirical speed and volume data will be required as the LHA has concerns regarding the practicality of the proposed access location onto Aylesford Way. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m should be shown in full in both directions onto Aylesford Way and in a northerly direction onto Granta Terrace. 2m x 2m pedestrian visibility splays will need to be provided within the curtilage of each new space that exits directly onto the highway. A footway (preferably 2m wide) should be implemented on both sides of the carriageway within the site (which should be 5.5m wide). Details of cycle parking facilities should be provided before commencement of development. The additional access to Aylesford Way should be omitted. A larger-scale vehicle swept path drawing should be provided. An alternative to the proposed car courts should also be considered as previously these have been found not to be fully utilised by residents for parking of their vehicles. This can lead to demand for on street parking. All single garages should measure 6m x 3m internally. Parking spaces must measure 5m x 2.5m with a 6m reversing space. Any consent

should be subject to a condition requiring a traffic management plan for the construction period.

The Transport Assessment Team states that the consultants have provided traffic flow diagrams to show the predicted changes in vehicular movements. In traffic flow terms, the net changes in flow compared to existing uses are low and, in traffic operational terms, these are acceptable. Details of the proposed junction arrangements will need to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Section 1.45 of the TS discusses the narrow and constrained nature of Granta Terrace and issues of on-street parking. Section 2.13 discusses proposed parking provision associated with the development. A review of on site parking provision will need to be agreed at the reserved matters stage. The level of development falls just below the level for which a Travel Plan would normally be required (80 dwellings). However, CCC would still wish to ensure that sustainable travel patterns are established at the sites and recommends that welcome packs are made available to occupants setting out options for sustainable transport including bus and train timetables/plans, and information on local cycle networks. Sections 1.35 and 1.36 of the TS discuss existing bus stop provision and note that limited provision is made for passengers especially for eastbound services. CCC recommends the developer provides real time displays and raised kerbs at both bus stops.

46. **The County Archaeologist** – Records indicate the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential. Important remains survive on site and these would be severely damaged or destroyed by the proposed development. The site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation which can be required by a condition of any planning permission.
47. **The Police Architectural Liaison Officer** – States that the risk from crime and ASB is low. Stapleford has 101 recorded crimes over a 2 year period, and 17 crimes recorded in the vicinity in the past 2 years. The layout of the site achieves good surveillance of all routes and public amenity space. The parking for the terraced houses A1 & A2 is away from the front of properties. Ideally householders should be able to see their car. However, the row of parking to the east is overlooked from the front by the A2 terrace. For the parking at the other end, surveillance could be provided by the A3 and A4 flats. Parking north of A5 could suffer a lack of surveillance. A window in A5 giving an active view from occupied rooms would assist in dealing with this. All other parking is in-curtilage which is ideal from a crime reduction perspective. Provided there is good surveillance of parked vehicles throughout, the layout is acceptable from a crime reduction and community safety perspective.
48. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** – States that adequate provision should be made for fire hydrants by way of a Section 106 Agreement or planning condition.
49. **The County Education Officer** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.

Representations by members of the public

50. Letters have been received from the owners of Nos. 5 and 7, and Firethorn in Aylesford Way, No.5 Granta Terrace and No.37 Hawthorne Road. A petition has also been submitted by Firethorn – this has been signed by the residents of Nos. 1a, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 15, 26, 30, 32 and 34 Aylesford Way, and No. 66 London Road. The main points raised are:

- Aylesford Way is a narrow, quiet street with quiet, older residents, and unsuitable to be joined to a new estate with children playing. It should not be used to access the site.
- There is insufficient parking on the site, and Aylesford Way is not designed for overflow parking.
- Granta Terrace is wider and already used for high volumes of traffic, and suited to take all the traffic volumes from the new estate.
- The density of dwellings is too high. The SHLAA recommends the site as suitable for 33 dwellings.
- The proposed dwellings would seriously detriment the amenities of Nos. 5, 5a and 6 Granta Terrace. The dwellings will be unsightly and result in a loss of light to these 3 properties, especially to No.5a's southerly window. These properties should be on the same build line as Nos. 5a and 6.
- The owner of No.25 Aylesford Way welcomes the development, stating the public open space adjacent to the river and provision of adequate parking are welcome and should be retained in any future application.
- Concerns regarding the position and layout of the access to the site from Aylesford Way. The proposed T-junction to the south of No.12 presents a road safety hazard in conjunction with the existing bend. Sight lines for vehicles turning right into the estate would be very poor. This could be addressed by providing the junction in place of the existing bend. It is understood this was incorporated at the pre-application stage. Have the relative merits of the different layouts been assessed?
- The application includes no information regarding how the sewage from the development will be disposed of. There are 2 small processing plants in Aylesford Way with sewers that are just adequate for the existing houses. Will sewage for the development be carried away and dealt with elsewhere?
- Aylesford Way covers a shallow sewer, which is liable to collapse with heavier traffic.
- This is the only substantial area of employment land in Stapleford and has protection from change within Policy ET/8. As Welch's are proposing to relocate to Duxford, there is no reason to suppose that any future employment use of the land would necessarily generate environmental problems. The Local Plan states that the provision and preservation of employment land in villages is a key aim. It requires applications resulting in a loss of employment to be accompanied by documentary evidence that the site is not suitable or capable of being made suitable for continued employment use, including evidence of marketing for a minimum 12 month period. Whilst there is some need for additional housing in Stapleford, this could be met by the other two applications and that no need has been established for the 44 dwellings. The provision of employment opportunities locally is highly desirable.

Material Planning Considerations

Principle of the development/loss of employment

51. The site is one of three sites within the centre of Great Shelford and Stapleford used in connection with the Welch's business. Policy ET/6 of the LDF states that the redevelopment of existing employment sites to non-employment uses within village frameworks should be resisted unless one of the following criteria is met:

- It is demonstrated that the site is inappropriate for any employment use to continue having regard to market demand. Applications should include evidence,

- to include a minimum 12 month marketing period, that the site is not suitable or capable of being made suitable for continued employment use;
- The overall benefit to the community of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of available employment land and premises;
 - The existing use is generating environmental problems such as noise, pollution or unacceptable levels of traffic.
52. The redevelopment of the three sites for housing would, if considered in isolation, result in the loss of local employment and, hence, be contrary to the above policy. However, Welch's are intending to relocate to Duxford (as proposed within application reference S/1726/12/FL) and, if this application is granted, existing jobs and local employment opportunities would be protected thereby ensuring the aims of Policy ET/6 would not be compromised.
53. Paragraph 8 of this report sets out Welch's justification for the proposed relocation of the business away from their existing sites in Great Shelford and Stapleford. Officers consider that this justification forms a compelling argument for the relocation of the business, and the significant shortcomings inherent with the existing sites has long been acknowledged by the Council. In the 1993 Local Plan, the Granta Terrace site was allocated for housing, as the location of the site in a residential area was considered to generate considerable nuisance to surrounding residents, particularly from HGV movements. The redevelopment of the site for housing, together with the relocation of the firm to other sites in the District better related to the road network and away from residential areas, was considered to solve the problem. Whilst almost 20 years has lapsed since the site was allocated for residential purposes, these issues are still as applicable today.
54. No marketing of the existing sites has been undertaken and it could be argued that, to fully comply with the above policy, the existing sites should be retained for employment purposes rather than redeveloped for housing. However, the premises could only be marketed on the basis of the established use of the site, and this use has clearly been acknowledged as unsuitable and untenable within this residential area. Welch's have worked extremely hard to maintain a good relationship with surrounding residents and to keep any disturbance to a minimum, but this wouldn't necessarily be the case if the sites were operated and occupied by an alternative business of this nature.
55. Notwithstanding the above, LDF Policy ST/4 identifies Great Shelford and Stapleford as a Rural Centre and, in such locations, residential development without any limit on scheme size is acceptable in principle. The Planning Policy team has advised that less than half of the 20,000 new homes required to be provided by 2016 were completed by the end of 2011 and that development of the sites would assist in the provision of additional housing over the remainder of the plan period. In addition, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment concluded that all three sites have development potential.
56. Taking the above policies into consideration, the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes is considered to be acceptable in principle, but only if Members have firstly resolved to grant planning permission for the proposed new site in Duxford (S/1726/12/FL). As the relocation of the business is essential to ensure the proposals are acceptable in planning policy terms, any approval would need to be subject to a legal agreement requiring the Duxford site to be provided in advance of any residential development coming forward. For viability reasons, it is accepted that the completion of the Duxford site in advance of any residential development may not

be achievable or reasonable, and it is therefore suggested that any legal agreement be subject to a requirement for a substantive start to be made on the Duxford site, thereby providing the Council with sufficient evidence and confidence that the company will relocate to the Duxford site. Without such controls in place, the applicants could theoretically move outside the District and benefit from a reduced level of planning obligations and it is therefore essential that the appropriate safeguards are in place to prevent this (albeit unlikely) scenario arising.

Housing density, mix, affordable housing and contributions

57. The erection of 44 dwellings on the site equates to a density of 35 dwellings per hectare, with the overall density across the three proposed residential sites amounting to 38 dwellings per hectare. The density of development therefore accords with LDF Policy HG/1, which requires residential developments to achieve an average net density of at least 30 dwellings per hectare.
58. LDF Policy HG/3 requires the provision of a minimum of 40% affordable housing for new housing development, whilst Policy HG/2 requires the following mix for the market element of schemes proposing up to 10 dwellings:
- 1 or 2 bedroom dwellings – minimum 40%
 - 3 bedrooms – approximately 25%
 - 4 bedrooms – approximately 25%
59. For larger schemes, the mix of units is intended to provide a range of accommodation, including 1 or 2 bed dwellings, having regard to economic viability, the local context of the site and the need to secure a balanced community.
60. This application relating to Site A proposes 14 affordable dwellings and 30 market houses. As stated earlier in the report, this application is intended to be considered as a package along with sites B and C (both in London Road), with a total of 66 dwellings proposed on all three sites. Across the three sites, it is proposed to provide 14 no. (21%) affordable dwellings all of which would be located on this site, due to the requirements of affordable housing providers and management issues associated with scattered sites.
61. This level of overall affordable housing provision clearly contravenes the minimum 40% requirements set out within Policy HG/3 and the Affordable Housing SPD. In accordance with the requirements of the SPD, the applicants have undertaken a viability assessment and appraisal, and the Council has appointed an independent expert to assess the viability of the four proposals. This exercise included: a) reviewing the information submitted by the applicant in respect of the residential sites; b) providing an assessment of the build and infrastructure costs associated with the relocation site; and c) providing a report to the Council with recommendations on the likely level of planning obligations achievable. The Council's consultant worked closely with the applicant to scrutinise the information which resulted in most items being agreed upon. The principal issue that could not be agreed upon is the extent to which the three residential sites should cross subsidise the relocation of the existing business. The initial view from the Council's consultant was that the three residential sites were technically viable with 40% affordable housing, as the residual land value exceeded an assumed existing use value for the sites. During negotiations the applicant explained that, due to high land costs in South Cambridgeshire, they would be unable to relocate the existing business within the District should such a high level of affordable housing provision be required. It was also explained that other finance sources (i.e. company savings) would be required to fund parts of the new facility as

figures quoted were not fully inclusive of all costs. As a result the applicant suggested that the proposal would be unviable at an affordable housing provision in excess of 12%. The Affordable Homes Team has suggested that, regardless of other material considerations, it would be unable to support a scheme that delivered less than 20% affordable housing.

62. The application relating to this site has subsequently been amended to increase the level of affordable housing provision from 12% to 21%, providing a total of 14 units. Further viability appraisals were evaluated following changes to the indicative scheme design and have been presented to the District Council. The applicant has also updated their position statement talking account of the negotiations that have since been concluded. Taking these viability considerations into account, together with the response from the Affordable Homes team advising that the number, location and mix of the proposed affordable dwellings on Site A is acceptable, officers are minded to recommend the applications be approved on the basis of delivering 14 affordable dwellings, to be secured through a Section 106 Agreement.
63. There would be 52 market properties provided across the three sites, with the following mix being proposed:
- 18 no. 1 and 2 bed dwellings (Sites A and C) – 34.6%
 - 3 no. 3-bed dwellings (Site A) – 5.8%
 - 31 no. 4+bed dwellings (Sites A and B) – 59.6%
64. Policy HG/2 explains that, for large development schemes, there can be some flexibility in the normal 40%/25%/25% ratio required on smaller sites. In this instance, the three sites are considered to achieve a good ratio of smaller 1 and 2 bed units. The number of proposed three bedroom dwellings is very low, but the applicant's agents have advised that the increase in affordable housing provision from 12% to 21% is predicated on the ability to achieve the larger type of units on the remainder of the three sites. It is argued that the sales market for private housing is at the family end of the spectrum in a location such as this, hence the proportion of larger sized units. On balance, and taking into account these factors, the overall mix of the market element of the proposal is considered to be acceptable.
65. As the most significant part of Welch's business is conducted on this site in Granta Terrace, the company would need to remain in situ until the Duxford development has been completed. As a result, it is most likely that this would be the last of the three proposed residential sites to come forward. As the affordable housing for all three sites is intended to be provided entirely on this site, it would be essential that Sites B and C be subject to a Section 106 Agreement to require the provision of a commuted sum in the event that Site A fails to come forward within an agreed timescale.

Highway safety

66. Stapleford Parish Council and a number of local residents have raised concerns regarding the highway safety implications of the proposal, and particularly regarding the suitability of Aylesford Way as a means of access to the site.
67. This outline application is solely seeking approval for the means of access at this stage. The Local Highways Authority has been consulted on the proposal and has raised no in principle objections in respect of the existing visibility splays at the top of either Granta Terrace or Aylesford Way, or to the intensification of use of Aylesford Way. The LHA objected to the originally proposed access position onto Aylesford Way, directly to the south of No.12, on the basis that, if located in this position, the

required 2.4m x 43m visibility splays would not be achievable. In response to these concerns, and in consultation with the Highways Authority, the plans have been amended to reposition the access further to the south, at the point at which Aylesford Way turns 90 degrees to the east, thereby creating a T-junction. The LHA has indicated verbally that such an arrangement would be acceptable and would resolve its concerns regarding the highway safety implications of the proposal.

68. The application indicates there would be a total of 69 parking spaces for the 44 dwellings, which equates to a ratio of 1.57 spaces per dwelling. Concerns have been raised within responses received that this would result in on-street parking problems. The Council's parking standards require the provision of a maximum average of 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling, and the number of spaces shown within the illustrative layout therefore complies with the maximum policy standards. It should also be stressed that the site is in a sustainable location, in close proximity to services and facilities within Great Shelford and Stapleford and within walking distance of a bus stop, and car ownership would not therefore be a necessity in this location. The proposed level of parking provision indicated is therefore considered to be appropriate and, in any case, would be finalised through the Reserved Matters process.
69. The County Council's Transport Assessment team has commented that limited provision is made for passengers at the existing bus stops in the vicinity of the site (on London Road), particularly for eastbound services. The County Council has recommended that real time displays and raised kerbs be provided at both bus stops, in order to encourage sustainable transport amongst residents. The required works have been calculated as equating to approximately £15,000 per bus stop and would need to be incorporated into the required legal agreement.

Design and visual impact

70. The application has been submitted following extensive pre-application discussions with Officers, with the illustrative layout being amended to address comments and concerns raised during this process.
71. The existing buildings on the site are unattractive, functional structures that date from the 1950's. The removal of these buildings and their replacement with appropriately designed dwellings, riverside walkway and area of public open space, would significantly enhance the character and appearance of the area.
72. The illustrative plan shows the provision of a layout that connects Granta Terrace to the west with Aylesford Way to the east. The northern part of the site is shown as comprising two-storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings and apartment blocks, with the scale and design of properties at this end reflecting the character within Granta Terrace, and the layout shown turning the corner into the site. At the eastern end of the site, two-storey dwellings are also proposed, with the layout designed to follow the building lines established by the dwellings to the north and east within Aylesford Way. Whilst the adjacent properties in Aylesford Way are bungalows, the two-storey scale is considered to be appropriate in principle given that the dwellings would be viewed more in the context of the development site.
73. At the southern end of the site, the illustrative layout indicates the provision of larger dwellings that would face a river walkway and area of public open space adjacent to the River Granta. Previous iterations of the proposal discussed at the pre-application stage included schemes that turned away, or were side on to, this area. The layout shown within the illustrative plans would provide an attractive outlook for future

residents of the dwellings (as well as appropriate surveillance of the open space area) and ensure that distant views of the site from across the river would be of the frontages of dwellings rather than rear gardens.

74. The Urban Design Officer has considered the submitted illustrative layout and advised the form of development indicated is appropriate.

Residential amenity

75. The site is adjoined by residential properties within Granta Terrace and Aylesford Way, as well as the rear gardens of dwellings fronting London Road. The submitted illustrative layout drawings indicate that distances of 25 metres can be achieved between opposing windows of the proposed dwellings and existing surrounding properties. Concerns have been raised by residents within Granta Terrace regarding the impact of the proposed two-storey block of apartments at the north-western edge of the site. Officers consider that the position of the units indicated, given their siting entirely in front of the front elevation of this property and directly to the south, would result in a loss of amenity to the adjacent residents. However, the layout has been submitted for illustrative purposes only, and would not be approved as part of any permission. Officers consider that this section of the site could be redesigned to address these issues without affecting the overall proposed number of dwellings.
76. The proposal would result in the removal of the existing haulage and distribution use from the site and, therefore, all HGV movements in Granta Terrace associated with the existing use would cease. Whilst the number of trips associated with the site would be anticipated to rise, given that these would be cars rather than HGV's, the use of the site for residential purposes would enhance the amenities of existing residents in Granta Terrace. Residents within Aylesford Way would experience a greater level of car traffic using the road than is presently the case, but this is not considered to give rise to an unacceptable level of harm or noise disturbance to these residents.
77. As well as the amenities of existing residents, it is also necessary to consider whether future residents of the proposed dwellings would experience a satisfactory level of amenity. Whilst no formal response has been received from the Environmental Health Officer (EHO), there have been on-going discussions between the EHO and the applicant's consultants. The EHO has advised that the relocation of the existing industrial site and consequent environmental enhancements are generally welcomed, but that the submitted acoustic information indicates that the four plots closest to Wedd's Joinery and other industrial units at Nos.9 and 10 Granta Terrace are likely to experience excessive noise. This could result in noise complaints from future residents and, potentially, the operation from adjacent industrial units being deemed a statutory noise nuisance. The EHO has requested further clarification and information on this issue.
78. Providing the Environmental Health Officer raises no in principle objections after consideration of the additional noise impact information, it is considered that the submitted layout plan satisfactorily demonstrates that the site is capable of accommodating up to 44 dwellings without resulting in harm to the amenities of its residents or adjacent residents.

Flood risk/contamination/drainage issues

79. The southern part of the site, running parallel with the River Granta, lies within an area of high flood risk. The illustrative layout has indicated that this area would be

designated as public open space. The Environment Agency initially objected to the proposal. However, it has since transpired that this was due to the fact that part of the FRA was missing from the application submission. This information has since been provided as a result of which the EA has withdrawn its objection to the scheme, advising that the proposed development area would be on existing ground levels above the 1 in 100 year plus climate change allowance modelled flood levels, and that the majority of the public open space would not be at risk from extreme event flooding with the possible exception of a small area in the south-eastern corner where levels are below 16.00m ODN.

80. The application has been accompanied by a contamination assessment which indicates that remedial measures are required to be incorporated into the development comprising clean soil cover in the south west, upgraded water supply pipes and for services to be fitted with clean corridors. This can be controlled by planning condition.
81. Concerns have been raised by Stapleford Parish Council and local residents regarding foul and surface water drainage arrangements for the site. The Environment Agency's response has clarified that such details would need to be conditioned as part of any consent, and details agreed prior to the commencement of any development.

Ecology issues

82. The Council's Ecology Officer has advised that there is scope to provide ecological enhancements to the site by regarding the embankment adjacent to the River Granta. The applicant's agents are presently liaising with the Environment Agency in order to establish whether these suggested enhancements would be acceptable from a flood risk point of view. This is a matter of detail that could be finalised as part of any reserved matters application and it is suggested that a condition requiring a scheme of ecological enhancement be attached to any consent.

Sustainability issues

83. The application proposes that the 10% renewable energy requirements would be achieved through the use of solar panels.

Developer contributions

84. The planning statement includes an agreement to the contributions required towards the provision and maintenance of open space, community facilities, education, waste and monitoring. Whilst the statement also contends that a contribution towards public art is not required, following the response from the S106 Officer, the agents have concurred with this requirement also being incorporated into any legal agreement.
85. The site includes a proposed area of public open space adjacent to the river. The original drawings proposed the provision of a Local Equipped Area of Play within the open space. However, the indicative LEAP was located within 20 metres of dwellings and was therefore not in compliance with the relevant policy requirements. Officers are not convinced that a policy compliant LEAP could be provided. To achieve at least 9 pieces of play equipment with a 20 metre buffer would result in a long, narrow strip of play equipment directly adjacent to the river. In view of the fact that the site lies within easy walking distance of well-equipped recreation grounds within Great Shelford and Stapleford, officers consider that a compromise solution, consisting of a smaller equipped play area for younger children, should be provided on the site. The

S106 agreement could be drafted to require a LEAP but, in the event this is unachievable, the fallback position would be the provision of a smaller play area on site (consisting of 4-5 pieces of equipment) with an offsite payment representing the difference between the value of what can be accommodated on site and the total play contribution of £107,919.85.

86. The S106 Agreement would also need to include provision for improvements to the existing bus stops in London Road, as set out in paragraph 70 above.

Recommendation

87. If planning application S/1726/12/FL is approved by Members, the recommendation is one of delegated approval (subject to no objections being raised by the Environmental Health Officer and Local Highways Authority to any additional noise impact information provided and the revised access arrangement respectively), as amended by Flood Risk Assessment (Part 2) date stamped 18th September 2012, Health Impact Assessment date stamped 18th October 2012, noise impact assessment date stamped 12th November 2012, and Tree Survey and drawing numbers G003/102 Rev PL3, 103 Rev PL3, 107 Rev PL2 and 675007/120 Rev PL1 date stamped 21st November 2012. Any permission would need to be subject to the prior signing of a Section 106 Agreement in accordance with the terms set out in this report, and to the following conditions:

1. Approval of the details of the layout of the site, the scale and appearance of the development, and the landscaping (hereinafter called the “reserved matters”) shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.
(Reason – This application is in outline only.)
2. Application for the approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
(Reason – The application is in outline only).
3. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
(Reason – The application is in outline only.)
4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 site location plan, G003/101 Rev PL1 and 107 Rev PL2 (access only).
(Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)
5. The layout shown within drawing numbers G003/102 Rev PL3 and 103 Rev PL3 is for illustrative purposes only and is not approved by this consent.
(Reason – The application is in outline only).
6. Before the occupation of any dwellings on the site, the access from the existing highway shall be laid in accordance with the approved drawings.
(Reason – In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

7. The access shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway, in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason – To prevent surface water discharging to the highway in the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
8. No unbound material shall be used in the surface finish of the driveway within 6 metres of the highway boundary of the site.
(Reason – To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
9. No development shall take place until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - i) Contractors' access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel;
 - ii) Contractors' site storage area(s) and compounds(s);
 - iii) Parking for contractors' vehicles and contractors' personnel vehicles;Development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason - In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with Policies DP/3 and DP/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
10. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years from the date of the planting, or replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.
(Reason - To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity in accordance with Policies DP/2 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
11. Any removal of trees, scrub or hedgerow shall not take place in the bird breeding season between 15 February and 15 July inclusive, unless a mitigation scheme for the protection of bird-nesting habitat has been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To avoid causing harm to nesting birds in accordance with their protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and in accordance with Policies DP/1, DP/3 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
12. No development shall take place until a scheme for the final treatment and form of the river bank frontage adjacent to the River Granta has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To enhance ecological interests in accordance with Policies DP/1, DP/3 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

13. No development shall take place until a scheme of ecological enhancement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the features to be enhanced, recreated and managed for species of local importance both in the course of development and in the future. The scheme shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To enhance ecological interests in accordance with Policies DP/1, DP/3 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
14. No development shall take place until a scheme for protective fencing along the ditch has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason - To ensure no debris enters the watercourse during demolition, to prevent harm to ecological interests in accordance with Policies DP/1, DP/3 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
15. During the period of construction, no power operated machinery shall be operated on the site before 0800 hours and after 1800 hours on weekdays and 1300 hours on Saturdays, nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays, unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason – To minimise noise disturbance to adjoining residents in accordance with Policy NE/15 of the Local Development Framework 2007.)
16. No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage strategy should demonstrate the surface water run-off generated up to and including the 1 in 100 year critical storm inclusive of an appropriate climate change allowance will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site following the corresponding rainfall event. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion.
(Reason - To prevent the increased risk of flooding, both on and off site, in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
17. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the implementation programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To reduce the risk of pollution to the water environment and to ensure a satisfactory method of foul water drainage in accordance with Policy NE/10 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
18. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification, the public open space area as shown hatched green within the redline application area on Drawing G003/103 Rev P1 dated 27

July 2012 (excepting the proposed residential development area) shall remain sterile with no development, including any extensions, buildings, walls and/or ground raising taking place unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Authority.

(Reason - To ensure the potential floodplain area is exempt from permitted development rights and prevent any increased risk of flooding that would otherwise be caused by a reduction in flood storage capacity or deflection of flood flows, in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

19. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed scheme for landscaping and boundary treatment of the public open space area shown hatched green within the redline application area on Drawing G003/103 Rev P1 dated 27 July 2012 (excepting the proposed residential development area) shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.
(Reason - To ensure no ground raising, fencing or major planting will be detrimental to flood flows or flood storage capacity, in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
20. No development approved by this planning permission (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), shall take place until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority:
 - a) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified: all previous uses; potential contaminants associated with those uses; a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors; and potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.
 - b) A site investigation scheme, based on (a) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
 - c) The results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (b) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
 - d) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (c) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.
(Reason – To ensure that risks from land contamination and potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses (including petrol filling station) to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters (particularly the principal aquifer and River Granta), property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy DP/1 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
21. No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted

to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan") for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan. The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

(Reason – To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the principal aquifer and River Granta), from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses (including petrol filling station), in accordance with Policy DP/1 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

22. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

(Reason – To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the principal aquifer and River Granta), from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses (including petrol filling station), in accordance with Policy DP/1 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

23. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason – To prevent the risk of contamination to potable supplies from, for example, pollution/turbidity, risk of mobilising contamination, drilling through different aquifers and creating preferential pathways. Thus it should be demonstrated that any proposed piling will not result in contamination of groundwater, in accordance with Policy DP/1 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

24. No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision and implementation of renewable energy technologies, to provide at least 10% of the predicted energy requirements through renewable energy technology, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason – To ensure that the scheme generates at least 10% of its energy from renewable sources in accordance with Policy NE/3 of the Local Development Framework 2007.)

25. No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve the development to a standard recommended by the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented.

(Reason - To ensure an adequate water supply is available for emergency use.)

26. No development shall take place on the application site until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a

written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(Reason - To secure the provision of archaeological excavation and the subsequent recording of the remains in accordance with Policy CH/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

88. In the event that S/1726/12/FL is not approved by Members, the recommendation for this application is one of refusal on the grounds that, in the absence of alternative premises, the proposal would result in the loss of local employment contrary to Policy ET/6.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Development Control Policies, adopted July 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, adopted January 2007
- Supplementary Planning Documents: Open Space in New Developments, Trees and Development Sites, Public Art, Biodiversity, Landscape in New Developments, District Design Guide, Affordable Housing, Health Impact Assessment
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- Circular 11/95
- Planning File References: S/1725/12/OL, S/1727/12/OL, S/1728/12/OL, S/1726/12/FL, C/0136/54, C/0109/55, C/0225/57, C/0255/57, SC/0146/59, C0730/63, C/0724/64, S/0523/74/F, S/2208/78/EU, S/0571/93/O, S/0533/01/F and S/0862/02/F.

Case Officer: Lorraine Casey – Senior Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713251