

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

5 December 2012

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

S/1728/12/OL – GREAT SHELFORD

Outline application, including means of access, for the erection of up to 14 dwellings and associated parking and landscaping following the demolition of existing buildings and removal of hardstanding, at 32 London Road 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 0.22 hectare application site is located on the south side of London Road 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 is occupied by a single-storey (approximately 5 metre high) brick building with a mansard style profiled metal roof and canopy to the front. It is used for a motor dealership and external car sales with a vehicle workshop to the rear. To the east and west of the site are pairs of two-storey semi-detached Victorian dwellings. To the south, beyond a 2 metre high fence forming the rear boundary, the land backs onto Granta Terrace, a narrow, private road with a row of two-storey properties along its southern side. On the opposite side of London Road to the north is a parcel of land that is currently fenced off and historically been used for associated customer and staff parking.
2. The application seeks outline consent, with all matters other than the means of access reserved, for the erection of up to fourteen dwellings on the site. The submitted access layout plan, as amended, proposes the provision of a single centrally positioned vehicular access. This would be a 6.5 metre wide shared pedestrian and vehicular surface in a hammerhead arrangement at the end. The access would comprise 4.5 metre kerb radii and 2.4 metre x 70 metre visibility splays in both directions.

3. The illustrative layout drawings indicate the provision of two apartment blocks to the front, designed in a semi-detached plan form, with the access road positioned centrally between them, and a terraced apartment block to the rear. The access is shown in a hammerhead arrangement, with parking spaces for all the dwellings accessed directly off the hammerhead and provided at a ratio of one space per dwelling. The Design and Access Statement suggests that the frontage dwellings would take the form of two large semi-detached traditionally styled villas set back from the street and following the existing building line, whilst the rear dwellings would have lower ridge lines and single-storey height eaves. It is proposed that the dwellings would comprise a mix of 4 no. 1 bed and 10 no. 2-bed apartments.
4. 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 C. Separate applications have been submitted for residential development on the other two sites. Site A is located in Granta Terrace and is a 1.63 hectare site comprising Welch's headquarters (used for road haulage, distribution, warehousing, truck and van sales, and vehicle/crane hire) and is the subject of an outline application for 44 houses (Reference S/1725/12/OL). Site B relates to the car parking area on the opposite side of the road and is the subject of an outline application for 8 dwellings (Reference S/1727/12/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.
5. The planning statement accompanying the application explains that Welch's currently operate on three separate sites with 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.
6. 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

7. C/0417/57 – Extension of showroom and office to commercial garage – approved
8. C/0111/64 – Erection of paint preparation shop for motor vehicles – refused
9. S/0697/84/F – Petrol canopy – approved
10. S/0892/91/F – Extension for service bays – refused
11. S/1525/91/F – Extension for service bays – refused
12. S/1660/91/F – Redevelopment of garage complex – approved

Planning Policy

13. National Planning Policy Framework 2012
14. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Core Strategy 2007:
ST/4: Rural Centres
15. 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
 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/15: Noise Pollution
NE/16: Emissions
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

16. 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
17. 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

18. **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.

No objections are raised in respect of the amended plans showing the access layout, visibility splays and bus stop position. 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.

19. **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.

20. **The Urban Design Officer** – Recommends approval, stating that the proposals are appropriately integrated with the existing adjacent developments, and the site planning maximises the site opportunities to create a coherent development that reinforces the street frontage. The proposed access is appropriate. The building massing and form illustrated, namely 2 and 2.5 storey residential development, is also acceptable and in keeping with its neighbours. Further development must respect the existing neighbours.
21. **The Trees and Landscape Officer** – Raises no objections, stating that there are no trees of significance on site. Landscaping is vital, and trees planted as part of a landscaping scheme must be provided with enough rooting volume to allow for establishment and retention into maturity. Details of planting pits will be required as part of any landscaping scheme and trees should include specimens that will reach 10-15 metres in maturity to retain the contribution to the overall tree scene of the area.
22. **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.
23. **The Ecology Officer** – Raises no objections subject to a condition to control vegetation removal during the bird nesting season.
24. **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.

25. **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.

25. **Affordable Homes** – States that the proposed total provision of 14 affordable dwellings [on Site A] (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.
26. **The Arts Officer** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
27. **The Sustainability Officer** – No response received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
28. **The Environmental Health Officer** – No formal response has been received to date. However, the EHO has advised verbally that, following the submission of a noise impact assessment, there are no in principle objections, subject to the imposition of conditions, including a noise insulation scheme to protect the dwellings from London Road traffic noise. Members will be advised of the recommended conditions in an update prior to the Committee meeting.
29. **The Environmental Health Officer (Contaminated Land)** – States the submitted report indicates that remedial measures are required for protection of both human health and controlled waters. Some of these measures for protection of human health will need to be incorporated into the development. The work will need to be carried out during rather than prior to development. Any permission should be subject to a condition requiring works to be carried out in accordance with submitted reports.
30. **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.
31. **The Drainage Manager** – Expresses concern that the proposed method of surface water disposal is to the foul public sewer. A suitable surface drainage outfall must be identified, as infiltration suds do not appear to be suitable for the site. If no outlet can be identified, would wish to object to the application.
32. **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.

33. **The Environment Agency** – States that discharging surface water to the public foul sewer would not be acceptable as it may exacerbate surging of the foul sewer network and sewage treatment works. A sustainable method of surface water drainage must therefore be approved prior to commencement of any development. Conditions are also recommended relating to contamination investigation and piling/foundation design.
34. **Anglian Water** – Raises no objections, stating that there are no assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within the site.
35. **The Local Highways Authority** – A drawing showing 2.4m x 70m visibility splays is required. 2m x 2m visibility splays to each access are also required. Additional conditions should require the access to be constructed to avoid surface water draining onto the highway, the access to be constructed from a bound material, and to require a traffic management plan during the construction period.
36. **The County Archaeologist** – Raises no objections, stating that archaeological works would not be necessary.
37. **The Police Architectural Liaison Officer** – Advises that crime in the area is low. There have only been 17 crimes in London Road in the past 2 years. The site is surrounded by the residential gardens of existing properties. As a non-permeable site there is statistically a greatly reduced risk of crime. Vehicle parking to the rear of properties fronting London Road is not ideal, but there is good surveillance of this area from properties to the rear of the site. The layout appears acceptable. The final developers of the site should consider achieving a Secured by Design award as SBD developments are statistically 65% less likely to be the subject of burglary crime.
38. **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.
39. **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

40. Letters of objection have been received from the owner/occupiers of Nos. 27 and 30 London Road, Nos. 23 and 25 Granta Terrace (as well as an additional resident of Granta Terrace, address not provided). The main points raised are:
- Overlooking from rear units into garden and kitchen/diner of No.30 London Road.
 - Insufficient parking – 1 space per unit would not be adequate. And would result in more on-street parking in and around London Road.
 - Loss of vehicular right of way to No.30
 - Proposal has expanded from 9 houses at pre-application stage. 14 houses would be too high a density and result in an over-development of the site. 8 dwellings to match those on the opposite side of the site would be an appropriate level of development for a site of this size.
 - The development would adversely affect properties on London Road and Granta Terrace.
 - It should be possible for the site to be cleared of contamination so that houses would be acceptable.
 - The plan seems to show pedestrian access onto Granta Terrace (Nos. 19-31). This is a private unmade road maintained by residents that is used for access

and parking. It is used for residents parking on the right hand side. A gate is shown opening onto this road and would result in the loss of one parking space, exacerbating existing parking problems.

- Welch's provides local jobs for the village, which has helped to maintain the local economy and enhance the vibrant nature of the local area. If the company needs to move, the sites should be replaced with other commercial ventures to promote a healthy and diverse community.

Material Planning Considerations

Principle of the development/loss of employment

41. 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.
42. 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.
43. Paragraph 6 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.
44. 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.

45. 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.
46. 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

47. The erection of 14 dwellings on the site equates to a density of 64 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.
48. 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%
49. 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.
50. The application relating to Site C proposes 4 x 1-bedroom and 10 x 2-bedroom market dwellings. As stated earlier in the report, this application is intended to be considered as a package along with sites A (Granta Terrace) and B (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 Site A, due to the requirements of affordable housing providers and management issues associated with scattered sites.

51. 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 [confidential] 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.
52. The application relating to Site A 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 taking 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.
53. 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%
54. 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.

55. As the most significant part of Welch's business is conducted on the Granta Terrace site (Site A), the company would need to remain on this site 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 Site A, 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.
56. As this scheme proposes 14 dwellings, there would normally be a requirement for the on-site provision of public open space. In this instance, however, it is proposed that the public open space requirements associated with all three sites be accommodated entirely within Site A.

Highway safety

57. Stapleford Parish Council has raised concerns regarding the highway safety implications of the proposal, requesting that consideration be given to the introduction of flashing signs and an additional pedestrian crossing near to Dolphin Way.
58. 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 objections to the highway safety implications of the proposal, with the access layout drawing being amended to show the requested 2.4 metre x 70 metre visibility splays in their entirety. The application is therefore considered acceptable from a highway safety perspective without any need or requirement for the provision of additional safety measures in the area.
59. The application proposes a parking ratio of just 1 space per dwelling, and concerns have been raised within responses received that this would result in on-street parking. The Council's parking standards require the provision of a maximum average of 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling. This ratio is intended to ensure that parking provision is proportionate to the size of dwellings proposed. Given that the standards are maximum rather than minimum standards, the sustainable location of the site in close proximity to services and facilities within Great Shelford and Stapleford and directly adjacent to a bus stop, and that the proposed units are all small 1 and 2-bedroom apartments, the proposed level of parking provision is considered to be appropriate.

Design and visual impact

60. 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. The illustrative plan shows the provision of apartment blocks, designed with a plan form reminiscent of two pairs of semi-detached dwellings, to the front of the site, set back to follow the existing building line. These are shown positioned on either side of the centrally positioned access, with a terrace of apartments to the rear. It is suggested that the rear units would have low angle-storey eaves and lower ridge heights than the frontage dwellings with first-floor rooms accommodated in the roof-space and lit by roof lights to the front and dormers to the rear.
61. In order to accommodate 14 flats on the site, a tandem form of development is proposed. Generally, this form of development is not characteristic of the immediate area. However, there are clear views across the site of the two-storey dwellings within

Granta Terrace and there is therefore a developed rather than open backdrop to the site. The principle of erecting dwellings within this location is therefore considered to be acceptable.

62. The Urban Design Officer has considered the submitted illustrative layout and advised the form of development indicated is appropriate.
63. Concerns have been raised regarding the pedestrian access onto Granta Terrace shown within the illustrative layout, and the consequent impact on on-street parking spaces. This is an issue pertaining to the layout (which would not be approved as part of any consent) and this can be designed out as part of any detailed or reserved matters scheme.

Residential amenity

64. The site is adjoined by residential properties to the east and west, with the latter property having a number of bedroom windows in its east elevation looking towards the site.
65. Whilst the illustrative layout indicates an acceptable relationship between the front and rear blocks, the distance to the rear of the adjacent dwellings at Nos.30 and 34 London Road would only be approximately 18 metres. Within any detailed or reserved matters plans, great care would need to be taken to control any first floor openings, in order to prevent unacceptable degree of overlooking of these neighbouring dwellings' main private garden areas and rear windows, and to control the height of these units to ensure the neighbouring gardens would not suffer an unreasonable loss of sunlight.
66. As well as the amenities of existing residents, it is also necessary to consider whether residents of the proposed dwellings would experience a satisfactory level of amenity. The application has been accompanied by a noise impact report that assesses the impact of road noise on future residents and concludes that such noise impacts can be mitigated by installing appropriate ventilation and enhanced glazing.
67. It is considered that the submitted layout plan satisfactorily demonstrates that the site is capable of accommodating up to 14 dwellings in principle without resulting in harm to the character of the area, highway safety or amenities of adjacent residents.

Contamination/drainage issues

68. 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, vapour resistant membrane, upgraded water supply pipes and for services to be fitted within clean corridors. This will need to be carried out during rather than prior to development. A condition requiring the remediation strategy to be implemented prior to occupation should therefore be added to any permission.
69. The application proposes that surface water would be discharged to the public foul sewer. Both the Environment Agency and Council's Drainage Manager have raised objections to this aspect of the proposal. A condition would therefore need to be added to any consent to ensure that an acceptable surface water drainage scheme is provided prior to the commencement of any development on the site.

Ecology issues

70. The application has been accompanied by a Phase 1 Habitat Survey which concludes that the site is of low ecological importance, but that the ash tree in the south-western corner of the site could provide a suitable habitat for nesting birds, and should therefore only be removed outside the nesting season. The Trees Officer has raised no in principle objections to the loss of this tree (subject to the imposition of a landscaping condition), whilst the Council's Ecology Officer also has no objections subject to a condition to control vegetation removal during the nesting season.

Sustainability issues

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

Developer contributions

72. 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.

Recommendation

73. If planning application S/1726/12/FL is approved by Members, the recommendation is one of approval, as amended by tree survey date stamped 19th September 2012; drawing number SK52A date stamped 16th October 2012; noise impact assessment date stamped 12th November 2012; and drawing numbers G003/102 Rev PL3 and 105 Rev PL2 date stamped 21st November 2012. Any approval 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 SK52A.
(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 105 Rev PL2 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. During the period of construction and demolition, 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.)
13. Prior to the commencement of any development, a noise insulation scheme for the dwellings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.
(Reason – To minimise noise disturbance to future residents of the dwellings in accordance with Policy NE/15 of the Local Development Framework 2007.)
14. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of sustainable surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained in accordance with the timing/phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage and prevent flooding and surging of the sewerage system in accordance with Policies DP/3 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
15. 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.)

16. 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.)
17. No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a long-term monitoring and maintenance plan in respect of contamination including a timetable of monitoring and submission of reports to the Local Planning Authority, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reports as specified in the approved plan, including details of any necessary contingency action arising from the monitoring, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any necessary contingency measures shall be carried out in accordance with the details in the approved reports. On completion of the monitoring specified in the plan a final report demonstrating that all long-term remediation works have been carried out and confirming that remedial targets have been achieved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(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.)
18. 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.)
19. 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 - Piling or any other foundation designs/investigation boreholes/tunnel shafts/ground source heating and cooling systems using penetrative methods

can result in risks 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.

20. 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.)
21. 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.)
74. 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
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- Circular 11/95
- Planning File References: S/1728/12/OL, S/1725/12/OL, S/1727/12/OL, S/1726/12/FL, C/0417/57, C/0111/64, S/0697/84/F, S/0892/91/F, S/1525/91/F and S/1660/91/F.

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