

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

6 November 2013

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

S/1728/13/FL – WESTON COLVILLE

Erection of a country house, two staff dwellings, and barn, together with parkland, associated site works, and excavation of lake and pond at Mines Farm, Weston Green for Mr H D'Abo

Recommendation: Approve Conditionally

Date for Determination: 19 November 2013 (Major Application)

Notes:

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination as the Officer recommendation is contrary to the recommendation of West Wratting Parish Council.

To be presented to the Committee by Kate Wood

Site and Proposal

1. The application site, an area of approximately 39 hectares, is located immediately to the south-west of Weston Green. It is situated within gently rolling countryside typified by blocks of woodland, hedgerows and large, irregular shaped fields. The site is made up of two arable fields separated by a deep drain, hedgerow and footpath, the western field triangular in shape and tapering towards the west, with Chapel Road defining the long northern boundary of the field. The eastern field is more rectangular, its northern boundary forming part of the framework of Weston Green.
2. Mines Farm comprises a group of derelict agricultural buildings (dating from the mid 19th century) within the western field, set 50 metres back from Chapel Road with an intervening overgrown concrete hardstanding. They consist of a two storey weather-boarded and brick structure and a single storey structure beyond repair. The field rises up from the road to a plateau about half way across the field. The roadside boundary is unfenced but there is a good hedgerow along the south boundary of this field. Within the eastern field, ground levels again are lowest at the northern end, closest to the village.
3. The full application, received on 5 August 2013, proposes the erection of a country house, two staff dwellings and a barn, all within a parkland setting comprising new woodland, meadows, a lake and pond.
4. Members may recall that planning permission has previously been granted at appeal (and subsequently renewed) for the erection of a contemporary 3¹/₂ storey country house on this site. Further details of the history of the site are set out in paragraphs 10-17 below.

5. The proposed country house would be located in the western field and on the crest of the rise, approximately 150 metres to the south-west of the derelict farm buildings and around 220 metres back from the road. It would be a contemporary two-storey, dwelling aligned along an east-west axis in order to maximise distant views to the north-east and between dense woods to the north-west. Proposed materials would consist of a green oak timber frame infilled with lime-based hempcrete for the walls and patinated copper for the roof. The house would consist of two intersecting pentagons. The ground floor would be organised as an open sequence of generous rooms around two courtyards, one external to the south and one internalised under a large skylight to the north. The first floor would occupy the roof structure of the building which is characterised by large mansard windows. A walled garden and private terrace and lawn would be provided on the south side of the dwelling whilst, to the north, there would be meadow land.
6. The proposed staff cottages would each comprise four bedrooms and would be constructed on the site of the existing derelict farm buildings. They would be predominantly single-storey (4.2 metres high) lime render buildings arranged around a central courtyard. Two elements of the building near to the main access would have first floor accommodation and would be 6.5 metres high.
7. The proposal also seeks to erect a barn, to be used for housing the wood chip boiler, to provide drying space for coppiced timber and for agricultural equipment storage, near to the south-western corner of the site, approximately 80 metres back from the road. The barn would be a timber clad building measuring 30.7 metres long x 9.5 metres wide and standing 8.5 metres high.
8. The landscaping proposals include the creation of a lake to the south of the staff cottages and a pond in the eastern field. Willow energy woodland, on a 4 year short rotation coppice, would be planted alongside the main road, on the north-east side of the lake, and in the eastern field. Standard woodland (oak, ash and pine), on a 7 year mid-rotation coppice, would be introduced alongside the main road, the southern boundary of the western field and the eastern boundary of the eastern field. Sweet chestnut woodland, on a 14 year mid-rotation coppice, is proposed south of the willow areas and along the southern boundary of the eastern field. Finally, alder carr woodland would straddle the boundary between the two fields surrounding the pond outflow.
9. Access to the house and staff cottages would be via the existing access point onto Chapel Road. The driveway would be 6 metres wide and would pass the staff accommodation before turning east along the lake, and then turning back on itself to approach the house from the west. A secondary route from the main house would run westwards and exit at the western point of the site onto Chapel Road. This road would be used to transport coppiced willow to and from the barn as well as an alternative route to the main house.

Planning History

10. **S/2191/10** – Planning permission granted for extension of time limit for implementation of planning permission reference S/0376/08/F, for the erection of a country house, two staff dwellings, and barn, together with parkland, associated site works, and excavation of lake and pond.
11. **S/0376/08/F** – Application for the erection of a country house, 2 staff dwellings, and barn together with parkland, associated site works and excavation of lake and pond.

This application was considered at Planning Committee in May 2008 and was refused for the following reason:

“1. Development of a house in the countryside is contrary to Policy DP/7 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework unless it can be justified as being essential for the effective operation of identified countryside activities. The proposed development has been advanced as an exception to this policy and argued to comply with the requirements of paragraph 11 of Planning Policy Statement 7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas) which states that, very occasionally, the exceptional quality and innovative nature of the design of a proposed new house in the countryside may provide special justification for granting planning permission. The proposed scheme fails to achieve this and would not result in a significant enhancement of its immediate setting for the reasons set out below:

- Due to the height and scale of the country house, together with its proximity to and elevated position above the road, it would be a visually dominant feature within the countryside and would be detrimental to the open and rural character of the landscape;
- The main house has been designed without an eaves overhang. This would be out of keeping with the English timber frame tradition, which always has a sheltering overhanging roof to protect the wall, and also raises serious concerns about the long term appearance of the building;
- The introduction of intensively coppiced large blocks of monoculture of willow and sweet chestnut trees, particularly where willows are positioned on a slope, would be alien features that would fail to significantly enhance the character of the landscape;
- The introduction of a lake, and associated surrounding bunding, in a position sited halfway up a hillside would be an incongruous and artificial feature (lakes normally being sited in valley bottoms) that would not result in an enhancement in the character of the landscape;
- The landscaping scheme, in proposing to plant woodland on the assumed historical site of Moynes Farm, fails to acknowledge the history of the site;
- The proposed staff cottages, by virtue of the use of white concrete for the roofs and walls, together with the proximity of the buildings to the main road, would be very stark in appearance and visually harmful features in the landscape. The visual impact of the cottages would be exacerbated by the lack of an eaves overhang or gutters/downpipes meaning that, over time, the character and appearance of the buildings would change and degrade as they weather, causing further visual harm;
- Due to the height of the proposed maintenance shed, together with its siting in close proximity to the road and elevated position above the road, it would be a visually prominent feature within the countryside.

For the above reasons, the proposal would also be contrary to Policies DP/2, which requires new development to preserve or enhance the character of the area, DP/3, which states permission will not be granted for proposals that would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the countryside and landscape

character, and NE/4, which only permits development if it respects and retains or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the Landscape Character Area in which it is located.

2. In the absence of sufficient justification on the grounds of agricultural need, the proposed staff cottages contravene Policy DP/7 of the Local Development Framework 2007 which states that, outside village frameworks, only development for agriculture and other uses that need to be located in the countryside will be permitted.
 3. The application fails to satisfactorily demonstrate that the development will neither cause nor exacerbate flooding to existing property. Consequently, the proposal contravenes Policy NE/11 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007, which requires proposals to adequately consider the issue of flood risk.
 4. In the absence of a full ecological survey and assessment, the application fails to satisfactorily evaluate the present biodiversity value of the site and existing barns, and hence to ensure that all valuable biodiversity species and features are identified and properly integrated into the scheme. Consequently, the proposal contravenes Policy NE/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007, which requires new development to maintain, enhance, restore or add to biodiversity.”
12. The application was subsequently the subject of a planning appeal (an informal hearing). Prior to the hearing, an ecological appraisal and further flood risk information were submitted, resulting in the 3rd and 4th reasons for refusal being withdrawn. The discussion at the hearing therefore focussed on the 1st and 2nd reasons for refusal, namely the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside.
13. The Inspector allowed the appeal, on 26th February 2009, stating that:
- “.....there is no doubt that the building would be of very considerable architectural interest on account of its outstanding design and its innovative use of materials and construction methods.”; and
- “I do not accept the assumption, implicit in the Council’s reason for refusal, that because the house would be very prominent it would necessarily be detrimental to the character of the landscape. The building has been designed as a sculptural object and is intended to act as a local landmark. Considerable thought has gone into its siting in relation to the local topography and areas of woodland. In my view the building would make a positive contribution to the landscape in the same way that other buildings, sculptures and other artefacts have done in the past.”
14. The Inspector also stated that the Council’s objection to the coppiced woodland, on the basis that it would be an alien feature in the landscape, was ill founded, as the extensive areas of coppiced and other woodland included in the scheme would be seen in the context of the large stands of woodland already in the vicinity, as well as increasing the biodiversity interest of the site. The proposed pond and lake were considered by the Inspector to be of great benefit, adding variety and beauty to the landscape and expanding the range of wildlife habitats on the site.
15. With regards to the two staff cottages, the Inspector stated that the scheme fits within the tradition of country estates, in which lodges and cottages for estate workers are

common features, and that this staff accommodation would ensure a large degree of self-sufficiency within the development. The appearance of the cottages/barn, and their visual impact within the landscape, was also deemed to be acceptable.

16. The appeal decision concluded that, due to the exceptional quality and outstanding design of the scheme, together with the enhancement to the natural beauty and biodiversity of the landscape, the development fulfils all the criteria of PPS7, and therefore qualifies for exemption from the usual strict controls over development in the countryside envisaged in PPS7 and in the development plan.
17. Prior to the above decision, an application for a country house, staff cottage and associated landscaping works was refused and dismissed at appeal (**S/1472/02/F**). In addition, planning permission had been refused a number of times for the conversion of the redundant agricultural buildings to form a dwelling (**S/0373/89/F**, **S/0352/88/F** and **S/0805/83/F**).

Planning Policy

18. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD, adopted July 2007:

DP/1: Sustainable Development
DP/2: Design of New Development
DP/3: Development Criteria
DP/7: Development Frameworks
NE/1: Energy Efficiency
NE/4: Landscape Character Areas
NE/6: Biodiversity
CH/2: Archaeological Sites
NE/11: Flood Risk
NE/12: Water Conservation

19. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents:

Trees and Development Sites – Adopted January 2009
Biodiversity – Adopted July 2009
District Design Guide – Adopted March 2010
Landscape in New Developments – Adopted March 2010

20. National Planning Policy Framework 2012
21. **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.
22. **Circular 05/2005 (Planning Obligations)** - Advises that planning obligations must be relevant to planning, necessary, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respect.

Consultation by South Cambridgeshire District Council as Local Planning Authority

23. **Weston Colville Parish Council** - Recommends approval, stating:

“Approved but only with the proviso that it is only used for private residential use to minimise traffic in Chapel Lane which is insufficient to support commercial use.”

24. **West Wrattling Parish Council** – Recommends refusal, stating:

“The Parish Council would like a stipulation to be considered should this application be approved either by SCDC or on appeal as there is a certain “commercial” aspect to the design of the house. Council did not consider it “exceptional” and it is also out of the village envelope and placed in a large area of land which joins two villages. The stipulation is that:

a) No “change of use” to commercial allowed.”

25. **The Landscape Design Officer** – No comments received to date. Any comments received will be reported to Members in an update prior to the Committee meeting.

26. **The Ecology Officer** – Raises a holding objection due to the lack of up-to-date ecology information submitted with the application. The applicant has simply resubmitted the data from 2008 and the information must be reviewed with reassessed data backing up any claims.

27. **The Urban Design Officer** – Supports the application. The NPPF states good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 55 requires authorities to avoid isolated new homes in the countryside unless they are of an exceptional quality or of an innovative design. The site is in open countryside where new isolated residential buildings would not normally be permitted unless there are special justifications such as the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design. Such a design should be truly outstanding or innovative, reflect the highest standards in architecture, and significantly enhance the immediate setting. The proposed scheme is intended to be a contemporary re-interpretation of the English country house tradition, in which the dwelling, outbuildings, woodland, water and open space are combined into an integrated whole within an informal landscape setting. The rationale of designing the main house as a sculptural object to serve as a local landmark is supported. The concept of creating a contemporary styled dwelling in a traditional parkland setting is innovative, and the idea of introducing coppiced woodland to produce estate-grown bio-fuel can help enhance the sustainability of the site. The design of the scheme is considered exceptional in terms of its innovative use of construction materials and methods of construction, and in the way it would significantly enhance the appearance and biodiversity of the landscape. The siting of the main house has been carefully considered to respond to the site’s immediate and wider context and would make a positive contribution to the landscape. The siting of the staff accommodation and barn are also considered appropriate.

28. The layout of the main house is well-designed, the ground floor organised as an open sequence of large rooms around two courtyards and the first floor, which occupies the roof structure of the building, will be characterised by large, timber structural elements and mansard windows. The house will comprise a green oak timber frame infilled with hempcrete and lime render while patinated copper would be used for the roof. The materials are innovative and ecologically sensitive, and the rationale of using locally sourced recycled construction materials to reduce the carbon footprint is strongly supported, as is the concept of adopting a landscape enhancement approach. In conclusion, the rationale of creating a striking landmark building for this prominent location to enhance its immediate setting is strongly supported. The scale, massing, built form and materials are considered appropriate. The exceptional design, innovative use of building materials, construction methods and on-site renewables, and its high quality landscape strategy would significantly enhance its immediate

setting and improve the landscape quality of the local area. The proposals are therefore considered to fulfil the criteria in paragraph 55 of the NPPF, and approval is recommended.

29. **The Environment Agency** – Raises no objections, in principle, to the proposed development, stating that its previous comments submitted in respect of the original application still apply. Conditions requiring the submission of foul and surface water drainage details should be added to any consent.
30. **County Archaeology** – Commented re S/0376/08/F that an arch evaluation would need to be carried out before planning permission was granted. The desktop assessment and specification were sent to Arch and additional comments to be relayed to Members in an update.

The Inspector's decision relating to the 2008 application was in conflict with the advice of many consultees and, although arch matters were acknowledged, were not considered to be of sufficient importance to be included in the main issues for the original objection to the application. On this major application located within an archaeologically rich landscape area, physical archaeological evidence that will inform on the nature, location and significance of archaeological remains within the application area, should be submitted in support of any application before determination. In the absence of such evidence, the application should be refused. The current application contains no such evidence that can be used to determine the suitability of the development areas being placed where they are. Whilst we do not object to the development per se, this lack of evidence means we are unable to advise you regarding the scope of works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the known significant and, as yet unknown, archaeological resource. The desk-based assessment originally carried out in 2008 and revised in 2013 is not helpful. The results of a field evaluation should be provided in connection with this application so that any grant of planning consent contains appropriate archaeological conditions by which the appropriate mitigation of the impact of the development can be secured.

Representations by members of the public

31. 5 letters of objection have been received from nearby residents: Nos. 29, 37 & 49 The Common and The Old Vicarage in West Wrattling; and No.63 Common Road in Weston Colville. The main points raised are:
 - Given the substantially changed proposals, the development can no longer be held out as the winner of an architectural competition and therefore has no special standing or significance.
 - The application now provides for two courtyards and almost separate units, and why does a country house require its own kitchen plus a professional one?
 - The application raises concern that there may be an intention to use the building for commercial purposes.
 - The Council should strongly maintain its objections to the development of this land.
 - The site lies outside the village envelope and is an area of outstanding beauty and prime agricultural land.
 - The previous application, despite vigorous objections from the Council on landscape grounds, was allowed on appeal by an Inspector who had a specific expertise and interest in architecture, not specifically in landscape.

- There has been no interest in the consented scheme despite extensive marketing, and it can be concluded it is not considered an attractive location for a country house.
- The proposal has a greater footprint than the approved scheme and the development would intrude into the open landscape.
- The proposal would harm the future ability to return this land to food production.
- Country houses are almost always set within their own parkland. The proposal would be located at a high point and on the edge of its parkland.
- The proposal impacts on the landscape character area, which is defined by wide open countryside with small, compact areas of rural development in a rolling landscape. The proposal would have a maximum visual impact on this open landscape.
- The proposal is unsustainable in transport terms.
- The absence of important archaeological information (1612 map, and any reference to Hill Crofts, an adjacent wood containing a series of probably medieval and post-medieval earthworks) raises concern about the completeness of the research undertaken.

Material Planning Considerations

32. The site is located outside the development framework and in the countryside. The proposal submitted under application reference S/0376/08/F was refused by this Authority and then subsequently allowed at appeal. Following the appeal decision, this Authority approved an application to extend the time limit for implementation of the proposal, and this permission expires on 10th March 2014. Whilst this Authority refused the original application, the Planning Inspectorate's subsequent decision to allow the appeal (and subsequent renewal of planning permission) are material planning considerations to be taken into account in the determination of the current planning application.
33. The previous scheme was considered under PPS7, which has now been superseded by the NPPF. This effectively reiterates the wording of PPS7 insofar as it relates to country houses by stating that authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as...the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of dwelling. Such a design should be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; reflect the highest standards of architecture; significantly enhance its immediate setting; and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.
34. In refusing the 2008 application, the Council identified a number of issues with the design, namely:
 - Height, scale and elevated position would be visually dominant and harmful to the landscape;
 - The eaves overhang would be out of keeping with the English timber frame tradition
 - The introduction of coppiced large blocks of monoculture would be alien features that would fail to enhance the character of the landscape
 - The landscaping would fail to acknowledge the history of the site; and
 - The design of the staff cottages would be harmful to the area.
35. In allowing the appeal, the Inspector disagreed with the Council's assessment of the case, and was of no doubt that the building would be of considerable architectural

interest due to its outstanding design and innovative use of materials and construction methods. He considered that the building was designed as a sculptural object and intended to act as a local landmark, and that considerable thought had gone into its siting in relation to the local topography and areas of woodland. It was concluded that the building, together with its landscaped setting incorporating blocks of woodland, a pond and lake, would make a positive contribution to the landscape.

36. It is proposed to make a number of alterations to the design of the country house, including a reduction in height and increase in footprint of the building. The basic principles underlining the development, namely the position of the dwelling, the access to it, and its landscaped setting would all remain as approved. The principal changes encompassed in the current application, when compared to the approved scheme, are as follows:

Main house

- Omit artificial bund on which house was sited
- Reduce from 3.5 storey to 2 storey height (14.5m above ground level to 11m), with the dwelling occupying an enlarged footprint.
- Change roof material from stainless steel to patinated copper

Staff accommodation

- Change finish from concrete to lime render

37. The fact there is an extant consent on the site, and the comments previously made by the appeal Inspector should form the starting point for the consideration of the application. As the proposed revisions would not alter the approved landscaped setting, the assessment of the proposal should focus on whether the revisions would still bring forward a form of development considered to be of innovative and exceptional design.
38. It is clear from the comments received from the Urban Design Officer, as set out in paragraphs 27-28 of this report, that the proposed dwelling is considered to be truly outstanding and innovative in design. The proposal would result in the creation of a striking, landmark building that is considered to be a contemporary re-interpretation of the English country house tradition, in which the dwelling, outbuildings, woodland, water and open space are combined into an integrated whole within an informal landscape setting. Additionally, the design of the scheme is considered exceptional in terms of the innovative use of construction materials and methods of construction, and in the way it would significantly enhance the appearance and biodiversity of the landscape.
39. A holding objection has been raised by the Council's Ecology Officer, who states that updated information should be provided in order to ensure all valuable biodiversity species are identified and properly integrated. As set out in paragraphs 11 and 12 of this report, the original 2008 application was partly refused due to the lack of biodiversity information. This issue was satisfactorily addressed as part of the appeal process through the submission of an ecological appraisal undertaken in 2008. The Ecology Officer has advised that updated information should be provided as part of the current application. Given that there is an extant permission on the site until March 2014, the Ecology Officer has been asked whether further information is necessary in this instance and, if so, whether such details can be required by way of a planning condition. Members will be updated further prior to the Committee meeting.

40. As set out in paragraph 30 of this report, an objection has also been received from the County Council's Archaeological department. In response to this objection, the applicant's appointed planning consultant has advised that issues regarding archaeology were comprehensively considered by the Inspector who conducted the Hearing into the 2008 application. The County Archaeology Section attended the Hearing and made a number of submissions to the Inspector. Taking these issues into consideration, the Inspector concluded in the appeal decision that "parts of the site, particularly the area where the old manor house is believed to have stood, are of known archaeological interest. Notwithstanding speculation at the Hearing that other parts of the site might also be of interest I see no justification for the suggestion that a full investigation should be carried out before planning permission is granted. The standard condition suggested by the Council would adequately protect the archaeological interest of the site."
41. The consultants contend that nothing has changed since the Hearing to suggest that a full investigation would now be justified in advance of any planning permission being granted. Officers concur with this reasoning and consider that there is no justification or reason to suggest the Council should now take a different view to that taken by the Inspector in the Hearing relating to the 2008 application.

Recommendation

42. Subject to the resolution of the holding objection raised by the Ecology Officer, delegated powers are sought to approve the application subject to the following conditions:
1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
(Reason - To ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development, which have not been acted upon.)
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: [list approved plans]
(Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)
 3. In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars and paragraphs (i) and (iii) below shall have effect until the expiration of 1 year from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.
 - i) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (Tree Work).
 - ii) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written approval of the local planning authority.

iii) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such a size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

(Reason – To protect trees which are to be retained in order to enhance the development, biodiversity and the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/6 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

4. No development shall take place until details of the finished floor levels of the buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policy DP/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no development within Classes A to H of Part 1 of Schedule 2 and Classes A to C of Part 2 of the Order shall take place without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

(Reason – To ensure that future extensions and/or alterations that would otherwise be permitted are not carried out with consequent potential harm to the architectural qualities of the building, in accordance with Policy DP/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

6. 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.)

7. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface 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 ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage and to prevent the increased risk of flooding in accordance with Policies DP/1 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

8. No development shall take place other than in accordance with the mitigation requirement set out in Section 5 of the Ecological Appraisal dated August 2008, prepared by the Landscape Partnership (“the scheme”). 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.)

9. No development shall take place until the applicant, or his agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a staged programme of archaeological work 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.)

10. Details of any external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the buildings are occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. No external lighting other than that shown in the approved details shall be used without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.
(Reason – To protect the character and appearance of this rural area at night, in accordance with Policy DP/2 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

11. The occupation of the two staff dwellings shall be limited to persons solely or mainly working, or last working on the appeal site, or a widow or widower of such a person, and to any resident dependants.
(Reason – The dwellings are situated in a rural area outside any established settlement where the Local Planning Authority would not normally grant permission for such development and this permission is granted solely in order to fulfil a need to satisfy the requirements of the country house.)

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: Trees and Development Sites; Biodiversity; District Design Guide; Landscape in New Developments.
- Circular 11/95 and 05/2005
- Planning File References: S/1728/13/FL, S/2191/10; S/0376/08/F; S/1472/02/F; S/0373/89/F; S/0352/88/F; S/0805/83/F.

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