

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

8 January 2014

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

Application Number: S/2092/13/OL

Parish(es): Waterbeach

Proposal: Residential Development of up to 36 Dwellings and Formation of Accesses

Site address: Land to the East of Cody Road and North of Bannold Road, Waterbeach

Applicant(s): Manor Oak Homes

Recommendation: Refusal

Key material considerations: Principle of Development
Housing Land Supply

Committee Site Visit: No

Departure Application: Yes

Presenting Officer: Karen Pell-Coggins

Application brought to Committee because: Strategic Significance

Date by which decision due: 29 January 2014

Executive Summary

1. This application proposes 36 dwellings on land that is currently situated outside the Waterbeach village framework and in the countryside. The site is designated as an Extension to the Green Belt in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission July 2013 in order separate the village of Waterbeach from the Barracks and allocated Waterbeach New Town to the north. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the development, density, housing land supply, emerging local plan policy, housing mix, affordable housing, developer contributions and the impacts of the development upon the character and appearance of the area, trees, landscaping, biodiversity, highway safety, neighbour amenity, and flood risk. Officers recommend refusal of the application on the grounds of the prematurity of the proposal in relation to the consideration of the Draft Local Plan in relation to the designation of the site as an Extension to the Green Belt and the allocation of the Waterbeach New Town to the north, loss of an important landscape buffer between the village of Waterbeach and the Barracks, and the sustainability of the location for the number of new dwellings as proposed.

Site and Proposal

2. The site is located to the east of Cody Road and to the north of Bannold Road, outside the Waterbeach village framework and within the countryside. It measures 1.44 hectares in area and currently comprises open agricultural land. The village of Waterbeach is situated to the south within the framework and Waterbeach Barracks is situated to the north within the countryside. The site forms part of the Landscape Character Area known as 'The Fens' and is generally level ground. The northern boundary is well landscaped and the western boundary adjacent to Cody Road and the southern boundary adjacent Bannold Road have sporadic landscaping. The eastern boundary is open. The site lies within a Flood Zone 1 (low risk) area. There are drainage ditches on the southern and western boundaries of the site.
3. This outline planning application, received on 30 October 2013, as amended, proposes the erection of a residential development of 36 dwellings and the formation of accesses. 14 of the 36 dwellings (39%) would be affordable to comply with local needs. 4 dwellings would have one bedroom, 8 dwellings would have two bedrooms, and 2 dwellings would have three bedrooms. The tenure split would be 70% social rented and 30% shared ownership. 22 of the 36 dwellings (61%) would be available for sale on the open market. 2 dwellings would have two bedrooms, 8 dwellings would have three bedrooms, and 12 dwellings would have four or more bedrooms. The dwellings would be two storeys to two and a half storeys in height. The materials of construction would include brick, render and timber. 72 parking spaces are proposed to serve the development that range from one parking space for the smaller units to three parking spaces for the larger units. Two main accesses and a number of single accesses are proposed off Cody Road to serve 34 dwellings within the development and a shared access is proposed off Bannold Road to serve two dwellings within the development. An area of 0.14 of a hectare of public open space in a linear form would be provided on the eastern side of the site.

Planning History

Application Site

4. *None exists.*

East of the Site

5. **S/1359/13/OL** - Residential Development up to 90 Dwellings with access to Bannold Road - Refused
6. The application was refused under delegated powers for the following reasons: -
 - "i) The implementation of the proposed development, if approved, would prejudice the consideration of Draft Policy S/4 Cambridge Green Belt and the proposed Green Belt Extension shown upon Policies Map Inset No.104 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission (July 2013) in that the site occupies a significant proportion of the area which has been included in the Draft Local Plan and would harm the effectiveness of the submitted proposal, if included in the Adopted Local Plan. The erosion of the proposed Green Belt Extension would seriously harm the objectives of the proposed Waterbeach New Town as set out in Draft Policy SS/5 Waterbeach New Town and Policies Map Inset H: Waterbeach New Town of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission (July 2013).

- ii) The development would result in the loss of an important landscape buffer area between Waterbeach and Waterbeach Barracks, to the harm of the landscaped setting of each, and would represent an undesirable coalescence of the village and Barracks contrary to the adopted Local Development Framework 2007 at Policy DP/3, which seeks to prevent development that would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the countryside and landscape character; at Policy DP/7, which states that outside village frameworks only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted: the aims of the policy seek the protection of the countryside from gradual encroachment and to help guard against incremental growth in unsustainable locations: and at Policy NE/4, which seeks to preserve the local character and distinctiveness of the District's landscape.
- iii) The proposal to erect up to 90 dwellings on the application site adjacent to the adopted development framework boundary for Waterbeach represents development which is unsustainable in scale and location because it fails to accord with the adopted intentions of the Local Planning Authority for the provision of housing in the District as set out in Policy ST/2, which provides a strategy for the location of new housing in the District, and Policy ST/5, which includes Waterbeach as a Minor Rural Centre with more limited services where residential development up to an indicative maximum of 30 dwellings will be permitted, in the South Cambridgeshire Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2007.
- iv) The application site is located in an area of high archaeological value where any surviving assets would be severely damaged or destroyed by the proposed development as illustrated in the submitted Concept Masterplan. The application has not been supported with sufficient information to enable an assessment of the need for suitable mitigation, which may include the preservation of archaeological assets in situ, to be made prior to the issue of any planning permission for the development of the site. The application as submitted fails to comply with Policy CH/2 of the Adopted Local Development Framework 2007 which seeks to ensure protection for archaeological sites from unnecessary damage by development.
- v) The application as submitted does not provide sufficient information in the Transport Assessment and supporting documentation to enable the potential impact upon the local road network and any necessary mitigation to be properly assessed. The proposal fails to comply with Policy DP/3 of the Adopted Local Development Framework 2007 which seeks to ensure no unacceptable adverse impact from traffic generated by new development."

7. **S/1432/85/O** - Five Dwellings and Garages - Appeal Dismissed

8. The Inspector commented as follows: -
 "Waterbeach is a varied and characterful village which has succeeded in absorbing a large number of new houses without losing its compact and attractive appearance. It is separated from Waterbeach Barracks by a strip of arable land only some 200 m wide and the barracks itself is as extensive as a large village. It seems to me highly desirable that a wedge of open land should be retained between the two settlements to prevent their coalescence. Bannold Road, with its grass verges, mature trees and generally rural appearance, forms a natural northern boundary to the village, providing open views of farmland with the barracks beyond... If the appeal site were also to be built on this would further reduce the visual impact of the green wedge and

it might be difficult to resist pressure for more house building on the land to the east of the site.”

West of the Site

9. **S/0645/13/FL** - Erection of 60 dwellings Including Affordable Housing, Access, Car Parking & Associated Works, Open Space, Landscaping & Children's Play Area - Pending Decision
10. The planning committee resolved to refuse the application at the meeting on 2 October 2013 but an appeal was submitted on non-determination prior to the decision notice being formally issued. The reason for refusal was as follows: -
“The implementation of the proposed development, if approved, would prejudice the consideration of submitted Policy S/4 Cambridge Green Belt and the proposed Green Belt Extension shown upon Policies Map Inset No.104 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission (July 2013) in that the site occupies a significant proportion of the area which has been put forward for consideration in the submitted designation and would harm the effectiveness of the submitted proposal, if it is to be included in the Adopted Local Plan. The erosion of the proposed Green Belt Extension would seriously harm the objectives of the proposed Waterbeach New Town as set out in draft Policy SS/5 Waterbeach New Town and Policies Map Inset H: Waterbeach New Town of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission (July 2013).”

Planning Policy

11. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy DPD, adopted January 2007**
ST/2 Housing Provision
ST/5 Minor Rural Centres
ST/10 Phasing of Housing Land
ST/11 Plan Monitor and Manage
12. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Development Control Policies DPD, adopted January 2007**
DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments
DP/7 Development Frameworks
HG/1 Housing Density
HG/2 Housing Mix
HG/3 Affordable Housing
NE/1 Energy Efficiency
NE/3 Renewable Energy in New Developments
NE/4 Landscape Character
NE/6 Biodiversity
NE/8 Groundwater
NE/9 Water and Drainage Infrastructure
NE/11 Flood Risk
NE/12 Water Conservation
NE/14 Lighting Proposals
NE/17 Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
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
TR/4 Non-Motorised Modes

13. **Proposed Submission Local Plan (July 2013)**

SS/5 Waterbeach New Town
S/3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S/4 Cambridge Green Belt
S/7 Development Frameworks
S/9 Minor Rural Centres
HQ/1 Design Principles
HQ/2 Public Art and New Development
H/7 Housing Density
H/8 Housing Mix
H/9 Affordable Housing
H/11 Residential Space Standards for Market Housing
NH/2 Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
NH/4 Biodiversity
NH/8 Mitigating the Impact of Development In and Adjoining the Green Belt
NH/14 Heritage Assets
CC/1 Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Change
CC/3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments
CC/4 Sustainable Design and Construction
CC/8 Sustainable Drainage Systems
CC/9 Managing Flood Risk
SC/2 Health Impact Assessment
SC/6 Indoor Community Facilities
SC/7 Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments
SC/8 Open Space Standards
SC/10 Lighting Proposals
TI/2 Planning for Sustainable Travel
TI/3 Parking Provision
TI/8 Infrastructure and New Developments
Policies Map Inset No.104 : Waterbeach– the application site together with agricultural land to the east of Cody Road lies in the Green Belt Extension (Policy S/4) between Waterbeach village and the new town.
Policies Map Inset H: Waterbeach New Town. The northern boundary of the application site adjoins the southern boundary of the proposed New Town (Policy SS/5)

14. **South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):**

Open Space in New Developments SPD - Adopted January 2009
Biodiversity SPD - Adopted July 2009
Trees & Development Sites SPD - Adopted January 2009
Landscape in New Developments SPD - Adopted March 2010
District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010
Affordable Housing SPD – Adopted March 2010
Public Art SPD - Adopted January 2009
Health Impact Assessment SPD – Adopted March 2011

15. **South Cambridgeshire LDF Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment ('SHLAA')**
Site 089

16. **Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment May 2013** ('SHMA')
- Consultation by South Cambridgeshire District Council as Local Planning Authority**
17. **Waterbeach Parish Council** – Recommends refusal on the following grounds: -
- i) Flood risk because drainage is running at full capacity;
 - ii) The site is in the proposed new green belt;
 - iii) Parking in Cody Road and access for emergency vehicles;
 - iv) Not in accordance with the South District Council development plan; and,
 - v) Buffer zone between the village and the former military housing.
18. **Planning Policy Manager** – Comments are awaited.
19. **Housing Development Officer** – Comments are awaited.
20. **Drainage Manager** – Comments are awaited.
21. **Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board** – Objects to the application and comments that there needs to be holistic approach to drainage of the development sites in this area to ensure that a drainage system is put in place that would not increase flood risk to existing properties and land. Does not object to the proposal for surface water attenuation and the proposed routes from the Board's system. However, there are concerns in relation to Board's main drain. The proposed receiving watercourse is virtually non-existent and improvement works would need to be undertaken to improve its capacity. It is uncertain whether there is any connection between the watercourse and the proposed route along Bannold Road as there is no visible sign of a culvert under the access to the Doctor's Surgery.
22. **Trees and Landscapes Officer** – Comments that the site being an agricultural field does not have any significant trees within it. However, there are trees and sections of hedge on the boundaries that need to be retained and incorporated into the landscape scheme.
23. **Landscape Design Officer** – Comments that the site contributes towards the rural character of the village. It is not considered that there is any urgent physical, social or other need for the two parts of the village to be linked by development, and there is no justification for allocating land in this locality contrary to the general planning policies which apply. Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. The site is located in a relatively open area separating the village from the Barracks to the north. The open land creates a rural character and an appearance of the countryside entering the village. If this site were developed it would intrude into the rural separation area between Waterbeach and the Barracks.
24. **Ecology Officer** – Comments that is willing to accept the conclusion that the agricultural land has limited ecological value and no semi-natural habitats would be lost as a consequence of the proposal. Welcomes the proposal for landscape planting to include areas of wildflower meadow as this would offer biodiversity gain but the agreement of its management would need to be clarified at reserved matters stage. Requests a condition to achieve a scheme of ecological enhancement.

25. **Local Highway Authority** – Recommends refusal on the following grounds: -
- i) The width of the two main accesses on to Cody Road should measure 5.5 metres in width; and,
 - ii) The proposal would lead to the creation of a number of accesses on a stretch of classified highway where the principal function is that of carrying traffic freely and safely between centres of population. The slowing and turning of vehicles associated with the use of the access would lead to conflict and interference with the passage of through vehicles to the detriment of that principal function, and introduce a further points of possible traffic conflict, being detrimental to highway safety.
26. **Environmental Health Officer** – Comments are awaited.
27. **Contaminated Land Officer** – Comments that the site is a large plot of agricultural land with anecdotal proximity to former military land. Recommends a condition to be attached to any consent for a site investigation into contamination in order to minimise the risk of pollution to future occupiers of the site and existing occupiers in the surrounding area and controlled water and ecological systems.
28. **Environment Agency** – Comments are awaited.
29. **Anglian Water** – Comments are awaited.
30. **Section 106 Officer** – Comments are awaited.
31. **Cambridgeshire County Council Education Officer** – Comments are awaited.
32. **Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team** – Comments are awaited.

Representations by members of the public

33. 19 letters have been received from local residents that object to the proposal on the following grounds: -
- i) Greenfield land outside the village framework contrary to the Local Development Framework;
 - ii) Piecemeal development and should not be considered in isolation to two other applications on adjacent sites;
 - iii) Land designated as Green Belt in the Draft Local Plan to provide valuable separation between the village and land on the Barracks and to the north allocated for the Waterbeach New Town;
 - iv) Loss of good quality agricultural land when there are brownfield sites available;
 - v) Adverse effect upon landscape setting and identity of village as it provides a green buffer between the village and Barracks that would result in the merging of the new town and Waterbeach if this is lost;
 - vi) Waterbeach is a special case in relation to housing land supply as it would provide a substantial amount of housing when the new town is developed and additional housing on the Barracks site;
 - vii) The route of surface water drainage to the ditch along Bannold Road and Cody Road is not suitable and would result in flood risk;

- viii) Cody Road is narrow and the only vehicular access to Hailing Place and on-street parking from the development would restrict access and cause a hazard traffic using this route;
- ix) Traffic generation from the amount of proposed developments in this area at the impact upon the Bannold Road/Way Lane/Cody Road junctions and congestion along Way Lane and St Andrews Hill and accesses opposite the junction of Way lane and more vehicles turning right into Denny End Road would cause a hazard;
- x) Inadequate bus service;
- xi) Previous appeal dismissed on the land by an Inspector;
- xii) The development would restrict expansion of the Doctors Surgery; and,
- xiii) Loss of habitat to birds and wildlife.

Material Planning Considerations

34. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the development, density, housing land supply, emerging local plan policy, density, housing mix, affordable housing, developer contributions and the impacts of the development upon the character and appearance of the area, trees, landscaping, biodiversity, highway safety, neighbour amenity, and flood risk.

Principle of Development

35. The site lies outside but adjoining the development framework, where new housing development would normally be resisted. The concerns of principle relate to the harm to the appearance of the countryside and the loss of a rural separation between the existing village and the former barracks. Although landscaping proposals within the development itself are considered generally to be acceptable, the loss of countryside in this sensitive location would be a significant harm and would form a precedent for further such proposals on agricultural land to the east, to the progressive harm to the countryside. This would be contrary Policies DP/3, DP/7 and NE/4 of the LDF.
36. Policy ST/2 of the Core Strategy sets out a hierarchy of provision of new housing in the district. The provision of new housing in the rural area outside the edge of Cambridge or in the new town of Northstowe is given the least preference in this policy, and in Policy ST/5 Waterbeach is classified as a Minor Rural Centre where development should be limited to an indicative maximum scheme size of 30 dwellings within the village framework. Taking these parameters into account it is considered that the proposal complies with the adopted strategic vision for the location of new housing in the District and represents a sustainable form of development.

Housing Supply

37. The NPPF has introduced the principle that a Local Plan/LDF be considered to be out of date if the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a deliverable five-year supply of housing land in its area with an additional buffer of 5%. Where the Local Plan/LDF is out of date for this reason, the LPA must consider housing applications in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
38. The applicant is strongly of the view that the Council's figures on housing supply do not meet this test and that accordingly the application should be assessed on its merits. In an appeal decision in October 2013, the Inspector agreed with the Council and that the Cambridge Sub-Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) "contains a more up-to date and thus more reliable assessment of housing need in the district than the housing target contained within the LDF".

39. The Inspector raised three issues about the Council’s approach to calculating its land supply against the SHMA target, which led him to conclude that the Council had not at that time demonstrated a 5-year supply for 2013-2018 on the basis of the information before him. The issues were whether a 5% buffer was appropriate, that limited weight should be given to the Proposed Submission Local Plan as the Council will not consider representations until early 2014, and that even on the basis of the Proposed Submission Local Plan there remained a 0.1 year shortfall in housing land for 2013-2018. Those matters have been satisfactorily addressed as follows:

- i) The Council’s audit trail for the Proposed Submission Local Plan explains why a 5% buffer is appropriate.
- ii) The Proposed Submission Local Plan trajectory is an up to date and comprehensive understanding of housing delivery on known housing commitments and is appropriate for calculating 5-year supply. Even if the Council or the Local Plan Inspector were to conclude that changes to the plan were necessary, it is reasonable to assume that new sites would be added which would not affect the trajectory in an adverse way because the plan would not be sound if it did not demonstrate a 5-year supply.
- iii) The 0.1 year shortfall based on the Proposed Submission Local Plan trajectory equates to 117 homes for 2013-2018. This shortfall is already more than made up by 131 additional homes on windfall sites with planning permission or resolution to grant permission in the first 6 months of 2013-2014 that would have been included in the Local Plan trajectory had they been known at the time the plan was published.

40. The Council can now demonstrate a 5.0 year supply of housing land for the period 2013-2018 and more than a 5-year supply for every subsequent 5-year period to 2031, the period covered by the Proposed Submission Local Plan, as shown in the following table:

Calculation of 5-year housing land supply for ...	5 year supply (including 5% buffer)
2013 - 2018	5.0
2014 - 2019	5.5
2015 - 2020	6.1
2016 - 2021	6.8
2017 - 2022	7.1
2018 - 2023	7.0
2019 - 2024	6.6
2020 - 2025	6.2
2021 - 2026	5.6
2022 - 2027	5.5
2023 - 2028	5.6
2024 - 2029	5.9
2025 - 2030	6.0
2026 - 2031	6.3

It follows that other relevant LDF policies can be considered as up to date and can be applied to the current application.

41. It is considered that the proposal represents unsustainable development as it does not accord with the Council’s adopted strategic vision for development in the District, and that it would result in demonstrable harm to the appearance and function of the

countryside leading to and setting a precedence for further coalescence with Waterbeach Barracks, the site of a proposed new town in the draft Local Plan.

Emerging Local Plan

42. The draft policies proposals as set out in the Local Plan Proposed Submission are at an early stage of progression through to adoption. The Government's guidance in the NPPF indicates that they carry little weight at this stage except in exceptional circumstances. The proposal to designate the site as Green Belt Extension (which the NPPF only permits in exceptional circumstances such as the planning of a new settlement), would be significantly harmed if the current proposal were to be implemented, as it represents approximately 18% of the proposed Green Belt area. In order for the draft Green Belt Extension proposal to be considered fully, and not to be prejudiced by incremental development, it is considered that the current application should be rejected on the grounds that to grant approval for development on such a significant scale would be premature at this time and harm the possibility of the Green belt extension coming forwards.

43. The draft NPPG (new National Planning Policy Guidance which will replace the previous and still valid guidance notes which were attached to the former PPS documents that were replaced by the NPPF) provides emerging guidance when considering whether a development proposal is premature. It states:

'While emerging plans may acquire weight during the plan-making process, in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework – and in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development – arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than in exceptional circumstances (where it is clear that the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, taking the policies in the Framework and any other material considerations into account). Such circumstances are likely to be limited to situations where both: -

- i) The development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging Local Plan or neighbourhood plan; and,
- ii) The emerging plan is at an advanced stage but has not yet been adopted (or, in the case of a neighbourhood plan, been made).

'Refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified where a draft Local Plan has yet to be submitted for examination, or in the case of a neighbourhood plan, before the end of the local planning authority publicity period. Where planning permission is refused on grounds of prematurity, the local planning authority will need to indicate clearly how the grant of permission for the development concerned would prejudice the outcome of the plan-making process.'

44. It is considered that such exceptional circumstances are present. The proposed extension to the Green Belt is integral to the new town proposal in order to retain essential visual separation between the two settlements and which is a matter the NPPF says should be considered when allocating a new town. As a result, to grant permission here would fundamentally harm the future planning of the new town and maintaining separation with the village in the long term. The emerging Local Plan has been the subject of two rounds of consultation and the new town and its extended Green Belt are central components of the Draft Submission Local Plan.

Surface Water Disposal

45. Surface water is proposed to be discharged into the drainage ditch on the southern boundary of the site that connects to the internal drainage board's watercourse. The Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board has commented that the ditch is virtually non-existent and improvement works are required to improve its capacity. This matter needs to be considered further by the Land Drainage Manager.

Highway Matters

46. The proposed increase in traffic generation from the development is not considered satisfactory in relation to the capacity of the nearby roads.
47. The width of the two main accesses off Cody Road serving the development would not accord with Local Highway Authority standards that require the access to be at least 5.5m in width. The vehicular and pedestrian visibility splays are acceptable and would accord with Local Highways Authority standards. The proliferation of single accesses on to Cody Road with no on-site turning would result in manoeuvring on to the public highway that would cause a hazard to the free flow of traffic along Cody Road and be detrimental to highway safety.

Detailed Matters

48. The site measures 1.44 hectares in area. The erection of 36 dwellings would equate to a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. Whilst this density would not comply with Policy HG/1 of the LDF that seeks densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare, it is considered acceptable in this case given that a greater number of dwellings would not represent a sustainable form of development in relation to the size of the settlement as a Minor Rural Centre and it is a sensitive site outside the village framework and within the countryside.
49. 14 of the 36 dwellings provided would be affordable in nature to comply with local needs (39%). This would comply with the requirement of at least 40% affordable housing provision of developments of more than two dwellings as set out under Policy HG/3 of the LDF when undertaking the calculation set out in the Affordable Housing SPD and rounding down (i.e. $36 \text{ dwelling} \times 0.40 \% = 14.4 \text{ affordable dwellings}$).
50. 22 of the 36 dwellings would be available on the open market. The development proposes an indicative mix of 2 x two bedroom dwellings, 8 x three bedroom dwellings, and 12 x four plus bedroom dwellings. This mix is not considered to comply with Policy HG/2 of the LDF where the starting point is at least 40% one or two bedroom units, 25% three bedroom units and 25% four bedroom units unless the scheme is not economically viable, the proposal is more in context with the sites or the need to secure a more balanced community. It would also not comply with Policy H/8 of the Local Plan that seeks at least 30% one or two bedroom units, 30% three bedroom units and 30% four bedroom units with 10% flexibility added. However, as this proposal is in outline form, it is not considered appropriate to address this issue at this stage as the applicant has not requested that this matter is to be considered as part of the outline application that has been submitted. Therefore it is more appropriate for this issue to be considered further and addressed at the reserved matters stage if outline planning permission is granted for this scheme.
51. The layout, scale, form, designs, and materials of dwellings are likely to be appropriate and these issues will be considered further at the reserved matters stage.

52. The landscaping of the site is not considered acceptable in its current form but this issue can be conditioned for appropriate landscaping to come forwards should the scheme be supported.
53. Contributions have been agreed towards sport facilities, formal and informal children's playspace, informal open space, community facilities, education, strategic waste, library and lifelong learning, waste receptacles, and public art. The exact amounts will be determined at the reserved matters stage.

Other Matters

54. The proposal would not adversely affect biodiversity interests or result in the loss of any important wildlife habitats. The management of the wildflower meadow can be controlled via a condition attached to any consent to secure that a scheme of ecological enhancements occurs on site.
55. A condition would be attached to any consent to secure an investigation into contamination to ensure that the development would not adversely affect any nearby receptors.

Conclusion

56. Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is considered that planning permission should not be granted in this instance.

Recommendation

57. It is recommended that the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:
 - i) The implementation of the proposed development, if approved, would prejudice the consideration of submitted Policy S/4 Cambridge Green Belt and the proposed Green Belt Extension shown upon Policies Map Inset No.104 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission (July 2013) in that the site occupies a significant proportion of the area which has been put forward for consideration in the submitted designation and would harm the effectiveness of the submitted proposal, if it is to be included in the Adopted Local Plan. The erosion of the proposed Green Belt Extension would seriously harm the objectives of the proposed Waterbeach New Town as set out in draft Policy SS/5 Waterbeach New Town and Policies Map Inset H: Waterbeach New Town of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission (July 2013).
 - ii) The development would result in the loss of an important landscape buffer area between Waterbeach and Waterbeach Barracks, to the harm of the landscaped setting of each, and would represent an undesirable coalescence of the village and Barracks contrary to the adopted Local Development Framework 2007 at Policy DP/3, which seeks to prevent development that would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the countryside and landscape character; at Policy DP/7, which states that outside village frameworks only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted: the aims of the policy seek the protection of the countryside from gradual encroachment and to help guard against incremental growth in

unsustainable locations: and at Policy NE/4, which seeks to preserve the local character and distinctiveness of the District's landscape.

- iii) The width of the two main accesses off Cody Road serving the development would not accord with Local Highway Authority standards that require the access to be at least 5.5 metres in width and the proliferation of single accesses on to Cody Road with no on-site turning would result in manoeuvring on to the public highway that would cause a hazard to the free flow of traffic along Cody Road and be detrimental to highway safety contrary to the adopted Local Development Framework 2007 at Policy DP/3, which states that all development proposal should provide appropriate access from the highway network that does not compromise safety.

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

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission July 2013
- South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- Planning File References: S/2092/13/OL, S/1359/13/OL, S/0645/13/FL, and S/1432/85/O.

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