

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

3 September 2014

**AUTHOR/S:** Planning and New Communities Director

---

**Application Number:** S/0558/14/OL

**Parish:** WATERBEACH

**Proposal:** Erection of up to 57 Dwellings including Affordable Housing, Public Open Space, Roads and Associated Infrastructure including a Sustainable Drainage System

**Site address:** Land at Bannold Road and Bannold Drove

**Applicant(s):** Downing Ventures Ltd.

**Recommendation:** Approval (as amended)

**Key material considerations:** Countryside  
Landscape Character  
Archaeology  
Ecology  
Biodiversity  
Trees and Landscaping  
Flood Risk  
Housing Density  
Housing Mix  
Affordable Housing  
Developer Contributions  
Housing Land Supply

**Committee Site Visit:** No

**Departure Application:** Yes

**Presenting Officer:** Karen Pell-Coggins

**Application brought to Committee because:** Recommendation conflicts with the views of Waterbeach Parish Council

**Date by which decision due:** 5 June 2014 (Extension of Time Agreed)

### Executive Summary

1. This proposal, as amended, seeks permission for a residential development outside the Waterbeach village framework and in the countryside. This development would not normally be considered acceptable in principle as a result of its location. However, two recent appeal decisions on adjoining sites have shown that the district does not currently have a 5 year housing land supply and therefore the adopted LDF policies in relation to the supply of housing are not up to date. The NPPF states that there is a

presumption in favour of sustainable development and where relevant policies are out of date, planning permission should be granted for development unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole. In this case the adverse impacts of the development in terms of limited visual harm are not considered to demonstrably outweigh the benefits that consist of a contribution of 57 dwellings towards the required housing land supply including 23 affordable dwellings, a location with good transport links and a range of services, and creation of jobs during the construction period that would benefit the local economy. Given the above balance, the application is recommended for approval.

### **Site and Proposal**

2. The site is located outside the Waterbeach village framework and in the countryside. It is situated to the north of Bannold Road and to the west of Bannold Drove, on the north eastern edge of the village. The site measures 1.8 hectares in area and currently comprises an area of open grassland. There is a hedge with trees along the western boundary of the site and a number of trees and shrubs along the southern, northern and western boundaries. There are ditches along the southern and eastern boundaries of the site and the IDB drain lies on the opposite side of Bannold Drove. The former Waterbeach Barracks housing lies to the north of the site. Residential development along Bannold Road and an arable field where consent has recently been granted for a residential development lie to the west of the site. An agricultural business and dwelling are situated to the east of the site. Open arable land lies to the south of the site.
3. This full planning application, received on 4 March 2014 and amended on 10 June 2014, is an outline application for the erection of up to 57 dwellings including affordable housing, public open space, roads and associated infrastructure including a sustainable drainage system. The development would comprise 23 affordable housing units and 34 market housing units of different sizes. The affordable housing mix would comprise 3 x 1 bed flats, 3 x 2 bed flats and 17 x 2 bed houses. The market housing mix would comprise 3 x 1 bed flats, 3 x 2 bed flats, 8 x 2 bed houses, 15 x 3 bed houses and 5 x 4 bed houses. There would be a variety of accommodation that includes flats, semi-detached and detached dwellings. The layout would have a central spine road with access on to Bannold Road. Dwellings of the main access would be grouped around shared private driveways. The dwellings would range in scale from two to two and a half storeys in height. The designs would feature a mix of classical and vernacular house types. At least two parking spaces would be provided for each dwelling and at 1.5 spaces per flat. Renewable energy features and water conservation measures will be incorporated into the design. Three areas of public open space would be provided on the site that covers an area of 890 square metres. A number of the trees and hedges on the site would be retained and protected along with the introduction of new landscaping.

### **Planning History**

4. There is no planning history on the site itself. However, a number of applications for similar developments along Bannold Road have been submitted.  
***Land East of Cody Road and North of Bannold Road***  
S/1907/14/OL - Residential Development of up to 36 Dwellings including Affordable Housing, Access, Car Parking, Open Space and Landscaping- Pending Decision  
S/2092/13/OL – Residential Development of up to 36 dwellings and Formation of Accesses - Refused

***Land West of Cody Road***

S/0645/13/FL - 60 Dwellings - Appeal Allowed

***Land North of Bannold Road***

S/1359/13/OL - Residential Development of Up to 90 Dwellings with Access to Bannold Road - Appeal Allowed

***Land between Bannold Road and Orchard Drive***

S/1551/04/O - Residential Development and Ancillary Open Space and Landscaping - Approved

S/1260/09/RM - 62 Dwellings - Approved

**Planning Policy**

5. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy DPD, adopted January 2007**
  - ST/2 Housing Provision
  - ST/5 Minor Rural Centres
  
6. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Development Control Policies DPD, adopted July 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
  - SF/6 Public Art and New Development
  - SF/10 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments
  - SF/11 Open Space Standards
  - NE/1 Energy Efficiency
  - NE/3 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development
  - NE/4 Landscape Character Areas
  - NE/6 Biodiversity
  - NE/11 Flood Risk
  - NE/12 Water Conservation
  - NE/15 Noise Pollution
  - NE/17 Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
  - CH/2 Archaeological Sites
  - TR/1 Planning for More Sustainable Travel
  - TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards
  - TR/3 Mitigating Travel Impact
  
7. **Submission Local Plan (March 2014)**
  - S/3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
  - S/4 Cambridge Green Belt
  - S/7 Development Frameworks
  - S/9 Minor Rural Centres
  - SS/5 Waterbeach New Town
  - HQ/1 Design Principles
  - HQ/2 Public Art and New Development
  - H/7 Housing Density
  - H/8 Housing Mix
  - H/9 Affordable Housing
  - NH/2 Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
  - NH/3 Protecting Agricultural Land

NH/4 Biodiversity  
CC/1 Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change  
CC/3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments  
CC/4 Sustainable Design and Construction  
CC/6 Construction Methods  
CC/8 Sustainable Drainage Systems  
CC/9 Managing Flood Risk  
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  
SC/11 Noise Pollution  
SC/12 Contaminated Land  
TI/2 Planning for Sustainable Travel  
TI/3 Parking Provision  
TI/8 Infrastructure and New Developments

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

Open Space in New Developments SPD - Adopted January 2009  
Affordable Housing SPD - Adopted March 2010  
Trees & Development Sites SPD - Adopted January 2009  
Landscape in New Developments SPD - Adopted March 2010  
Biodiversity SPD - Adopted July 2009  
District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010

**Consultation by South Cambridgeshire District Council as Local Planning Authority**

9. **Waterbeach Parish Council** – Recommends refusal for the following reasons: -

The development is outside the village framework

- i) The development is outside the village framework and the Parish Council resolved in 2012 to maintain a green buffer between existing housing and the former military housing.
- ii) The density of housing proposed is too great for the size of plot.
- iii) There is a significant flood risk because of poor drainage at the site. Environment Agency maps indicate surface water is a problem in this location.
- iv) The local sewage works is already at capacity.
- v) There is not enough open space for the size of plot. The proposed play areas appear to be located next to ponds, thus creating an inherent Health and Safety risk.
- vi) Insufficient visitor parking is provided.
- vii) There will be a significant impact on wildlife. The adjacent road is a green track leading to Bottisham Lock.
- viii) Existing businesses in the area are by their nature agricultural, meaning that there is odour and noise and large vehicles using the roads around the proposed development. Large agricultural vehicles, beet lorries and sewage tankers use the surrounding roads and the additional traffic could cause significant congestion, exacerbated by the nearby level crossing.
- ix) The most southerly pond is located near a known point of weakness in the road where a culvert has previously collapsed.
- x) It should be noted that the application incorrectly refers to Bannold Drive, whereas the road in question is Bannold Drove.

10. **Policy Team** – Comments that in his decisions on two recent planning appeals in Waterbeach, a planning inspector has concluded that the district cannot currently demonstrate a five year supply of land for building new houses. This is a requirement

set by national planning policy to help boost housing supply. The appeals affect how we make decisions on planning applications for new homes until we do have such a supply, although all housing proposals will still have to show they are sustainable against the tests in national planning policy. The appeal decisions include an adjoining site where the Inspector has concluded that this is a sustainable location for residential development.

11. **Trees and Landscapes Officer** – Has no objections and comments that the application is supported by a comprehensive Arboricultural report that includes detailed plans for the retention and protection of trees. The indicative landscaping layout could work well but a condition needs to be attached to any consent to agree a detailed soft landscaping scheme.
12. **Landscape Design Officer** – Comments that Waterbeach New Town is a strategic allocation for housing, employment and mixed use in the new Local Plan. This would be separated from Waterbeach village by an extension to the Cambridge Green Belt. Objects to the development on the grounds that it would result in a loss of openness and visual separation between the New Town and existing village.
13. **Ecology Officer** – Comments are awaited.
14. **Urban Design Team** – Comments the proposal raises a number of significant urban design related concerns which suggest that the location and design of the development are both inappropriate. Key concerns are that the development would block an attractive rural corridor linking with wider open countryside, the site location is too detached from walking access and the design does not demonstrate sufficient quality.
15. **Environmental Health Officer** – Comments that the proximity of the development to the adjacent farms that are potential odour sources would not be a constraint to the development given the lack of any complaints and predominant wind direction. The adjacent properties would also not result in noise and disturbance above the parameters of relevant recognised standards taking into account railway noise. Requests conditions in relation to the hours of use of power operated machinery or hand tools and external lighting. Also suggests informatives with regards to pile driven foundations and the burning of waste on site.
16. **Contaminated Land Officer** – Comments that the site has a previous agricultural use and a sensitive proposed residential use. Recommends a condition to require an investigation into contamination and a remediation statement to address any contamination found to ensure that the contamination to future users of the land and off site receptors are minimised.
17. **Land Drainage Manager** – Has no objections in principle and accepts the method of surface water drainage but comments that the public open spaces should have land drainage measures directed to the swales as a result of drainage issues in the area. Requires a condition to agree exact details to also be agreed by Waterbeach Internal Drainage Board.
18. **Affordable Housing Officer** – Supports the application. Comments that the proposal is for 57 dwellings and 40% affordable housing is sought on-site. The application is for 34 market dwellings and 23 affordable dwellings that would be consistent with the policy. The mix of 3 x 1 bedroom flats, 3 x 2 bedroom flats and 17 x 2 bedroom houses would accurately reflect the needs across the district. The tenure should be split 70/30 in favour of rented accommodation so 16 should be for rent and 7 shared ownership. The dwellings should be built to HCA design and quality standards and

available to anyone on the housing register to meet the identified need of 1700 applicants across the district.

19. **Section 106 Officer** – Requires the provision of 800 square metres of open space on site and developer contributions in relation to the maintenance of the public open space and provision and maintenance of children’s play space and sports space, indoor community facilities, waste receptacles and a fee towards the monitoring of section 106 agreements.
20. **Cambridgeshire County Council Highways Development Control** – Comments that the visibility splays calculated from the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile of empirical data within the revised statement at 32.6 miles per hour westbound and 33.6 mph eastbound are acceptable as it is only a nominal 60 miles per hour speed limit due to the existing layout of the highway network. States that the developer would need to fund any amendment to the location of the 30 miles per hour speed limit sign.
21. **Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Team** – Comments that the application is acceptable subject to the provision of a footpath on the northern side of Bannold Road from the frontage of the development to connect with the existing footpath provision east of Cody road, improvements to the local bus stop and contributions towards real time information and maintenance of the bus shelter, a framework travel plan prior to the occupation of the development and a full travel plan no later than 9 months from first occupation.
22. **Environment Agency** – Has no objections subject to conditions in relation to contamination investigation if any is found during development and pollution control. Also requests informatives with regards to surface water drainage, foul water drainage and pollution control.
23. **Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board** – Comments that the Board operates pumping stations and maintains the network of Main Drains to provide protection to properties and land within the district. The system has no residual capacity to take any increased flows from the development site and the Board would only accept a Greenfield run-off rate of 1.1 l/s/ha into the district as this is the rate that the pumping stations are designed to. The general area has suffered from poor drainage in the past so any new development must have a robust method of surface water disposal. Surface water from the development should be directed straight to the Board’s Main Drain and none of the existing watercourses in the area should be used for storage or to discharge into the system. States that consent is required to discharge any water into the District and to carry out any work to any of the Main Drains.
24. **Anglian Water** – Comments that the public foul sewer has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed development.
25. **Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team** – Comments that further archaeological evidence should be submitted in support of the application to properly assess the impact of the development upon archaeology but agrees that a condition could be attached to the consent to ensure consistency with the adjacent applications providing the applicant accepts and makes financial provision for any future risks posed by the discovery of important archaeological remains including alterations to the development area to preserve the remains.
26. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** – Requests a condition in relation to the provision of fire hydrants and states that the number and location of fire hydrants will be determined following a risk assessment and with reference to the guidance contained within the “National Guidance Document on the Provision of Water for Fire

Fighting” January 2007 and that access and facilities for for the Fire Service should be provided in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document B5, Section 16.

### **Representations**

27. Letters of representation have been received from the local member and occupiers of 6 properties: -  
1 Josiah Court  
CB25 9PB  
114 Way Lane  
19 Lode Avenue  
No address given  
No address given.
28. The following concerns have been raised: -
- i) Traffic generation and highway safety to vehicles and pedestrians.
  - ii) Flood risk.
  - iii) Loss of agricultural land.
  - iv) Outside village framework.
  - v) Impact on countryside and rural character.
  - vi) Urban sprawl and loss of separation between settlements.
  - vii) Designation as Green Belt.
  - viii) Effect upon wildlife.
  - ix) Loss of trees and hedges.
  - x) Scale of development.
  - xi) Lack of visitor parking spaces.
  - xii) Capacity of sewage works.
  - xiii) Noise and traffic conflict with existing agricultural businesses.
  - xiv) Inadequate provision of open space and lack of amenity space.

### **Planning Considerations**

29. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are whether the principle of development is acceptable in the countryside and impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the area, the setting of heritage assets, biodiversity, ecology, archaeology, flood risk, highway safety, neighbour amenity and public footpaths and 5-year housing land supply.

### **Principle of Development**

30. The site is located outside the Waterbeach village framework and in the countryside where Policy DP/7 of the LDF and Policy S/7 of the emerging Local Plan states that only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted. The erection of a residential development of up to 57 dwellings is not therefore considered acceptable in principle. However, this policy is considered out of date due to the current lack of a 5 year housing land supply.
31. Waterbeach is identified as a Minor Rural Centre under Policy ST/5 of the LDF and Policy S/8 of the emerging Local Plan where there is a reasonable range of services and facilities and residential developments of up to 30 dwellings are supported in policy terms. The erection of up to 57 dwellings would nearly double the amount of residential dwellings allowed in such locations and would not support the strategy for the location of housing across the district. However, this policy is considered out of date due to the current lack of a 5 year housing land supply.

## **Housing Land Supply**

32. The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF) requires councils to boost significantly the supply of housing and to identify and maintain a five-year housing land supply with an additional buffer as set out in paragraph 47.
33. On the 25 June 2014 in two appeal decisions for sites in Waterbeach, adjoining and in the vicinity of the site of this application, the Inspector concluded that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. This is against the Strategic Housing Market Assessment figure for objectively assessed needs of 19,000 homes between 2011 and 2031, which he concluded had more weight than the Core Strategy figure. It is appropriate for the conclusions reached within these appeal decisions to be taken into account in the Council's decision making where they are relevant. Unless circumstances change, those conclusions should inform, in particular, the Council's approach to paragraph 49 of the NPPF. Which states that adopted policies which are "for the supply of housing" cannot be considered up to date where there is not a five year housing land supply. Those policies were listed in the decision letters and are: Core Strategy DPD policies ST/2 and ST/5 and Development Control Policies DPD policy DP/7 (relating to village frameworks and indicative limits on the scale of development in villages).The Inspector did not have to consider policies ST/6 and ST/7 but as a logical consequence of the decision these should also be policies "for the supply of housing".
34. Where this is the case, paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It says that where relevant policies are out of date, planning permission should be granted for development unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole, or where specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted (which includes land designated as Green Belt in adopted plans.

## **Proposed Green Belt**

35. The site is proposed to be designated as Green Belt under Policy S/4 of the emerging Local Plan in order to ensure separation from Waterbeach New Town that is allocated for new residential, commercial and mixed use development under Policy SS/5 of the emerging Local Plan. The Inspector in a recent appeal decision on the adjoining site considered that little weight can be attached to the designation of the land as Green Belt in the emerging plan given the objections which have been made to the designation. He considered that the function of spatial separation could be achieved on the land allocated as the Waterbeach New Town to ensure that the existing village would not merge with the new town and that the dismissal of the appeal on the grounds of prematurity would not be justified.

## **Character and Appearance of the Area**

36. The site is currently a piece of grassland bordered by trees and hedges that is situated outside the Waterbeach village framework and in the countryside. The Council considered in a recent appeal on the adjoining site that it performed two significant functions: first to provide an important visual break between the two settlements that comprise the village of Waterbeach and the former Barracks and second to provide a pleasant visual setting for both settlements. However, the Inspector considered that both physically and functionally the former Barracks now forms part of Waterbeach village as does not have a distinct identity given that recent



residential development has already resulted in some coalescence and that that the barracks have recently been sold off as private housing and has a similar character to the main part of the village. It is also important to note that the former barracks is physically linked to the existing village via Cody Road which has public footpaths on both sides and that residents would be likely to consider themselves part of the village and use the facilities within the village.

37. The development is considered to result in a loss of openness and rural character that would significantly change the appearance of the site when viewed from Bannold Road and Bannold Road and the setting of the village. However, the Inspector considered that these views would only result in limited harm to the setting of the village given the visible backdrop of existing housing and lack of long distance views within the wider context of the site and that the development would continue the pattern of coalescence that has already taken place within the vicinity of the site.

### **Housing Density**

38. The site measures 1.8 hectares in area. The erection of 57 dwellings would equate to a density of approximately 32 dwellings per hectare. Whilst this would not comply with Policy HG/1 of the LDF that seeks a density of at least 40 dwellings per hectare in the more sustainable villages across the district such as Waterbeach, it is considered acceptable given its sensitive location on the edge of the village and compliance with Policy H/7 of the Local Plan that seeks a density of at least 30 dwellings per hectare in Minor Rural Centres to respond better to the local character of the area. The development granted planning permission of the adjacent site has a density of 31 dwellings per hectare.

### **Affordable Housing**

39. 23 of the 57 dwellings would be affordable dwellings. This would comply with the requirement for 40% of the development to be affordable housing as set out in Policy HG/3 of the LDF and Policy H/8 of the emerging Local Plan to assist with the identified local housing need across the district. The mix of 3 x 1 bed flats, 3 x 2 bed flats and 3 x 2 bed flats would provide a mix that would address the need. A tenure split of 70% rented and 30% shared ownership would be sought through a legal agreement.

### **Housing Mix**

40. The remaining 34 of the 57 dwellings would be market dwellings. The mix would consist of 3 x 1 bed dwellings (9%), 11 x 2 bed dwellings (32%), 15 x 3 bed dwellings (44%) and 5 x 4 bed dwellings (15%). This would result in 41% smaller sized 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings that would comply with part of Policy HG/2 of the LDF. Although it is noted that the split of the 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings would be more in favour of the medium sized rather than larger sized dwellings, this is considered satisfactory given that Policy H/9 of the emerging Local Plan seeks a mix of 30% small 1 and 2 bed dwellings, 30% medium 3 bed dwellings and 30% large 4 bed dwellings with 10% flexibility. This policy can be given some weight given that although a large number of objections were received, these are seeking additional flexibility above that set out in the policy.

### **Design Considerations**

41. The application is currently at outline stage only with access to be considered as part of any approval. All other matters in terms of the layout of the site, scale, external appearance and landscaping are reserved for later approval.

42. The comments of the Urban Design Team in relation to the inward looking layout of the site and links with existing developments, typical suburban housing, unvaried sense of enclosure to streets, range of dwellings, prevalence of front of plot and 90 degree on street parking, lack of visitor parking, the position of the public open spaces surrounded by roads and lack of footpath links to adjacent sites are noted and will be considered at the reserved matters stage. This is also the case for the proximity of the ponds to the public open space as raised by the Parish Council. It is assured that these concerns will be resolved as far as possible with a coordinated response for the proposals on this site and the adjacent sites to ensure a high quality development that responds to local character. The reserved matters applications will be also be referred to the Council's Design Enabling Panel for its views. For this reason, the indicative layout submitted is specifically excluded from the consent.
43. The provision of 890 square metres of public open space on the site is satisfactory. A Local Equipped Area of Play is not required to be incorporated within the development providing there is a link to the area provide on the adjacent site. One of the spaces would need to be a Local Area of Play. Developer contributions are accepted towards the maintenance of the space on site and the provision and maintenance of children's playspace and outdoor sports space off-site along with community facilities.
44. The indicative landscaping of the site is considered appropriate and a condition would be attached to any consent to agree the final details of the scheme.

### **Trees**

45. The proposal would not result in the loss of any important trees and hedges that significantly contribute towards the visual amenity of the area. The trees and hedges along the boundaries of the site that are in a good condition would be retained and protected during development. New tree planting would be carried out to retain the rural character of the area and soften the impact of the development. This is particularly important on the southern and eastern boundaries of the site that would represent the new edge of the village.

### **Ecology**

46. The site is dominated by poor species semi-improved grassland surrounded by species poor hedgerows, scrub and scattered trees. It is considered to have a low ecological value but certain features of the habitats have the potential to support some protected species. A number of trees had features that would capable of supporting roosting bats, the field margin and scrub habitats may support reptiles and all habitats may support breeding birds. Recommends further surveys are carried out to determine the presence of protected species and any mitigation measures required and suggest ecological enhancements such as the planting of native species and opportunities for bats, reptiles and birds. A condition should be attached to any consent to agree further details.

### **Highway Safety**

47. Bannold Road is a long straight road that bends as its western point where it meets the High street. It is a fairly quiet road that has a speed limit of 30 miles per hour. However, it should be noted that the speed limit changes from 60 miles per hour to 30 miles per hour at the south eastern corner of the site where the sign is located.

48. The development would result in a significance increase in the level of traffic in the area. The Transport Statement submitted with the application states that the proposal would generate a maximum of 48 departures during the peak period of 0800 hours to 0900 hours based upon TRICS data. The roads are considered to have adequate capacity to accept this volume of traffic and the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety.
49. The access width of the main road into the site at 5.5 metres would accommodate two-way traffic into the site and would be acceptable. The 2.0 metres footpaths on each side are adequate and would provide safe pedestrian movements. The proposed vehicular visibility splays of 2.4 metres x 56 metres in both directions are considered appropriate based upon empirical data submitted that shows speeds of traffic travelling past the site at 32.6 miles per hour in a westbound direction and 33.6 miles per hour in an eastbound direction. The access would therefore accord with Local Highways Authority standards.
50. There is a bus stop on Cody Road approximately 400 metres to the west of the site. It gives direct public transport access to Cambridge and Ely by an hourly service Monday to Saturdays. This is accessible by walking via a public footpath along the southern side of Bannold Road.
51. Waterbeach railway station is located approximately 1.5km from the site on the southern side of Waterbeach. It gives direct public transport access to Cambridge and London beyond and Ely and Kings Lynn beyond by an hourly service. It is accessible by walking via footpaths and cycling along local roads.
52. The site is considered fairly sustainable given that it has access to two different modes of public transport within close proximity to the site by walking and cycling. This would ensure that there is not over reliance upon modes of transport such as the private car to travel outside the village. However, a contribution is required towards the provision of a shelter, travel information and kerbs at the bus stop to improve the facility and further encourage its use to the occupiers of the new development.
53. The Transport Statement commits to the provision of a framework travel plan to encourage the use of alternative modes of transport other than the private motor vehicle for occupiers of the new dwellings prior to occupation. Measures include the appointment of a travel plan co-ordinator and the provision of information packs to new residents. However, further details are required and a full travel plan would need to be submitted following first occupation of the dwellings. These would be conditions of any consent.
54. There are concerns in relation to the substandard nature of the footpath on the southern side of Bannold Road and the impact upon the additional pedestrian traffic from the development upon footpath. A pedestrian/cycle audit has been requested to identify existing facilities and measures for improvement to reduce risk to vulnerable users. This has recently been submitted and comments are awaited. Should the improvement of the existing footpath not be considered satisfactory, a new footpath should be provided along the northern side of Bannold Road from the site frontage to link to the existing footpath to the east of Cody Road. This would need to be secured via a section 106 legal agreement.

### **Neighbour Amenity**

55. The adjoining agricultural businesses, although some related to livestock, are not considered to result in noise and disturbance or odours to the future occupiers of the dwellings on the site. A condition would be attached to any consent in relation to the

hours of use of power operated machinery during construction of the development to minimise the noise impact upon neighbours.

56. The impact of the development itself on neighbours in terms of mass, light and overlooking will be considered at the reserved matters stage.

### **Flood Risk**

57. The site lies with Flood Zone 1 (low risk). The River Cam is the most significant watercourse in the area that is located 500 metres to the east of the site. The other notable watercourse within the immediate vicinity of the site is the IDB drain that runs along the eastern side of Bannold Drove. The southern and eastern boundary of the site comprises ditches.
58. The Surface Water Flood Risk Map in the SFRA indicates that the lower parts of the site are subject to the pooling of surface water. It is proposed to discharge surface water run-off to swales, balancing tanks and underground storage tanks leading to an outflow point at the south eastern corner of the site. There would be a flow control device at this point that would attenuate flows to a maximum of 1.1 l/s/ha before the surface water would enter the ditch along the eastern boundary of the site. This would then flow via an existing outfall into the IDB drain under Bannold Drove. This method of surface water disposal is considered appropriate subject to precise details being agreed along with the addition of land drainage measures for the areas of public open space. Surface water can be managed on site for all storm events including the 1 in 100 year storm inclusive of the 30% climate change allowance. This would equate to 72 hours of continuous rainfall. Floor levels of the dwellings would also be set 300mm above ground levels to allow for any failure of pumping stations that currently deal with kland drainage in the area. A swale or bund would also be incorporated into the western boundary planting to direct flows from any run-off from the western site towards Bannold Road. The development would not therefore increase the risk of flooding to the site and surrounding area and would comply with Policy NE/11 of the LDF and CC/9 of the emerging Local Plan.

### **Archaeology**

59. The site lies in an area of Waterbeach where little archaeological evidence is known although some nearby sites have discovered important remains. Although it is noted that further works should ideally be carried prior to the determination application, the development is not considered to destroy important archaeological remains providing a condition is attached to any consent to carry out an investigation to determine the extent of any archaeological remains on the site and mitigation measures to ensure they are protected and the applicants are advised of the risk involved. This approach was considered acceptable on two adjacent sites that were considered at appeal.

### **Contamination**

60. The development is not considered to result in contamination to future occupiers of the dwellings or off-site receptors such as watercourses providing a condition is attached to any consent to carry out an investigation into contamination and agree a remediation strategy to address any contamination found on site.

### **Other Matters**

61. Anglian Water has advised that the the local sewage works has the capacity to accommodate foul drainage from the development.

62. Conditions would be attached to any consent to ensure that the development would provide renewable energy measures and a water conservation strategy to ensure that the development would address climate change.
63. The need for the development to contribute towards the 5 year housing land supply would outweigh the loss of the land for
64. The land is not currently used for agricultural crop production purposes as it is grassland. In addition, it is grade 3 agricultural land (good to moderate) and consultation with Natural England is only required for the permanent loss of over 20 hectares of agricultural land.

### **Conclusion**

65. In considering this application, the following relevant adopted development plan policies are to be regarded as out of date while there is no five year housing land supply:  
ST/5: Minor Rural Centres – indicative maximum scheme size of 30 dwellings  
DP/7: Village Frameworks  
This means that where planning permission is sought which would be contrary to the policies listed above, such applications must be determined against paragraph 14 of the NPPF.
66. This report sets out how a number of potential adverse impacts can be addressed. However, an adverse impact that cannot be fully mitigated is the limited visual harm arising from the development of the site itself and a cumulative impact when considered in relation to the adjoining developments at Bannold Road and Cody Road.
67. This adverse impact must be weighed against the following benefits of the development:
  - The provision of 57 dwellings towards the 1400 dwellings to achieve a 5 year housing land supply in the district based on the objectively assessed 19,000 dwellings target set out in the SHMA and the method of calculation and buffer identified by the Inspector.
  - The provision of 23 affordable dwellings towards the need of 1,700 applicants across the district.
  - Developer contributions towards public open space and community facilities in the village.
  - Suitable and sustainable location for this scale of residential development given the position of the site in relation to access to public transport, services and facilities and local employment.
  - Improvement of footpath along southern side of Bannold Road
  - Upgrade of bus stop on Cody Road.
  - Employment during construction to benefit the local economy.
  - Greater use of local services and facilities to contribute to the local economy.
68. The adverse impacts of this development are not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole which aim to boost significantly the supply of housing and which establish a presumption in favour of sustainable development in the context of the lack of a 5-year housing land supply. Planning permission should therefore be granted because material considerations clearly outweigh the limited harm identified, and conflict with out of date policies of the LDF.

## Recommendation

69. It is recommended that the Planning Committee approves the application (as amended) subject to the following conditions: -

- i) Submission of reserved matters details
- ii) Implementation of reserved matter consent
- iii) Approved plans
- iv) Layout excluded from consent
- v) Access layout drawing number PL02]
- vi) Traffic management plan
- vii) Framework travel plan
- viii) Full travel plan
- ix) Boundary treatment
- x) Hard and soft landscaping
- xi) Landscaping implementation
- xii) Tree protection
- xiii) Clearance of vegetation outside bird breeding season
- xiv) Bat and reptile surveys
- xv) Ecological enhancement
- xvi) Surface water drainage
- xvii) Pollution control
- xviii) Contamination investigation
- xix) Archaeological investigation
- xx) Hours of use of power operated machinery
- xxi) External lighting
- xxii) Renewable energy statement
- xxiii) Water conservation strategy
- xxiv) Fire hydrants
- xxv) Drainage during construction

+ Section 106 in relation to developer contributions and works to southern public footpath

**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 Submission March 2014
- South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- Planning File Reference S/0558/14/OL, S/0645/13/FL, S/1359/13/OL, S/1907/14/OL, S/2092/13/OL, S/1260/09/RM, S/1551/04/O

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