

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

5 November 2014

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

Application Number:	S/1907/14/OL
Parish(es):	WATERBEACH
Proposal:	Residential Development of up to 36 Dwellings (Class C3) including Affordable Housing, Access, Car Parking, Open Space and Landscaping
Site address:	Land to the East of Cody Road and North of Bannold Road
Applicant(s):	Manor Oak Homes
Recommendation:	Approval (as amended)
Key material considerations:	Housing Land Supply Proposed Green Belt Countryside Highway Safety Neighbour Amenity Archaeology Ecology Biodiversity Trees and Landscaping Flood Risk
Committee Site Visit:	No.
Departure Application:	No.
Presenting Officer:	Karen Pell-Coggins
Application brought to Committee because:	The officer recommendation conflicts with the recommendation of Waterbeach Parish Council
Date by which decision due:	30 October 2014

Executive Summary

1. This proposal, as amended, seeks permission for a residential development outside the Waterbeach village framework and in the countryside. The 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 The NPPF states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and where relevant policies are out of date, planning permission should be granted for development unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when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 36 dwellings towards the required housing land supply including 14 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 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. Of the affordable dwellings, 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. Of the market dwellings, 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 0.32 of a hectare of public open space in a linear form would be provided on the eastern side of the site.

Planning History

4. **Site**
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 North of Bannold Road and West of Bannold Drove

S/0558/14/FL - Residential Development of Up to 57 Dwellings with Access to Bannold Road - Refused

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

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: -

“Highways

Cody Road is a narrow road already carrying extra traffic with the recent re-letting and selling of the properties that were formerly married quarters for the barracks site. There is now only one exit from this road whereas historically there was more than one exit when these properties were occupied by the military. Traffic from all the proposed new housing would be funnelled along Cody Road and out to Bannold Road. The junction of Cody Road and Bannold Road is already a dangerous junction as it is adjacent to the doctors surgery and many vehicles stop to enter the surgery car park, access to which is near the corner on Cody Road. In addition there are frequently many vehicles parked near this corner. All of this already makes access difficult to the doctors surgery, which could only get a lot worse with additional traffic.

Drainage - both surface and sewerage

We believe that drainage issues have not been properly addressed and would wish to see confirmed that the IDB is in agreement with the proposed drainage system. It appears that the point at which the proposed new sewer would join the existing system is in exactly the area where there are current flooding problems. Whilst the area has evidently been classified as Flood Risk Level 1 suggesting flooding would occur only once in a hundred years, this is clearly not the case as there has been severe flooding at least twice and possibly more often since February this year. Non-return valves having been installed in more than one property along Bannold Drove, the sewage overflow problem is simply moved further along the system. Flooding in this area is not a new problem. It is on the Fen edge and farmers historically get successful crops only 3 years out of 5.”

10. **Policy Team** – Comments that in his decisions in June on two planning appeals in Waterbeach, a planning inspector 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

the Council makes decisions on planning applications for new homes until it is able to demonstrate such a supply. This issue is addressed later in the report.

11. **Trees and Landscapes Officer** – Comments are awaited.
12. **Landscape Design Officer** – Has no objections and comments that the existing hedgerow planting should be retained as much as possible and reinforced around the perimeter of the site. Requests conditions in relation to hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatments, tree and hedgerow protection measures, surface water drainage, provision for waste, provision for cycle storage, provision for bird and bat boxes and provision of log piles and hedgehog and insect houses.
13. **Ecology Officer** – Accepts 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.
14. **Urban Design Team** – Comments that the proposals appear to represent a sensible and appropriate response to the site. The design offers a street frontage to Cody Road and the existing perimeter planting has been retained. There is acceptable separation between dwellings and there is a mix of housing types. The only concern is the location of the public open space which although has surveillance and makes sense if the adjacent phases of development come forward, could be more centrally within the development if this site is developed in isolation.
15. **Environmental Health Officer** – Comments are awaited.
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. **Affordable Housing Officer** – Supports the application. Comments that the number of affordable homes being provided is in accordance with policy, which is 40% on developments of 2 or more dwellings, as stated in the councils Affordable Housing SPD. The mix consists of 2 x 3BH, 8 x 2BH, 4 x 1BH and the size of units being offered is in accordance with the housing need across the district. The tenure split of 70/30 in favour of rented, is in accordance with our policy. Currently there are around 1,760 applicants registered on home link who are in need of affordable housing in the district and this demonstrates the need for affordable housing. The properties should be built to HCA design and quality requirements.
18. **Section 106 Officer** – Requires the provision of 925 square metres of open space on site and comments that the layout plan provides 1350 square metres. Also requires 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.
19. **Cambridgeshire County Council Planning Officer** – Requests developer contributions in relation to pre-school and primary education, libraries and life-long

learning, and waste infrastructure. No contribution is required towards secondary education.

20. **Cambridgeshire County Council Highways Development Control** – Comments that the Local Highway Authority would adopt the road if it has a width of at least 5 metres along with footpaths with a width of 1.8 metres. Requests that the access has dropped kerbs rather than radii kerbs. Requires conditions in relation to pedestrian visibility splays from all driveways on to the public highway, vehicular visibility splays from the main accesses on to the public highway, the accesses being constructed from bound material and a traffic management plan during construction. Also requests an informative.
21. **Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Team** – Comments are awaited.
22. **Environment Agency** – Has no objections subject to conditions in relation to pollution control to include surface water and foul drainage, and contamination. Also requests informatives.
23. **Waterbeach Level internal Drainage Board** – Has concerns over how the development would impact upon the drainage in the area. However, it welcomes the fact that there are proposals to install a new surface water system to take water away from the site. Any discharge into Board's system requires the consent of the Board. The system can only accept a discharge of 1.1 l/s/ha. This discharge rate is referred to in the Flood Risk Assessment for the site. Further details are required on the detailed design of attenuation system, consent/agreement to agree a new discharge to the watercourse and restrict any further connection, and flow control structure and details of the adoption of the balancing facilities.
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 the site is located in an area of high archaeological potential. Has no objections in principle but requests a condition to secure a programme of archaeological works to ensure that any remains are preserved.
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 by members of the public

27. Letters of representation have been received from the occupiers of 3 properties: -
1 Josiah Court
41 Bannold Road
10 Kirby Terrace

The following concerns have been raised: -

- i) Traffic generation, congestion and highway safety to vehicles and pedestrians.

- ii) Flood risk.
- iii) Piecemeal development while local plan is at inquiry stage.
- iv) Impact upon residential amenity of Nos. 7 to 10 Kirby Terrace through loss of view.
- v) Loss of property value.
- vi) Loss of agricultural land.
- vii) Outside village framework.
- viii) Impact on landscape setting of Waterbeach.
- ix) Parking.

Material Planning Considerations

28. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are whether the Council has a 5-year housing land supply, and whether in that context the principle of development is acceptable in the countryside and proposed Green Belt, and the impacts of the development upon the character and appearance of the area, biodiversity, ecology, archaeology, flood risk, highway safety, and neighbour amenity.

Housing Land Supply

29. 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.
30. 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. Please see Appendix for a copy of the decisions. He identified either a 3.51 or 3.9 year supply (each appeal was judged on its own evidence and slightly different conclusions reached). 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 "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".
31. 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).

Principle of Development

32. 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 36 dwellings would therefore not under normal circumstances be considered acceptable in principle. However, this policy is considered out of date due to the current lack of a 5 year housing land supply.
33. 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 36 dwellings would exceed 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.

Proposed Green Belt

34. The site is included in an area shown as a proposed extension to the Green Belt under Policy S/4 of the emerging Local Plan in order to provide 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 the appeal decisions on the adjoining sites 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

35. The site is currently arable land 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 sites that it performed two 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 and does not have a distinct identity. He took account of recent residential development that has already resulted in some coalescence and that the barracks have recently been sold off as private housing and has a similar character to the main part of the village. He also considered 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.
36. The Council has previously taken the view that development would result in a loss of openness and rural character that would change the appearance of the site when viewed from Bannold Road and Cody Road. However, the Inspector considered that these views would only result in very 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 and from those

schemes recently allowed at appeal. The appeals allowed on either side of the current application site will significantly reduce the openness of this area.

Housing Density

37. The site measures 1.4 hectares in area. The erection of 36 dwellings would equate to a density of approximately 28 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 the character of the area and compliance with Policy H/7 of the submission Local Plan that seeks a density of 30 dwellings per hectare in Minor Rural Centres but may vary where justified by the local character of the area or other local circumstances. The development granted planning permission of the adjacent sites has a density of 31 and 33 dwellings per hectare.

Affordable Housing

38. 14 of the 36 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 4 x one bed flats, 8 x two bed houses and 2 x three bed houses would provide a mix that would address the need. The tenure split of 70% rented and 30% shared ownership would also meet the need.

Housing Mix

39. The remaining 22 of the 36 dwellings would be market dwellings. The mix would consist of 2 x two bed dwellings (9%), 8 x three bed dwellings (36%) and 12 x four and five bed dwellings (55%). 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 local context of the site and the need to secure a more balanced community. It would also not comply with Policy H/8 of the submission 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.

Design Considerations

40. 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.
41. 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.
42. The comments of the Urban Design Team in relation to the position of the public open space are noted and will be considered at the reserved matters stage. 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 925 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 provided 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.
44. Further contributions have been agreed towards community facilities, education, strategic waste, library and lifelong learning and waste receptacles. The exact amounts depend upon the housing mix and will be determined at the reserved matters stage.
45. 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. This would ensure that the rural character of the site is retained.
46. 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.

Ecology

47. The proposal would not adversely affect biodiversity interests or result in the loss of any important wildlife habitats. The management of the proposed wildflower meadow can be controlled via a condition attached to any consent to secure that a scheme of ecological enhancements occurs on site.

Highway Safety

48. Bannold Road is a long straight road that bends as its western point where it meets the High Street. Cody Road links Bannold Road with the former barracks. They are fairly quiet roads that have speed limits of 30 miles per hour.
49. The development would result in a significant 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 42 vehicle movements at peak times based upon TRICS and Waterbeach Census Travel to Work 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.
50. The access width of the main roads into the site at 5.5 metres would accommodate two-way traffic into the site and would be acceptable. The 1.8 metres footpaths on each side of the accesses are adequate and would provide safe pedestrian movements. The proposed vehicular visibility splays of 2.4 metres x 43 metres in both directions are considered appropriate. The access would therefore accord with Local Highways Authority standards. The driveways to each dwelling would have pedestrian visibility splays. The kerbs adjacent to the accesses would be dropped. The number of accesses on to Cody Road has been reduced from that previously refused planning permission and the Local Highways Authority supports this revised proposal.

51. Each dwelling fronting and close to Cody Road would have at least two on-site parking spaces. This is unlikely to result on on-street parking that would affect the free flow of traffic and be detrimental to highway safety. Any visitor parking along Cody Road would be in the short term along a straight road with no parking restrictions and a width of 5.4 metres that would allow traffic to pass without obstruction. Whilst some of the smaller dwellings would only have one parking space, these are located away from Cody Road so any on-street parking would be likely to be around the public open space.
52. 72 vehicle parking spaces would be provided for the development. The level of parking for the whole site would be in accordance with the Council's standards of an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling. The site is also considered 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. Cycle parking would be provided within garages and outbuildings.
53. There is a bus stop on Cody Road immediately adjacent to 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.
54. 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.
55. 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.

Neighbour Amenity

56. The impact of the development itself on neighbours in terms of mass, light and overlooking is likely to be acceptable but 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 1km 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.
58. Surface water from the site would be discharged to a new piped outfall from the development via Cody Road and Bannold Road to the IDB controlled watercourse located immediately to the east of Bannold Drove. This would be controlled through attenuation of surface water for a 1 in 100 year storm event plus an allowance for 30% climate change in an underground storage tank on the site that allows a maximum run-off rate of run-off 1.1 l/s/ha before the surface water would enter the

outfall. This method of surface water disposal is considered appropriate as it would comply with the requirements of the Waterbeach IDB and has recently been accepted as a suitable method in the appeals on the adjacent sites. A condition would be attached to any consent to agree precise details and monitoring. The development would not therefore increase the risk of flooding to the site and surrounding area.

Archaeology

59. The site lies in an area of Waterbeach where little archaeological evidence is known although some nearby sites have discovered important remains. 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.

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 seek 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 agricultural purposes.
64. The loss of a view and a reduction in property value are not planning considerations that can be taken into account in the determination of this application.

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 adverse impact must be weighed against the following benefits of the development:
- The provision of 36 dwellings towards the shortfall in 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 14 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.
- Employment during construction to benefit the local economy.
- Greater use of local services and facilities to contribute to the local economy.

67. 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

68. 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
- vi) Vehicular visibility splays
- vii) Pedestrian visibility splays
- viii) Traffic management plan
- ix) Framework travel plan
- x) Full travel plan
- xi) Boundary treatment
- xii) Hard and soft landscaping
- xiii) Landscaping implementation
- xiv) Tree protection
- xv) Ecological enhancement
- xvi) Pollution control including surface water and foul drainage
- xvii) Contamination investigation
- xviii) Archaeological investigation
- xix) Hours of use of power operated machinery
- xx) External lighting
- xxi) Renewable energy statement
- xxii) Water conservation strategy
- xxiii) Fire hydrants
- xxiv) Drainage during construction

+ Section 106 in relation to developer contributions

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 References S/1907/14/FL, S/2092/13/OL, S/0645/13/FL, S/1359/13/OL, S/0558/14/OL, S/1260/09/RM and S/1551/04/O

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