

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

3 June 2015

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

---

<b>Application Number:</b>	S/2791/14/OL
<b>Parish:</b>	Melbourn
<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline planning application (including approval of access) for residential development of up to 199 dwellings plus a care home of up to 75 beds, new vehicular accesses from New Road, public open space and a landscape buffer
<b>Site address:</b>	Land East of New Road
<b>Applicant:</b>	Endurance Estates Strategic Land Ltd
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Delegated approval
<b>Key material considerations:</b>	The main issues are whether the proposed development would provide a suitable site for housing, having regard to the principles of sustainable development and housing land supply, scale of development and impact on character and landscape, services and facilities, access and transport, drainage, and ecology.
<b>Committee Site Visit:</b>	Yes
<b>Departure Application:</b>	Yes
<b>Presenting Officer:</b>	Paul Sexton
<b>Application brought to Committee because:</b>	The officer recommendation is contrary to the recommendation of refusal from Melbourn Parish Council
<b>Date by which decision due:</b>	27 February 2015

### **Executive Summary**

1. This proposal seeks outline permission (access only for approval) for a residential development of up to 199 dwellings, plus a car home for up to 75 beds, on land outside the adopted village framework and in the countryside on a greenfield site. The development would not normally be considered acceptable in principle as a result of its scale and location. However two recent appeal decisions on sites in Waterbeach

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 The NPPF states there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and where relevant policies are out of date, planning permission should be granted for development unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when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.

2. In this case any adverse impacts of the development in terms of the scale of development, visual intrusion into the countryside, impact on local services and highways/transport are not considered to demonstrably outweigh the benefits that consist of a contribution of 199 dwellings towards the required housing land supply, including 40% affordable dwellings, and a 75 bed care home and associated employment benefits, in a location with good transport links and a range of services, and creation of jobs during the construction period, and from the care home, that would benefit the local economy. Given the above balance, the application is recommended for delegated approval, subject to the resolution of matters of detail discussed in the report, including the signing of a Section 106 Agreement.

### **Planning History**

3. There is no relevant planning application history on the application site.
4. The site was however considered as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability (SHLAA) Site 3200, and was assessed at the Issues and Options Stage of the Local Plan as Site H7. This assessment identified the site as an 'amber' site suitable for consideration for allocation as a housing site, and found that it had some development potential, with a capacity for around 200 dwellings to be accommodated. It concluded that development would have a limited impact on landscape setting if a new soft green edge was created to the south.

### **Policy**

5. **National**  
National Planning Policy Framework  
Planning Policy Guidance
6. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy**  
ST/2 Housing Provision  
ST/5 – Minor Rural Centres
7. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies**  
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 Density  
HG/3 – Affordable Housing  
SF/6 – Public Art  
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 Developments
- NE/4 – Landscape Character Areas
- NE/6 – Biodiversity
- NE/9 – Water and Drainage Infrastructure
- NE/10 – Foul Drainage – Alternative Drainage Systems
- NE/11 – Flood Risk
- NE/12 – Water Conservation
- NE/14 – Lighting Proposals
- 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
- TR/4 – Non-motorised Transport

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
- Health Impact Assessment – Adopted March 2011

9. **Draft Local Plan**

- S/1 – Vision
- S/2 – Objectives of the Local Plan
- S/3 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- S/5 – Provision of New jobs and Homes
- S/7 – Development Frameworks
- S/9 – Minor Rural Centres
- S/12 – Phasing, Delivering and Monitoring
- 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/7 – Water Quality
- CC/8 – Sustainable Drainage Systems
- CC/9 – Managing Flood Risk
- HQ/1 – Design Principles
- HQ/2 – Public Art and New Development
- NH/2 – Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
- NH/3 – Protecting Agricultural Land
- NH/4 – Biodiversity
- NH/6 – Green Infrastructure
- H/7 – Housing Density
- H/8 – Housing Mix
- H/9 – Affordable Housing
- 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
- T/I – Parking provision

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

10. **Melbourn Parish Council** – recommends refusal. It has provided very detailed submissions outlining the Parish Council's objections to the proposed development, including a transport assessment carried out by a highways consultant, a full copy of which is attached as Appendix 1.
11. The Parish Council has also submitted a document summarising 1167 representations it received as a result of its consultation process.
12. In the summary of the reports the Parish Council states that its objections are on the grounds that:
13. 'The principle of development is unacceptable because:
  - a. According to the adopted Proposals Map (2011) and Policy DP/7 in the Development Control Policies DPD 92007), the site is located in the 'open countryside' where there is a general presumption against new development;
  - b. The proposed development is contrary to Policies S/7 and S/9 and the open countryside designation in the emerging Proposed Submission Local Plan 92013/14) and;
  - c. Notwithstanding any case on five-year housing land supply, the proposed development does not accord with the majority of the economic, social and environmental objectives set out in paragraph 7 of the NPPF (2012), and as such does not qualify as 'sustainable' development under the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development.
14. The proposed development is premature and risks prejudicing the emerging Proposed Submission Local Plan (2013/14) and its examination, and any decision or recommendations that the Inspector may make in the Spring/Summer.
15. The applicant's Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan: (i) are flawed where they assign generated flows at the junction of Mortlock Street/High Street; (ii) do not consider the impact of development traffic generated on local conditions outside of the junctions modelled; and (iii) proposed works and measures to mitigate impact that are weak and ineffective with no guarantee or either their implementation or success. Until these issues are addressed, it is not possible to ascertain whether or not the proposed development complies with Policies DP/3 and TR/3 in the Development Control Policies DPD (2007) and emerging Policy TI/2 in the Proposed Submission Local Plan (2013/14).
16. The proposed development is too large and out-of-proportion for a 'Minor Rural Centre' like Melbourn and will harm the character of the village, village life and place an additional burden on key village facilities, contrary to Policy ST/5 in the Core Strategy (2007), Policy DP/3 in the Development Control Policies DPD (2007) and Policy TI/2 in the Proposed Submission Local Plan (2013/14).
17. The proposed development will create unnecessary landscape and visual harm to the surrounding environment and countryside, contrary to Policy NE/4 in the Development Control Policies DPD (2007) and Policy NH/2 in the emerging Proposed Submission Local Plan (2013/14).

18. Melbourn Parish Council has a number of other concerns about the proposed development, including the loss of a locally important tree, the scope for failures in the local sewage system, deficiencies in the applicant's Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, and other locally known highway concerns.
19. Melbourn Parish Council's 2014 consultation results clearly demonstrate that the majority of local respondents are opposed to the proposed development.
20. In conclusion, the proposed development is contrary to the statutory development plan and in the absence of any overriding material considerations, should be refused planning permission in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.'
21. A further representation has been received in respect of the revised Transport Assessment, which is attached at Appendix 2. The Parish Council comments that it disagrees profoundly with the conclusions of the TA. The Parish Council has also submitted a list of conditions it would wish to see included should consent be granted.
22. **Cambridgeshire County Council Highways Development Control** – originally objected on the grounds that the proposed access conflicts with the proposed access for a site which has been identified within the SHLAA opposite to this site. Therefore, potentially creating a crossroads which, due to their poor accident record is unacceptable to the Local Highway Authority.
23. Following further consideration of an updated access and plan, and additional information it has no objection in principle to the proposed access from New Road, subject to conditions, including the provision of a raised table junction, speed management measures, new footway and cycleway links along New Road.
24. **Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Team** – commented in respect of the application as originally submitted that further assessments were required in respect of speed survey information on New Road; clarification of distances that residents within the development will have to travel for public transport services; whether real-time information is available at the bus stops nearest the site; further details detailing at what time of day the survey of current traffic flows was carried out; suitability of proposed access to cater for traffic flows; recalculation of nursing home trips; revised distribution calculations and travel mode split, assessment of A10 Frog End and A505 junctions; detailing of mitigation measures including bus stops, improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes and community transport, and cycle stands.
25. Following discussions with the applicant and the submission of further information the revised comments were submitted still requiring some additional information. Since these comments there has been further discussions with the applicant, as a result of which there are no objections subject to the requirements in paragraph 22 being secured and the following:
26. Improvements to existing bus stops along High Street, including shelters and Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) (design to be agreed with CCC and Melbourn PC); a new community transport vehicle; new on site car club to serve new residents and existing local residents; upgrades to the traffic signal junction in Melbourn including MOVA; contributions towards the safety scheme at the Cambridge Road/A10 junction; new cycle stands in Melbourn Village and near to the train station in Meldreth; contribution towards the A10 cycleway; a contribution towards improving

public footpath No.9 between Station Road and the railway station; travel plans to be secured through condition.

27. **SCDC Urban Design** – ‘Though the site is out with the village framework, is it within a sustainable location, the site it is largely surrounded by development on three sides, and residential development continues along the opposite side of New Road beyond the extents of the site. The topography of the site will help minimise the impact of any development of this site, as the land beyond rises so the potential for any long views into the site is minimised. For these reasons, the principle of development on this site is therefore not objectionable. The number of units proposed also appears acceptable, though any increase should be resisted as it is likely this will be at the expense of the open space.
28. Any development here will form a new edge to the village, and this will need to be considered carefully. The parameter plans includes a substantial green buffer along the southern boundary of the site. This appears appropriately sized to provide a meaningful buffer/recreational space, and should not be reduced in width as the detailed plans come forward.
29. The vehicular access point appears logical. Given the existing boundary constraints, particularly the backs of houses, there are limited opportunities for connections. The masterplan includes a pedestrian link at the northwest corner of the site, this should definitely be included to increase permeability. Opportunities for connections to existing rights of way etc should be made wherever possible.
30. There are a number of issues to address in the masterplan should a detailed application be developed. These include providing a suitable frontage to New Road, the quality of the green spaces, parking arrangements, distribution of the affordable housing, and incorporation of renewable energy measures.
31. **SCDC Landscape and Trees** – Landscape – No objection. As indicated above, the proposed landscape buffer to the southern boundary of the site should be instigated to avoid or reduce the effects of the proposed development on the edge of the village settlement. A minimum of 10m of woodland mix vegetation should be incorporated as mitigation works.
32. Conditions should include submission of full details of both hard and soft landscape works; five year replacement planting for both trees and shrubs following completion; ‘no-dig’ construction in route protection area; boundary treatment to dwellings; external lighting scheme; hard landscape works to include details of kerbs, paving materials, edging and street furniture.
33. **SCDC Ecology** – No objection. The South East boundary is very much welcomed having a minimum depth of 30m. This enables it to provide a multiple of functions (screening, habitat provision and public open space together with a wandering path).
34. It is noted that the parameter plan has a significant overlap between the residential development land and the proposed strategic green buffer which equates to 10m, why is this? This could potential result in what looks like a large green buffer being reduced by 10m with a loss to habitats and open space.
35. The use of partial tree screening in the South East boundary is welcomed as the blocks of trees do not disconnect people from the open farmland to the south. The blocks of trees provide a softer transition from the farmland habitats to the residential development and its open space.

36. Beech trees are present as hill top copses and plantations in this part of the district. Their use along with other chalk favouring species (privet, guelder rose and spindal) would be considered appropriate.
37. The existing traditional orchard should be viewed as an important biodiversity resource for the site (albeit just offsite). The habitat appears to have been extended through the planting of further orchard trees around the pumping station – can this been confirmed as correct? What other areas of orchard planting are proposed, are they in the SE boundary? At the full application stage gardens backing on to the orchard should also be planted with some fruit trees.
38. The development could adopt an orchard theme. Can a community orchard be established in the central open space?
39. The use of soakaways in public open spaces (rather than rear gardens) would provide an opportunity for habitat provision and ensure that they remain well maintained (soakaways in gardens may be redevelopment/interfered with in future leading to problems). Publically accessible SUDS would provide opportunities for habitat integration in to features such as swales and could be planted to provide complementary habitats to the drier parts of the site.
40. There is a degree of north to south habitat corridor provided by the trees associated with the paths leading to the central open space, similar is provided near to the west of the site. The final provision of street trees is very important to achieving these green links. Can it be confirmed that street trees can be and will be provided as this outline plan indicates?
41. The proposal for fence lifting by 200mm (or simply leaving out the gravel boards at fence bases) is welcomed along rear boundary fences so that small animals (hedgehogs and amphibians) can gain access to some gardens.
42. A range of specialist bird and bat boxes should be erected upon buildings. The built-in/integrated forms are preferential to externally added ones.
43. Specialist seed mixes, such as those that can provide flowering lawns, should be used in public open spaces where requirements are not for meadow habitats. If a quick sward establishment is required then the use of turf mat should be proposed. A reduction in basic amenity grass could act as a catalyst for a reduction in the overall mowing regimes of public open spaces.
44. The findings of the ecological assessment of this site are accepted. That being that skylark, corning bunting and dunnock hold territories just off of the site, that only a small parcel of land has potential for reptiles and that no significant arable plants occur in the site. The provision of semi-natural grassland and shrub habitats within the green buffer will provide further nesting sites for some species of farmland bird that nest in hedgerows or in undisturbed rough grassland zone.
45. **Design Enabling Panel** – concluded that this was a well-presented development proposal which demonstrates the evolution of the general design development to date but, which is capable of further improvement through further consideration.
46. It stressed that its comments and opinion were based solely on the design/layout of the proposal. It was acknowledged that the site is outside the settlement boundary, and is not presently designated for development.

47. The Panel was of the view that there is scope to develop a more efficient road layout, with particular regard to the public open space. The Panel questioned the need to have the central green space bisected by a vehicular route in addition to the perimeter vehicular access, which served all the outward facing dwellings.
48. The general approach of having areas of different character and density was broadly supported and encouraged.
49. The siting and detail of the retirement/care home was questioned, together with issues such as the siting and quantity of parking (insufficient provision?).
50. The scale of the care home and the impact upon the street scene on entering the site and in 'opposition' to relatively modest housing opposite with significant difference in scale and bulk did not convince the Panel.
51. It was considered that the scheme would benefit from a more active relationship to New Road and provide more visual engagement, notwithstanding the potential to maintain some perimeter planting and screening to the road.
52. The south east linear green space was supported, and the potential to provide buffer planting but still maintain views, both in and out of the development, was encouraged. The opportunity to create a space of significant external interest and activity should be explored and developed. As well as physical activity this might include an element of public art.
53. It was considered that there is scope for significant landscaping to the north east and south perimeters, and to respond differently accordingly to the neighbouring land use and character e.g. the need to maintain mutual privacy from houses to the north. The opportunity to have a softer buffer/some continuity of fruit trees and orchard to the east, and the scope for breaks in a substantial planting and green buffer to the south and open farmland beyond.
54. With regard to the dwellings fronting the central green space, scope for some increase in height and bulk at least in part. This in turn would allow some breaks in built up frontage to create greater visual permeability and maintain views, or at least glimpses, beyond the site, such as the framed views illustrated within the 'Initial Ideas Plan'.
55. Consideration has been given to the car users experience as they drive through the development, but the same thought needs to be given to the pedestrian experience. There is scope to improve and enhance the quality of the pedestrian connections across the site, especially linking into the linear green space, with minimised road crossings and tying in with open vistas in and out of the site, again as shown in the 'Initial Ideas Plan'.
56. The Panel would strongly encourage any potential links to surrounding streets and land, and thereby prevent this potential development becoming one large cul de sac.
57. Further consideration/detail needs to be given regarding the nature of the central green space, how it will be used and what it will contain. The inclusion of orchards in this particular location was questioned.



58. The potential to maximise dwelling orientation for optimal use of renewable energy sources should be a design driver (it was noted, and welcomed, that it is intended to provide a minimum 20% renewable energy).
59. It was noted that the car park provision obviated the need for parking courts, with a presumption in favour of curtilage parking, which was supported and encouraged.
60. It would appear that the housing/dwelling mix is appropriate, but the distribution of affordable dwellings needs further consideration, with pepper-potting across the site being strongly encouraged.
61. **Cambridgeshire County Council Education** – The County Council initially provided informal comments on the emerging development proposals in response to questions raised about the capacity of existing education provision in the village. County Council Officers have not met with the developers to formally comment on the emerging proposals.
62. County Council officers have met with the local County Councillor, District Councillors and representatives of Melbourn Parish Council to discuss the emerging proposals and the implications of these on education provision in the village.
63. In providing comments on the planning application, the County Council needs to be mindful of the existing provision in the village as well as the ability to secure additional capacity through the expansion of this provision. This is particularly important in considering a development of this scale, which is unlikely to generate sufficient additional demand to justify the development of new education provision.
64. County Council officers also need to be mindful of the ability and/or willingness of developers to secure or contribute towards the mitigation of the impact of the development. With regards to developments of this scale this can mean the developer being willing to make S106 contributions towards the expansion or provision of additional capacity. Through discussions on previous planning applications it has been made clear that if developers are willing to make appropriate contributions, the County Council would be at significant risk if they opted to object to the planning application.
65. This last point is particularly relevant in consideration of the planning application submitted in this case. County Council officers recognise that there is significant concern from many people within Melbourn about the capacity of existing provision to cope with the additional demand for places created by the proposed development.
66. *Early Years*
67. Early years provision in Melbourn currently consists of the pre-school, located adjacent to the primary school and the Little Hands Nursery. Both settings operate at, or close to, capacity and have limited opportunity for further expansion within their existing accommodation.
68. With existing pressures on provision in the village the County Council is already exploring opportunities for expansion of capacity of the existing providers to ensure that the two settings can provide sufficient places to meet the existing need.
69. There would therefore, be a need, for the developer to provide mitigation, in the form of a S106 contribution to enable the Council to either promote the expansion of one of the existing settings or to develop a new setting in the village.

70. There is concern that a S106 contribution would not be sufficient, as existing premises and sites may not offer sufficient capacity for further expansion. At this stage the County Council considers that there is the opportunity to explore expansion of the pre-school provision linked to the primary school site, as part of work to increase capacity at the primary school.

71. *Primary Education*

72. Melbourn Primary School currently operates with a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 45. The school is already operating over capacity, having made over admissions in many year groups to accommodate increasing demand from within the village resulting from demographic changes and recent housing development.

73. Demographic forecasts for the village suggest that there is a need to expand the school to meet the existing demand from within the village, regardless of the potential for further housing development in the village. There is therefore, a clear need for the developer to provide appropriate mitigation to address this additional demand.

74. Although it is accepted that there are some concerns that the current school site offers limited opportunity for further expansion, the County Council believes that there is the potential for the school to be expanded by a further half a form of entry (15 places in each year group). This would allow the school to operate a two class structure across all year groups, and would create sufficient additional places to meet the existing and forecast demand which would be expected from this site and other proposed housing developments currently identified in the village.

75. In this regard, although the County Council recognises the very real concerns expressed by the Parish Council at a recent meeting to discuss the development proposals, it is confident that it is possible to mitigate the impact of the development. In doing so, it is anticipated that the County Council as well as providing additional teaching space, would be able to improve the overall educational environment at the school.

76. Currently, with no detailed scheme for the expansion of the school, the County Council can only seek contributions based on the standard formula approach used by the District Council. This is far from ideal, and could lead to the County Council needing to secure additional investment from within its own five-year capital programme. This is a consequence of the pace and timing of the scheme coming forward for development. It is recognised and accepted however, that, subject to the developer making an appropriate contribution, proportionate to the impact of the development, the County Council is not in a position to object to the development proposals as submitted.

77. *Secondary education*

78. Melbourn Village College is the local secondary school serving the village. The college currently operates with a PAN of 148. However, the school currently has significant capacity within all year groups. Notwithstanding the increasing demand for school places across the County, this is forecast to remain the case for the foreseeable future.

79. Reflecting the level of existing capacity at the Village College, the County Council does not have any concerns that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the available secondary school capacity.

80. In conclusion the County Council does have some concerns that the impact of this development may be challenging to mitigate, especially in terms of early years and primary school provision. However, the County Council has previously identified that the primary school site has the capacity to enable the expansion of the school to become a 420 place, 2 form of entry school.
81. For this reason, whilst retaining some concerns about the impact of the development, it is assumed that the developer will make an appropriate contribution to mitigate the impact of the proposed development. With a contribution towards mitigating the impact of the development proposals, there is no basis for the County Council to object to the development proposals as set out in the planning application regarding education provision.
82. Since submitting the above the County Council has now advised that the capital programme includes a programme for providing 2 permanent classrooms which will replace the existing temporary classrooms on the school site. Mitigation for the development would be to increase the capacity to a 2FE school by providing a further 4 classrooms in addition to the 2 previously mentioned. Early years mitigation could be found by relocating the current pre-school to a new building elsewhere on the school land, and thereby free up a further classroom which may be used by the primary school.
83. **Cambridgeshire Archaeology** – Archaeological evidence extends across the site and includes funerary and occupation remains of Middle Bronze Age date. Earlier evidence appeared to be confined to relict occupation soils containing Neolithic worked flints, which were preserved in the top of natural depressions in the chalk, but no 'cut features' of this date were seen in the evaluation trenches. Later evidence included a Roman trackway – part of the long-distance route of 'Ashwell Street', along with associated features that had a clear relationship to it, and are considered contemporary. 19<sup>th</sup> century land divisions and tracks were also present.
84. The Heritage Statement indicates that no extant heritage assets of national importance will be affected by this proposed development, and that no new assets of equivalent status exist on site. This statement is accepted.
85. While significant, none of the newly encountered archaeological evidence is considered to be of national importance or of sufficient local importance to prevent the scheme from going ahead. The construction impacts of the scheme could be mitigated by conducting a programme of archaeological work to conserve the interest of the archaeological deposits, features and monuments through their appropriate recording, analysis and publication.
86. There are no objections to development from proceeding in this location, but consider that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation secured through the inclusion of a phased negative condition.
87. **Cambridgeshire County Council Minerals and Waste** – comments that the submitted documentation omit any reference of the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and the linked RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD (February 2012). These both have policies and guidance which need to be reflected in the development's Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and the Waste Audit and Strategy going forward. This is particularly important for both constructional and operational phases of the development.

88. Operational Waste – although at present only the TA makes reference to the South Cambridgeshire District Council waste collection service vehicles it is important that the applicant is aware of the other requirements set out within the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD. This will take account of the need for recycling facilities and a financial contribution to the Household Recycling Centre service. This will need to be considered as part of the RECAP Tool Kit and Contributions Assessment that will need to be submitted at the Reserved Matters application stage. This requirement can also be secured by planning condition.
89. Compliance with the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide can be secured by condition and the submission of a CEMP can be required by condition.
90. **Cambridgeshire County Council Floods and Water** – comments that it is positive that the site has considered the use of source control SuDS features such as permeable paving, however there may be restrictions on the ability of the Highways Authority to adopt these types of SuDS as part of a residential roads, therefore it should be considered at the early stages whether there are any other types of SuDS that can be used in the street scene, such as the use of infiltrating rain gardens. Overall there should be more emphasis on SuDS greenways across the site to try and enhance the ecology, amenity or street scene benefits that SuDS can bring more widely. Further detailed design is required to demonstrate how exceedance flows above the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event will be dealt with across the site without increasing flood risk to adjacent areas.
91. There is a need to ensure that run off from new developments is carefully managed so that surface water flood risk is not increased in surrounding areas or water quality reduced to nearby water bodies. Also that the SuDS are adopted and provision is made for its maintenance, in perpetuity.
92. **Cambridgeshire County Council Sports, Arts and Museums** – Reference about how the new population will be accessing sports, museums and arts facilities should be provided. Developers stated that they have considered the Public Art SPD before compiling the application but there is no mention of public art being provided within the site.
93. The County Council suggests that contributions are sought towards sports, museums and arts provision to support existing facilities, e.g. the sports facilities at the Village College site could be enhanced. The amount will be compatible with SCDC standards for sport and general guidance for arts and museums.
94. Developers should be aware that there will be increased demand and that leisure/recreational/cultural facilities are important for community cohesion.
95. Consider avoid putting LEAPs in the middle of housing. It leads to older children congregating and making noise late into the night.
96. **Cambridgeshire County Council Libraries and Lifelong Learning** – Melbourn is currently served by 2 mobile library stops and a volunteer run Library Access Point. The development will be over half a mile from the Library Access point and therefore we will be asking for a contribution of £28.92 per increased head of population for a new mobile stop to serve the residents of this new development, especially the 75 residents of the care home.
97. **Environment Agency** – comments that the proposed development will only meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework if the following measures as

detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with this application are implemented and secured by way of a planning condition. These are the demonstration of how appropriate protection and maintenance of the surface water drainage scheme will be achieved, and the provision of details of long term ownership/adoption of the surface water drainage scheme.

98. Conditions should also be included to deal with any contamination not previously identified which is found, and any remediation strategy required, and securing a scheme for the provision and implementation of a scheme for pollution prevention and control of the water environment.
99. **Anglian Water** – Initially commented that the foul drainage from the development is in the catchment of Melbourn Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows. The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows.
100. Following the receipt of correspondence from Melbourn Parish Council expressing concerns about the impact of further development in Melbourn, Anglian Water has met with representative to discuss their issues.
101. Initial desktop assessment indicated the network should be able to accommodate the development site without detriment and this formed the basis for Anglian Water's initial response to this planning consultation. However, Anglian Water has commenced detailed modelling of the foul network serving Melbourn to identify the impact of further development and to confirm if mitigation is required. The modelling will not be completed until the end of June 2015. With this in mind, it recommends, if the Council are minded to grant permission that a drainage condition is applied.
102. Anglian Water has indicated that on completion of the modelling of the Melbourn foul network if the proposed new development site at land east of New Road is identified as requiring mitigation, it will work proactively with the Developer to decide the optimum way forward. Dependent on the site and the network the mitigation could be a number of options, from a pump station and rising main to drain the site to the network, to additional storage or upsizing of existing infrastructure to deal with expected flows from the number of properties being planned. In strategic terms it indicates that the process can be completed from underwriting to commissioning of any asset in 18 months, but again this is dependent on the type of works that are required.
103. **Environmental Health Scientific Officer (Contaminated Land)** – is satisfied that a condition relating to contaminated land is not required.
104. **Environmental Health Officer** – No objection in principle provided issues raised are dealt with by condition or similar in order to minimise potential adverse impacts on existing and future residents, the wider community/living environment, and to protect quality of life, amenity and health. The conditions are also necessary in delivering and facilitating a sustainable quality development, and to ensure there is proper service provision.
105. Conditions are recommended to control construction noise, vibration and dust; operational noise impact assessment and a scheme for noise insulation or other noise mitigation in respect of the proposed care home and electricity; operational odour control scheme (care home); artificial lighting scheme; operational waste and recycling/waste management strategy.

106. A Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) appears to be proposed immediately to the rear of existing residential properties in Clear Crescent. In this location there is the potential for noise and disturbance to be caused to existing premises. However, the degree of any impact cannot be fully determined until further detailed design is submitted for consideration. Further noise impact assessment may be required when detailed design proposals are submitted for approval.
107. The submitted Energy and Sustainable Design Statement states that to meet renewable energy requirements, one of the options available are Biomass Boilers, for both the housing and care home. Before it is confirmed that this is suitable in this location, an air quality impact assessment may be required to determine if such systems are acceptable in terms of local air quality impacts and effects. In addition, as the supply of fuel for such biomass boilers is likely to include HGV type vehicular deliveries, the hours when such deliveries can take place may need to be restricted to daytime to protect amenity.
108. **Housing Development Officer** – The applicant is proposing 199 dwellings plus a care home of up to 75 beds. The affordable housing contribution on this application equates to 80 dwellings, which the applicant is suggesting in this outline application to be 70% rented and 30% intermediate. This offer is currently policy compliant, and in line with the Affordable Housing SPD.
109. Within the Design and Access Statement the applicant makes reference to the proposed housing mix and that the starter homes of 1 bed apartments should fall within the affordable housing provision, but not within the market provision.
110. Policy DP/2 does reflect a housing mix of at least 40% 1 or 2 bedroom homes, and is a reflection of the entire housing market, and not just the affordable homes as suggested by the applicant. There should be 1 bed homes within the market provision.
111. The emerging Local Plan is suggesting a slightly different housing mix of at least 30% 1 and 2 bed homes, at least 30% 3 bed homes and at least 40% 4 bed homes, with 10% flexibility.
112. The affordable housing should be evenly distributed throughout the development, and good quality design and layout should allow for tenure neutrality. The affordable homes should at least meet the old HCA space standards as a minimum as affordable homes are not under-occupied.
113. There is no affordable housing provision required within the 75 bed care home, but Strategic Housing would like to better understand the model that the applicant proposes to use in the provision of this type of housing given that recently an older person housing scheme (Southwell Court) was recently shut in Melbourn, with financial reasons being cited.
114. From recent discussions with the county and health partners there would appear to be a shortage of residential care homes in the District and there was particular disappointment with the care home that closed in Melbourn.
115. **NHS Property Services** – states that capacity for Primary Care services in Melbourn is provided by the Orchard Surgery. The surgery is now at capacity and, as indicated in relation to the proposed development at Victoria Way, will need to build and extension in order to provide capacity for new residents of both sites.

116. In line with the contribution requested for Victoria Way, the NHS seeks a contribution of £638 per dwelling, indexed, equating currently to £140,360 (£13398 of which relates to the care home). It is proposed that this contribution should be made at the commencement of development as the additional capacity would be needed as soon as possible.
117. **Orchard Surgery (Melbourn)** comments that it has discussed how it could accommodate the significant increase in patient numbers that could arise from this and proposed large scale developments in the area. NHS England has already indicated that support would not be given to a new surgery development, and the Surgery has considered a possible extension to its current premises. After monitoring the daily usage, it has become increasingly evident that there appears to be insufficient car parking to accommodate any significant increase in patient numbers.
118. In addition there is concern amongst the Partners with the unstable and constantly changing economic/funding rules applied to General Practice such that they would not wish to commit financially to an extension of the surgery premises at this time. This could result in the Surgery being unable to accommodate the additional numbers of patients proposed and may eventually lead to the closure of the list to new patients in order to protect the delivery of safe and timely medical care to current patients.
119. **Environmental Health (Public Health Specialist)** – comments that the Housing Impact Assessment (HIA) has been assessed as Grade B, which meets the required standard of the HIA SPD policy.
120. Although the HIA is weak in places its main objective is to identify possible health impacts resulting from the development, and this has been undertaken and reported within the HIA. This has been assessed as Grade B as the weaknesses do not materially affect the submitted application. However, due to the nature of the development (care home) it is recommended that a condition is included in any planning consent requesting a further health impact assessment at reserved matter stage. This could be a rapid or screening HIA particularly to focus on design of the care home and its surroundings.
121. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** – requests that adequate provision is made for fire hydrants, to be secured by planning condition, or a Section 106 agreement.
122. The **Trees Officer's** comments will be reported

### **Representations**

123. 257 letters have been received from 176 households (172 in Melbourn), objecting on the following grounds:
- Adding 199 new homes in Melbourn in one go (an increase of 10% in population) will place too much strain on the infrastructure, which are already overloaded.
  - Overdevelopment of the site. NPPF states that applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Neither the current nor emerging Local Plan provide for development of this site.
  - Site is outside the village envelope.

- New housing stock is necessary, but this development will cause unacceptable harm to the village. Onus is on the Council to allocate suitable land for development. This site was previously rejected.
- Development contrary to Policies S/2, S/4 and S/9 of the Submission Local Plan.
- The site on the outskirts of the village, with only one road in and out, will result in an isolated development and harm Melbourn's sense of community.
- Traffic in Melbourn is a problem already, with vehicles using unsuitable residential roads as rat runs and traffic jams occurring regularly at the traffic lights in the centre of the village. Beechwood Avenue and Back Lane are already used as a rat run. Access onto Cambridge Road north of the village is needed. Congestion at A505/New Road at peak times. Frog End junction is dangerous. Existing speed limits are ignored.
- New Road is not capable of supporting the additional traffic. It already has traffic calming measures needed due to existing traffic volumes it carries.
- Access to site is opposite existing accesses on New Road, leading to potential for accidents and congestion.
- Already congestion in High Street, New Road, and Mortlock Street in particular. The traffic lights and outside the Primary School and Co-op are already problem areas.
- Significant flaws in the Transport Statement.
- Prejudice access to land at 36 New Road – allocated site.
- Children of the village should be able to have all their education in the village. Even at the moment pre-schools and the primary school are full. Money that will be provided by the developer will not be sufficient to provide for the new development.
- Health services should be available in the village, and at the moment the GP and NHS dentist are full. There are long waiting times for appointments.
- Melbourn is a centre for surrounding villages. There are proposals for development going in for these too. What is being done to look at the cumulative effect of all these local proposals?
- Concern about capacity of sewage and surface water drainage systems. Problems with flash flooding. There has been decrease in water pressure since the development in Victoria Way.
- The site floods.
- Not sustainable.
- Detrimental impact on landscape and wildlife. Impact of emergency access on TPO tree.
- Increase in pollution, with health impacts.
- Will the care home be run by the Council as this is what is needed.
- Care home is not needed as two in the village already, one of which has recently closed.
- Proposed old people's home will mean more heavy traffic in and out i.e. ambulances and supply lorries.
- Need for new general store to support development.
- Melbourn becoming town rather than village.
- Three storey houses are out of keeping.
- 199 houses deliberately proposed to be under 200 which would require additional amenities to be provided
- Safety risk to pedestrians, particularly children walking to school.
- Need to provide additional recreational space.



- Assumption that people will walk to Meldreth Station unrealistic, as evidenced by chaos of cars at peak time in the station car park. People would not walk to other facilities in the village, putting additional pressure on roads and parking.
- Train service is at capacity during peak hours.
- Buses are slow and unreliable.
- Biking to Cambridge not a safe option, particularly as now the Royston-Cambridge bike highway has been put on hold. Cycle routes to and from the development site are not good.
- Not well related to existing facilities.
- Existing roadside footpaths do not extend as far as the site. Those that do exist are often narrow and in a poor state of repair
- Extra policing will be required.
- The existing green edge to the village is adequate.
- Detrimental impact on residential amenity. Loss of views out of village. Impact to rear of West Barn, New Road. Noise and light pollution from the care home.
- Irreversible loss of high quality Grade 1 or 2a agricultural land.
- Brownfield land should be developed first.
- Where would the additional employment required come from?
- Impact of construction traffic.
- There has already been a lot of building work in the village over the last few years.
- Already approval for 65 houses on opposite side on New Road, with more planned.
- Impact on response time of ambulances. Impact of additional traffic on regional ambulance centre – not mentioned in the application
- Contributes nothing to the village, other than a few affordable houses.
- Precedent for further development of land to the south.
- Impact on Foxton crossing.
- Inadequate local consultation by developer.
- 86% of the village are against the proposal. The local view should be supported.

124. County Councillor Susan van de Ven has submitted comments on the application, which are attached as Appendix 3.

### **Applicants Representations**

125. A letter from the applicant's agent responding to points raised by Melbourn Parish Council is attached as Appendix 4.

### **Site and Proposal**

126. The site is located to the east of New Road, immediately to the south east of existing dwellings in Clear Crescent and Fordham Way. It comprises approximately 10.9 hectares of primarily open arable land, the southern side of which slopes upwards in gradient, away from the village.
127. The site is bounded to the north east by East Farm, to the west by New Road and the rear of the curtilage of two former barns, now in residential use, and to the south by arable land, which continues to rise more steeply away from the village.
128. On the opposite side of New Road are residential properties, including Victoria Way. Land to the rear of Victoria Way, and the land associated with 36 New Road is a proposed residential allocation in the emerging plan. Members granted consent for the

erection of 64 dwellings on the land to the rear of Victoria Way at the December 2014 meeting (Ref; S/2048/14/OL), and there is an application currently under consideration for the erection of 26 dwellings at 36 New Road (Ref; S/0287/15/OL).

129. Some planting exists along the north west boundary of the site with existing properties in Clear Crescent and Fordham Way, including 3 trees which are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). There is a hedgerow and orchard planting to the north east of the site. There is also a TPO on a Horse Chestnut tree on the site frontage in the north west corner of the site. This tree is shown as being removed.
130. The outline application, with all matters reserved part from access, proposes the erection of up to 199 dwellings, a care home of up to 75 beds, landscaping, vehicular access and formal and informal open space. An illustrative masterplan is submitted in order to demonstrate that the site can accommodate the amount of development proposed.
131. Vehicular and pedestrian access is proposed to New Road. The application states that this has been designed to be compatible with the proposed access which would serve the allocated residential development on the opposite side of New Road. In addition and pedestrian and cycle access is proposed at the northern end of the site, which will also serve as an emergency access point. A new footway is proposed along the east side of New Road from the site access to connect to the existing footway to the north west.
132. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, Planning Statement, 5-Year Housing Land Supply Report, Transport Assessment, Landscaping and Visual Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment, Heritage Statement, Flood Risk Assessment, Foul Sewage Utilities Assessment, Ecology Report, Archaeology Evaluation Report, Energy and Sustainability Statement, Heath Impact Assessment, Ground Investigation Report, and Geophysical Survey Report.

### **Planning Considerations**

133. *Housing Land Supply*
134. 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.
135. On the 25 June 2014 in two appeal decisions for sites in Waterbeach the Inspector concluded that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. 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”.

136. 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).
137. *Principle of development*
138. The site is located outside the Melbourn village framework and in the countryside where Policy DP/7 of the LDF and Policy S/7 of the Draft 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 199 dwellings, and care home of up to 75 beds, 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.
139. Melbourn is identified as a Minor Rural Centre under Policy ST/5 of the LDF and Policy S/9 of the Draft Local Plan. These are villages where there is a reasonable range of services and facilities, and residential developments of up to 30 dwellings are normally supported in policy terms. The erection of up to 199 dwellings, plus care home, 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.
140. *Deliverability*
141. The applicant has agreed that the time period allowed for submission of reserved matters can be reduced to 1 year from the date of consent. An indicative timetable has been submitted which states that reserved matters and contracts will be dealt with in year 1, with up to 50 dwellings and the care home being constructed in year 2, with 50 dwellings in each of the following years, and completion in year 5.
142. The results of the modelling being undertaken by Anglian Water are not known, and therefore the extent of new works, if any, which may be required to provide capacity for proposed development are yet to be identified. However, officers are of the view that the indication given by Anglian Water that works would normally be expected to be carried out within 18 months, means that the deliverability of the scheme should not be prejudiced.
143. Officers are of the view that the applicant has demonstrated that the site can be delivered within a timescale whereby significant weight can be given to the contribution the proposal could make to the 5 year housing land supply.
144. *Sustainability of development*
145. The NPPF states that there are 3 dimensions to sustainable development, economic, social and environmental. The aspects are considered in the assessment of highlighted issues below.

146. *Economic*

147. Paragraph 19 of the NPPF advises the Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth, and significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.
148. The proposed development would give rise to a number of economic benefits. In the short term this would include the creation of jobs in the construction industry as well as the multiplier effect in the wider economy arising from increased activity. In the long term the provision of housing would help meet the needs of businesses in Cambridge and London, where there will be a realistic travel option by train for future residents. The applicant states that the proposed care home would create at least 40 full time equivalent jobs in the care industry. For these reasons the scheme would bring positive economic benefits thus complying with this dimension of sustainable development.

149. *Social*

150. Provision of new housing including affordable dwellings:
151. Chapter 6 of the NPPF relates to 'delivering a wide choice of high quality homes and seeks to 'boost significantly the supply of housing' placing importance on widening the choice of high quality homes and ensuring sufficient housing (including affordable housing) is provided to meet the needs of present and future generations.
152. The development would provide a clear benefit in helping to meet the current shortfall in South Cambridgeshire through delivering up to 199 residential dwellings. 40% of these units will be affordable, with a 70/30 tenure split in favour of rented properties. This equates to 80 dwellings, excluding the care home. The applicant has indicated that the affordable units will be distributed throughout the development in small groups or clusters. Density is indicated at being 35 dwellings per hectare over the net developable area.
153. The applicant indicates that the mix of market housing will be in accord with Policy H/8 of the emerging Local Plan. The affordable housing can be secured through a Section 106 Agreement. Officers are of the view the provision of up to 199 houses is a benefit and significant weight should be attributed this in the decision making process.
154. The applicant has provided a letter from a group interested in providing the care home element of the scheme.
155. Open Space:
156. Areas of formal and informal public open space are shown on the indicative layout plan. These include an informal linear green space of approximately 1.8ha, which will define the south east boundary of the site, and will create a soft green edge to the village, and approximately 0.6ha of formal play space, with a central open space surrounded by dwellings. The extent of proposed open space exceeds the guidelines set out in the adopted SPD (Open space in new developments) and will provide for the needs of future residents, although the wider social benefits are more limited.

157. The details of the type and specification of the open space areas is to be agreed at reserved matters stage, with the long term management of this land, along with appropriate off-site and maintenance contributions, secured through the S106.
158. Services and Facilities:
159. Paragraph 55 of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas advising 'housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities'.
160. As a Minor Rural Centre, Melbourn is a village where there is a reasonable range of services and facilities. These include a Village College (1.6km), Primary School (0.75km), Church (0.9km), a range of shops, a number of public houses, doctor's surgery (0.6km), dentist, with a railway station in Meldreth (1.7km). Distances are approximate and taken from the centre of the site.
161. The nearest bus stop is located on the High Street, which is some 900m from the centre of the application site, and is outside the easy walking distance of 800m.
162. The development overall is considered to be located within an acceptable distance of local services such as to not dissuade residents from looking at alternative means of transport other than the private car.
163. Both the NHS and Orchard Surgery have confirmed that there is currently no capacity at the surgery to cater for the new development, and that the premises will need to be extended so that it can accommodate the additional patients that will be generated by this and the development site to the west of New Road. Whilst it may be physically possible to extend the building, additional car parking cannot be achieved on the site. The applicant initially entered into discussions with NHS Property Services about provision of a new surgery building on the site, however this was not supported by NHS.
164. At the current time a specific scheme for extension of the premises has not been identified, and therefore the NHS has requested a contribution on the basis of a sum per person, in line with that sought for the recently consent development on land off Victoria Way. This will be secured through the Section 106 Agreement. The Highway Authority is seeking a cyclepath from the development site along New Road to the Orchard surgery, which will improve connectivity.
165. The County Council has identified the need for funding for a total of 4 additional classrooms (2 of which are already committed) at Melbourn Primary School, with there being sufficient capacity on site to deliver these. There is also a need for additional early years provision. The funding will be secured through the S106. Sufficient capacity exists at Melbourn Village College to accommodate the increased number of pupils. It is hoped that early years provision can also be secured at the Primary School site, with community access being secured.
166. Transport:
167. There has been considerable local concern from both Melbourn Parish Council and residents regarding the potential highway implications of a development of this scale. These concerns relate to the new access and traffic on New Road, but extend further afield and include the impact on the New Road/Orchard Road junction, the junction of New Road/A505, the junction of Cambridge Road/A10.

168. The County Council has considered the Transport Assessment submitted with the application, and initially required to the applicant to undertake significant additional work, as highlighted in paragraph 23 above.
169. Following consideration of this additional information it has raised no objection, subject to the applicant either providing, or contributing towards either new highway works or improvements to existing highway infrastructure.
170. At the proposed entrance to the site a raised table junction will be created, and existing traffic calming features removed. A new footpath link will be provided along the east side of New Road from the site entrance to link to the existing footpath further north on New Road. The applicant is also being asked to provide a footpath/cycleway along New Road, as far as the entrance to the Doctor's Surgery. The Highway Authority is confident that this can be provided within the existing public highway, although there may be some sections where a full 2m width is not achievable. These works should be secured by a Grampian style condition. There is not space within the public highway to provide a cycleway to the High Street junction.
171. Speed humps along New Road are to be replaced with cycle friendly speed cushions. A new car club is to be set up to serve new and existing residents. A new community transport vehicle is sought to cater for the needs of the development. These will be secured at the expense of the applicant.
172. The nearest bus stops to the site are on High Street, near Vicarage Close. It has not been possible to secure new bus stops closer to the site, however the Highway Authority is seeking to secure improvements to existing stops through the provision of shelters and a RTPI system. These works can be secured through the Section 106 Agreement at the expense of the applicant.
173. The Highway Authority has identified that the traffic light junction between New Road, High Street and Station Road, is likely to be at capacity by 2020, but that the introduction of a more flexible mode of control, such as a MOVA, if correctly set up, will provide some additional capacity, and is considered to be a suitable mitigation for this development on this occasion. These works can be secured through the S106 at the expense of the applicant.
174. The Highway Authority is also seeking a contribution from the applicant towards improvements to the Cambridge Road/A10, with the amount being based upon percentage increase in traffic at this junction likely to be generated by the development.
175. New cycle stands are to be provided in Melbourn village and near to the train station in Meldreth, and a contribution is sought for improvements towards improving footpath No.9 between Station Road and Meldreth Station, with the overall scheme costing £81,600. A contribution, proportionate to the new development, is also being sought towards the Cambridge Road cycle improvements scheme, and the Royston A10 cycle scheme.
176. Travel plans for the development can be secured through condition, and should relate to both the residential and care home elements.
177. *Environmental*
178. Landscape:

179. The proposal represents a large scale development beyond the existing south east edge of the village, and the site is prominently viewed when approaching the village along New Road from the higher land to the south. The application documentation recognises that the development will have an impact on the visual character of this part of the village. However, the site will represent an extension of an area of relatively modern development at the edge of the village and provides an opportunity to secure an increased landscape buffer.
180. The illustrative masterplan shows a significant area of planting proposed along the south east boundary of the site. The Landscapes Officer has assessed the application and concluded that there are no objections on landscape grounds, subject to the landscape buffer being secured. The conditions suggested in paragraph 32 can be included in any consent.
181. Ecology:
182. The Ecology Officer has considered the report submitted with the application and has raised no objection. The proposed landscape buffer officer's potential for significant ecological enhancement. Many of the points raised by the Ecology Officer can be dealt with during detailed discussions prior to the reserved matters submission, with the ecological enhancements being secured by conditions attached to the outline consent.
183. Trees:
184. The main area of the site does not contain existing trees, however there are a number along the north east boundary, including 3 Horse Chestnuts which are covered by a TPO. The application documentation proposes felling of the Horse Chestnut tree of the New Road frontage, as a result of the proposed emergency access to the development. The arboricultural report submitted with the application states that there is Bacterial Bleeding Canker throughout the stem, and needs to be felled. The health of the tree is contested by the Parish Council, with the tree being of significant local value. The comments of the Trees Officer will be reported, but the loss of this tree should be prevented unless proven essential due to the issues identified in the arboricultural report.
185. Heritage Assets:
186. The proposed development does not have a direct impact on the Conservation Area, There are no listed buildings close to the site.
187. Cambridgeshire Archaeology comments that the Heritage Statement indicates that no extant heritage assets of national importance will be affected by this proposed development, and that no new assets of equivalent status exist on site. This statement is accepted. It has no objections to development proceeding in this location, but considers that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation secured through the inclusion of a phased negative condition. This condition can be included in any consent.
188. Residential Amenity:
189. The construction phase of a development of this scale will have an impact on residential amenity. However this impact can be mitigated by the inclusion of conditions requiring submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan, and restrictions on hours of deliveries and operation of power driven machinery.

190. Officers are confident that the impact of the residential element of the development, in terms of overlooking, loss of light and overbearing impact on existing properties, can be mitigated by appropriate layout and design at the reserved matters stage.
191. Officer share the concerns about the location of the proposed care home element of the scheme, and this will require further consideration at the reserved matters stage to ensure that the proposed building, car parking areas and associated lighting do not result in a loss of amenity to existing adjacent properties in New Road.
192. Notwithstanding the above the development of this site will inevitably impact on existing residential amenity as the site is currently open agricultural land.
193. Design and Layout:
194. The application is in outline and there detailed design and layout are not for consideration at this stage. The Urban Design Officer and Design Enabling Panel were of the view that further improvements could be made to what was already a well presented scheme. These matters can be considered further prior to the submission of a reserved matters application.
195. Officers are of the view that the illustrative scheme demonstrates that the site can physically accommodate the scale of development proposed.
196. Surface Water Drainage:
197. The site lies in Flood Zone 1. The Environment Agency has not raised an objection and is of the view that surface water drainage from the site will not be an issue, subject to suitable conditions being included in any consent.
198. The local concerns relating to surface water drainage are noted, however proposed discharge rates for surface water drainage will be required to be the same as the existing rates of greenfield runoff, and a SuDS scheme will be required. The application indicates that the development will utilise on site infiltration and storage methods to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.
199. Foul Water Drainage:
200. There have been concerns expressed about existing drainage problems in the village, albeit on the north east side. However, it is important to ensure that this development does not exacerbate existing problems. The results of the modelling of the existing system and Melbourn works will identify if any mitigation is required as a result of these works. Anglian Water has recognised that it is required to carry out any mitigation works required, and officers are of the view that these should be able to be secured within a timescale which will not prejudice deliverability of the scheme. However, as the extent of any works required are not yet known, any consent would be delegated, and the matter brought back to Members for further consideration if as a result of the findings the deliverability of the scheme was materially compromised.
201. A foul water drainage scheme can be secured through a Grampian style condition.
202. Energy Efficiency:
203. The application is accompanied by an Energy and Sustainability Statement which indicates demonstrates that the proposed development will provide 20% of its required



energy from renewable sources, thereby exceeding the 10% development plan requirements. The report identifies options such as PV panels, solar thermal panels, a biomass boiler to serve the care home, and passive heating through building orientation. A scheme can be secured by condition.

### **Contributions**

204. The CIL Regulation 122 states that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:

- (i) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (ii) Directly related to the development; and
- (iii) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

205. Under Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended in 2014); after 6th April 2015 a planning obligation may not constitute a reason for granting planning permission if since 6th April 2010 five or more separate planning obligations, that provide for the funding or provision of that project or type of infrastructure, have been entered into. Officers can confirm that there have not been more than 5 planning obligations for the village of Melbourn since 6th April 2010.

206. The Section 106 Agreement is currently being discussed with the applicant but should include the following:

Building of new classrooms and the provision of Early Years facilities at Melbourn Primary School, with the sums to be secured being £826,229.55 (£11,719 per pupil) and £417,900.

Healthcare contribution at £140,360

Sports space at £200,000 – a deficit in sports space has been identified for projects in the village.

Indoor community space at £100,000 – a deficit has been highlighted in Melbourn, notwithstanding the provision of new hub. This is identified for use as part of the primary school project where community access for groups would be secured

Libraries and Lifelong Learning at £13,812.19

Household waste receptacles at £13,830.50

Highway infrastructure contributions including Cambridge Road cycleway improvements £17,850, Royston A10 cycle scheme £5,640, new community transport vehicle £45,000, Cambridge Road/A10 junction safety scheme £21,120.

Figures for the bus stop improvements are to be agreed once details of the scheme are agreed. The level of contribution to the improvements to footpath No.9 are to be agreed.

207. Matters such as the footpath, cycleway provision and speed measures in New Road, and improvements to the traffic signal junction will be secured by condition.

208. Having regard to the development plan and the NPPF Officers are of the view that these obligations are all considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and without this level of contribution would not be confident that the development could be considered sustainable. All contributions have been scrutinised and are considered the result as a direct consequence of the development and proportionate to the development.

### **Conclusion**

209. In determining planning applications for new housing development where the

Council does not have an up-to-date 5 year housing land supply, the balancing exercise is weighted in favour of granting permission, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole.

210. Paragraphs 6-9 of the NPPF indicate that 'sustainability' should not be interpreted narrowly and that the three dimensions (economic, environmental, social) of sustainability should be sought jointly and simultaneously. Officers are of the view the proposal would have a clear direct and indirect economic benefit, and offers the opportunity for social benefits arising through the delivery of new homes, including affordable houses, which contribute to the Council's shortfall at a mix and tenure in conformance with the development plan, along with expanding the school, surgery and helping to maintain other services and facilities in the village.
211. A development of this size on the edge of the village will have some environmental impact, such as visual intrusion into the countryside, and increased traffic movements through the village. It is recognised that Members are faced with a difficult balancing exercise. Planning law requires applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Officers are of the view, that on balance, the harm arising from the scheme does not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme which will deliver up to 199 dwellings, including 40% affordable, and 75 bed care home, along with associated jobs, and as such there are material considerations which justify approval. For the above reasons the application is recommended for delegated approval subject to completion of a S106 Agreement

### **Recommendation**

212. Delegated approval, subject to the further comments of Anglian Water and to conditions and completion of a Section 106 Agreement. Member will be updated on the list of conditions prior to the committee meeting.

### **Background Papers**

Where the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 require documents to be open to inspection by members of the public, they must be available for inspection: -

- (a) at all reasonable hours at the offices of South Cambridgeshire District Council;
- (b) on the Council's website; and
- (c) in the case of documents to be available for inspection pursuant to regulation 15, on payment of a reasonable fee required by the Council by the person seeking to inspect the documents at the offices of South Cambridgeshire District Council.

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- 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/2791/14/OL

**Report Author:** Paul Sexton – Principal Planning Officer  
Telephone: (01954) 713255

