

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

4 November 2015

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

Application Number: S/1338/15/OL

Parish: Gamlingay

Proposal: Outline application for the redevelopment of up to 29 dwellings, including open space with access applied for in detail

Site address: Land south of West Road, Gamlingay

Applicant(s): Mr Tim Holmes (of Endurance Estates Strategic Land Ltd)

Recommendation: Delegated Approval subject to the completion of a section 106 agreement regrading infrastructure contributions, affordable housing and ecological enhancement, management and monitoring.

Key material considerations: Principle of development, housing mix, local character, heritage impact, travel and access, services and facilities, ecology, noise and other environmental impacts, residential amenity and S106 contributions.

Committee Site Visit: 3 November 2015

Departure Application: No

Presenting Officer: Andrew Winter, Senior Planning Officer

Application brought to Committee because: The recommendation of officers conflicts with that of the Parish Council.

Date by which decision due: 6 November 2015

Relevant Planning History

1. No relevant history

Planning Policies

2. *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012*
National Planning Practice Guidance
3. *South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, adopted*

January 2007

ST/5 Minor Rural Centres

4. *South Cambridgeshire LDF Development Control Policies, adopted July 2007*

DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/4 Infrastructure in New Developments
DP/7 Development Frameworks
C/2 Archaeological Sites
CH/4 Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building
CH/5 Conservation Areas
HG/1 Housing Density
HG/2 Housing Mix
HG/3 Affordable Housing
NE/1 Energy Efficiency
NE/3 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development
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/16 Emissions
SF/6 Public Art and New Development
SF/10 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space and New Developments SF/11 Open Space Standards
TR/1 Planning for More Sustainable Travel
TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards
TR/3 Mitigating Travel Impact
TR/4 Travel by Non-Motorised Modes

5. *South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)*

District Design Guide SPD – Adopted 2010
Public Art SPD- Adopted 2009
Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD – Adopted 2009
Health Impact Assessment SPD – Adopted March 2011
Affordable Housing SPD – Adopted March 2010
Open Space in new Developments SPD – Adopted 2009
Listed Buildings SPD – Adopted July 2009
Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009
Landscape and new development SPD – Adopted March 2010
Biodiversity SPD – Adopted July 2009

6 *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 adoption 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
 HG/1 Design principles
 HG/2 Public art in new development
 NH/2 Protecting and enhancing landscape character
 NH/4 Biodiversity
 NH/6 Green infrastructure
 NH/11 Protected Village Amenity Areas
 NH/14 Heritage assets
 H/7 Housing density
 H/8 Housing mix
 H/9 Affordable housing
 SC/8 Open space standards
 SC/11 Noise pollution
 SC/13 Air quality
 T/I Parking provision

Consultation

7. **Gamlingay Parish Council** – Recommends refusal for the following reasons:
8. “a) Planning Policy – Site is outside the current village boundary in the existing local plan. It was rejected for possible development at a preliminary assessment stage for the new local plan (currently suspended) in favour of other sites in the village for housing. District Councillors advised that the existing local plan and policies are the relevant documents to be used to assess applications.
9. b) Visual impact – Many of the 19 objections from local people received by the parish council have raised this as an objection. The appearance of the proposed development on entering the village from the South is very dominant and urban and has a negative impact on the conservation area. The heritage assessment seems misguided – a proposal to build 2.5 storey houses close to the road frontage on Mill St, although only indicative, would create an overbearing dominance in this area and change the profile of the village approach completely. Most of the properties in this area are bungalows or low profile houses.
10. c) Privacy and overbearing – The bungalows previously mentioned will be severely impacted in terms of privacy and overbearing because of the height of the proposed adjacent properties, which will overlook their properties and gardens and the new footpath which will run close to their boundary.
11. d) Noise and Smell – The construction itself will cause impact on existing properties in West Rd and Wooton Field and the addition of 29 households will cause ongoing issues with traffic noise and pollution.
12. e) Access/Traffic – Many objectors had grave concerns that 29 additional properties

would cause severe problems in the area. The village is poorly served with public transport therefore most new residents will need private transport to get about.

13. There are already 10 additional houses currently being built at 22A West Road which may not have been accounted for in the traffic surveys recently done. West Road is a small residential road leading to Wooton Field – an affordable housing site which is a cul de sac and which houses a large number of families with small children. This application proposes access to the 29 properties through this cul de sac which will of course experience a severe increase in traffic movements. At the end of West Road is a small country lane – known as Cow Lane – which is single width access with a blind bend. This will undoubtedly be used more if this proposal goes ahead and is totally unsuitable to cope with any increase in traffic movements.
14. f) Health and safety – Concerns about road safety – children in the Wooton Field cul de sac are accustomed to playing safely in the street, this proposal will take this away.
15. g) Crime and fear of crime – The overbearing nature of parts of the proposed development and the proximity of the connecting footpath to boundary fences raises concerns about security of property and potential crime/fear of crime.
16. h) Economic impact – The mix of houses indicated in the supporting documents seems unsuitable to the needs of the local community to expand and be sustainable. Young families should be encouraged to stay in the village, the majority of the proposed properties appear to be large and therefore potentially unaffordable.
17. i) Ecology/trees and hedges – The proposed ecology area is outside the site boundary. Gamlingay is already well supplied with ecology areas – recently the Millbrook Meadows has been developed for this purpose and it provides a valuable asset for the whole community. The additional ongoing maintenance requirements on the proposed ecology area could become a drain on parish resources but would have little community benefit. There is a 300 year old hedge at 2.5m above ground level on Mill St which is proposed for removal. It is understood that this was the recommendation of the SCDC design enabling panel but this would not be the wish of the local community.
18. j) Cumulative impact and community benefits – the proposal allows for access on to adjacent farmland which has caused concern about possible future development. There are no details in the application about community benefits. The parish council cannot assess the sustainability of the proposal in the absence of detail of what the scheme will deliver to the community.
19. Other issues were also raised as follows;
 - k) The parish council does not consider that an outline application is an appropriate process in order for it to be able to determine if this is a sustainable development for its parish. There are no proposed designs for the houses, there is no firm mix of the size of the houses, and there is only an indicative site layout that has already raised many concerns. We cannot consider a site as a sustainable development if it does not come with evidence of the local need for more housing, if it does not come with any commitment to a good overall design that would be able to make a positive benefit to the locality community and it does not come with any package of community benefits to mitigate the development impacts.
20. l) A public meeting was held at which the developer indicated that they could address some of the concerns raised, but despite being requested to do so, nothing has been

submitted in writing to be considered with this application. The parish council considers that there has been poor engagement by the developer with itself and the local community. It appears that too much reliance has been placed on the advice of experts at SCDC – the design enabling panel for example. This has led to some misguided decisions which have caused concern locally – such as the 2.5 storey houses fronting Mill St and the removal of the ancient hedge. Local consultation and site visits would have been a better approach.

21. m) Gamlingay has been very closely engaged in the local plan process and has been proactive in identifying suitable sites for new housing. It has accepted that housing growth will take place and has already accepted suitable sites – such as the Green End site. Other sites have also very recently been developed – the large development at Station Road, and the smaller developments at Merton Barns, Stubbs Oak and West Road. The cumulative impact of more development, such as outlined in this proposal, has not been accounted for – the impact on local infrastructure, schools and healthcare has not been taken into account. Gamlingay Parish Council that it carefully assesses the cumulative impact of all proposed development and is determined to ensure that development is sustainable.”
22. **Local Highway Authority (LHA)** – Requests a plan showing 2.4m x 70m visibility splays at the junction of Mill Street and West Road. The LHA can confirm that it will not be adopting any part of the development in its present format. The developer will need to confirm their understanding of this point and that the development’s road will be privately owned/operated. Following provision of the above, the LHA is satisfied that the proposal will have no significant adverse effect upon the public highway subject to conditions governing: falls and levels of driveways (to prevent run-off); bound material next to access with public highway; a traffic management plan to be agreed; the provision of a footway/cycleway link of 3.5m in width to the village of Gamlingay from the development and uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points on Mill Street.
23. **Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology** – Raises no objection in principle but considered that a condition should be added requiring a programme of archaeological investigation to be secured prior to the commencement of development.
24. **Historic England** – The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.
25. **Gamlingay Surgery** - “There are several developments in Potton and Gamlingay which will have a major impact on the provision of primary medical services. In Potton 240 new buildings are being erected and a possible new traveller site of unknown size is proposed. In Gamlingay 231 new dwellings are being developed, many have already been finished. We understand that this figure includes the redevelopment of the Greenend Site with a request for 90 dwellings and the West Road Site with 29 new dwellings. With an estimated occupancy of 2.6 per dwelling the rise in practice population is at least 1225.
26. Workload in General Practice has been rising strongly over the past years and will continue to do so. Our current waiting time for routine appointments is 2 weeks, a situation that is extremely unsatisfactory for our patients and ourselves alike, let alone potentially dangerous. We will have to provide an additional 7488 consultations a year in order to stand still, this is the equivalent of a whole new full time GP partner.
27. As a starting point we are already above the Bedfordshire average ratio for number

of patients registered per GP whole time equivalent, with the additional patients as a results of the new developments we will be well above average as demonstrated in the following figures:

The current Bedfordshire average GP to Patient ratio = 1732

Our current Practice average GP to Patient ratio = 1945

Our practice average GP to Patient ratio with the proposed new developments = 2149

28. We receive continuous feedback and enquires from our patients who are very concerned about our already stretched waiting times and they are also very concerned about the increase in the local population and the impact this will have in the future. Practices who found themselves in a similar situation where forced to closed their lists. We have made an application to access funds for the development of Greensands Medical Practice through the only currently existing process, the Prime Minister's Challenge Fund, but our bid was rejected.
29. Our practice in its current state has no means to either take on or accommodate a new partner, be it whole or full time. We have 3 consulting rooms for three GP partners, one nurse treatment room, one phlebotomy/midwifery room, one waiting room, one reception room, 2 admin rooms and one kitchen/meeting room in Gamlingay. The Potton premises is landlocked and cannot be extended. In order to accommodate additional staff and to be able to attract any potential newcomers we need to make alterations to the building and look at extending the current building. In no way will we be able to cater for an increase in population and consultations with our current facilities.
30. The plans for an extension to the surgery are for 1 consulting room and 1 multi purpose room with an estimated project cost of £152,500. With the £66,000 already applied for we would be looking additional funding of £86,500. We would therefore propose a figure of £727 per new dwelling.
31. We have been granted section 106 contributions from an existing development in Station Rd, Gamlingay which will help to work towards this goal, but a substantial contribution by the developers of the proposed new housing will be required to contribute to this end."
32. **Landscape Officer** – "At national level the site is situated within the national character area of 90 Bedfordshire Greensand Ridge as assessed by Natural England. At Regional Level the Landscape Character Area of the site has been assessed as Wooded Village Farmlands by Landscape East and supported by Natural England. Landscape Characteristics of the site and the immediate surrounding area include:
 - Gentle rolling and elevated arable landscape
 - Open landscape with extensive panoramic views
 - Mixed field and roadside boundaries range from mature shelterbelts to gappy, short flailed boundaries to intact evergreen hedgerows.
 - Varied field patterns
33. I agree with the findings made by Bidwells that the sensitivity of potential landscape receptors to change in and around the site are medium – very high. Areas which are particularly effected by change include the following:
 - Listed building to the east of the site on Mill Road
 - Conservation area which abutts the site boundary
 - Regional landscape character – removal of existing village edge and small

pastoral field

34. I agree with the applicant the landscape impact is the application itself. It is the change of a pastoral field to residential development. The visual impact would be severe - major in the immediate locality of the application due to viewers with proprietary interest and prolonged viewing opportunities. Whilst the surrounding views would be moderate – minor due to the landform or obscured views.
35. The applicant has indicated a number of mitigation and enhancement measures which are welcomed. These include the following:
- The creation of a buffer strip to the southern boundary. This will reduce the effect of the development, filter views and enhance the external views of the village.
 - Developing and improving access to the site and areas of interest.
 - Developing a new green infrastructure and ecological area within the settlement
 - Reinstating and restoring the existing hedgerow acting as a green corridor for wildlife as well as providing new habitats
 - Respect the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area and Listed buildings
36. In principle, I have no objection with the proposed residential development of up to 29 dwellings, including open space with access upon the site. With careful landscape mitigation and enhancement measures the landscape and visual effect would be reduced.
37. Planning Conditions are recommend for the following:
- Full details of both hard and soft landscape works.
- Soft landscape works to include details of proposed trees, shrubs, turf and seeding works, including details of species, size, number and density with specification of planting.
 - Scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage
 - A scheme of no-dig construction within the Root Protection Area
 - Boundary treatments to dwellings
 - External lighting scheme
 - Evidence of vehicle tracking particularly at turning heads
 - Hard landscape works to include details of proposed kerbs, paving materials, edging and street furniture, including details of size, number, finished colour with specification.
 - 5 year maintenance and management landscape scheme for the ecological area
 - Provision for waste/recycling bins - location, design, and access to be considered
 - Provision of cycle storage - location, design, and access to be considered
 - Provision of bat brick/boxes and nest boxes
 - Provision of log piles, hedgehog and insect houses
 - Provision of swale pond
 - Details of the
 - contractors' access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel;
 - contractors' site storage area(s) and compounds(s);
 - parking for contractors' vehicles and contactors' personnel vehicles
 - Details and measures to be made to protect existing trees and their roots during works and trafficking to and from the site."

38. **Urban Design Officer** – “Though the design has been improved since the initial layouts were shared, there are still some concerns with this application, most of which have been voiced previously, but appear not to have been addressed in the final submission.
39. The overall density appears acceptable, though it is at the upper limit. The inclusion of the pedestrian link to Mill Street is welcomed, and needs to be retained. The houses adjacent to the link need to address the route to ensure there is natural surveillance.
40. The appropriateness/impact of this development is much harder to assess as an outline application. In particular I have concern with the siting/scale/massing/design of the units facing onto Mill Street, their impact on the setting of the listed buildings and conservation area, and appropriateness as a new gateway to the village from the south. There is no comfort/guarantee in this application that these units will be acceptable, and it would have been better if at least these units were included in a hybrid application as a full plans submission. The ridge height of these properties should not be higher/dominate the Listed Buildings opposite. The relationship between these opposing buildings needs to be carefully considered to ensure any new development in this location is appropriate and a positive contribution to the character of Gamlingay.
42. The road layout is not appropriate, the sharp 90degree bends will make for an awkward movement pattern, and there appears to be a lot of road/hard surfacing for a development of this size. The roads layout should be softened, and turning heads for larger vehicles such as refuse vehicles considered.
43. Units 24/25 and 19/20 do not back onto the backs of other properties, and instead are surrounded (on three sides in the case of units 7 and 12) by roads and this should be designed out and is largely the result of the cranked road layout.
44. The park is centrally located which is positive, but some houses back on to it, and it is surrounded by hard surfacing and roads on three sides which isolates it, rather than integrating it well as it should be. The visitor parking should be relocated so that it does not encroach into the pedestrian space.
45. The garden sizes for units 1-3 do not appear large enough to meet SCDC standards.
46. Though roofs and properties should be orientated south where possible, a varied roof line should be presented, especially along the southern boundary so that the village edge does not appear regimented and repetitive. Hipped roofs are not appropriate for Gamlingay.
47. Although indicative it is disappointing the layout has not been further refined to show a more acceptable design to make a more robust case for this number of units on this site, as it stands it is not entirely convincing.”
48. **Historic Buildings** – “The site runs adjacent to the conservation area and Mill Street is an important gateway to the village and conservation area. There are a few listed buildings on the east side of Mill Street that add to the important character of the conservation area.
49. The large proportion of the site will not be visible within the conservation area or within the setting of the listed buildings, with the exception of plots 15 and 16.

50. Discussions leading up to this application encouraged the layout of 15 and 16 to either be set back or front Mill Street. From the layout submitted, it appears that the scheme hopes to follow the principle of fronting Mill Street. Although there appears to be landscaping between the plots and Mill Street. With this approach, it will be important to see elevations on how this will be viewed in street scene. Without elevations of these plots, impacts to the conservation and listed building cannot be assessed. Therefore the application cannot be supported. I recommend that a full application is submitted, in particular to these two plots. These plots should not have a ridge height greater than those dwellings along Mill Street.”
51. **Cambridge County Council Flood and Water Management Team** – The surface water drainage scheme is considered acceptable in principle. A condition is recommended to secure a detailed surface water drainage scheme prior to the commencement of the development.
52. **Environment Agency** – No objection, subject to conditions governing: groundwater and contamination issues; no infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority; piling foundations; and a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control of the water environment.
53. **Acting Environmental Health Manager** – “We have no objection in principle to this application providing the environmental health issues/health determinants detailed below are effectively controlled 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. They are also necessary in delivering and facilitating a sustainable quality development and to ensure there is adequate service provision.”

Construction noise, vibration and dust conditions:

54. (a) No construction work and or construction related dispatches from or deliveries to the site shall take place, other than between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 on Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 hours on Saturdays unless agreed in writing with the local planning authority. No construction works or collection / deliveries shall take place on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
55. (b) No development shall commence until a construction noise impact assessment and a report / method statement detailing predicted construction noise and vibration levels at noise sensitive premises and consideration of mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from construction noise and or vibration has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Potential construction noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS5228:2009+A1:2014: ‘Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Part 1: Noise and Part 2: Vibration. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
56. (c) No development shall commence until a dust management plan / programme to include details of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust (including the consideration of wheel washing and dust suppression provisions) from the site during the construction period or relevant phase of development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved dust management

plan / programme unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Artificial lighting recommended condition:

57. (d) Prior to the commencement of the development an artificial lighting scheme, to include details of any external lighting of the site such as street lighting, floodlighting, security / residential lighting and an assessment of impact on any sensitive residential premises on and off site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include layout plans / elevations with luminaire locations annotated, full isolux contour map / diagrams showing the predicted illuminance in the horizontal and vertical plane (in lux) at critical locations within the site and on the boundary of the site and at future adjacent properties, including consideration of Glare (direct source luminance / luminous intensity in the direction and height of any sensitive residential receiver) as appropriate, hours and frequency of use, a schedule of equipment in the lighting design (luminaire type / profiles, mounting height, aiming angles / orientation, angle of glare, operational controls) and shall assess artificial light impact in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professionals "Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011" including resultant sky glow, light intrusion / trespass, source glare / luminaire intensity and building luminance. The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Waste recommended condition:

58. (e) Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, any reserved matters application pursuant to this outline approval shall be accompanied by a Waste Management & Minimisation Strategy (WMMS), including the completed RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit and supporting reference material, addressing the management of municipal waste generation during the occupation stage of the development. No development shall take place until the strategy has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter.
59. The Waste Management & Minimisation Strategy (WMMS) must demonstrate how waste will be managed in accordance with the requirements of the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (or as superseded) and the principles of the waste hierarchy, thereby maximising waste prevention, re-use and recycling from domestic households and contributing to sustainable development. The WMMS should include as a minimum:
- A completed RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit and supporting reference material
 - A detailed Waste Audit to include anticipated waste type, source, volume, weight etc. of municipal waste generation during the occupation stage of the development
 - Proposals for the management of municipal waste generated during the occupation stage of the development, to include the design and provision of permanent facilities
e.g. internal and external segregation and storage of recyclables, non-recyclables and compostable materials; access to storage and collection points by users and waste collection vehicles
 - Highway vehicle tracking assessment and street widths / dimensions
 - Arrangements for the provision, on-site storage, delivery and installation of

- waste containers prior to occupation of any dwelling
- Arrangements for the efficient and effective integration of proposals into waste and recycling collection services provided by the Waste Collection Authority
- A timetable for implementing all proposals
- Provision for monitoring the implementation of all proposals

60. A Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) / Children's Play Public Open Space appears to be proposed in the middle of the development site. In this location there is the potential for noise and disturbance to be caused to proposed residential premises. However the degree of any impact cannot be fully determined until further detailed design including the activities proposed, is submitted for consideration.

Cambridge County Council (CCC) Education and Waste –

61. a) Early Years - No contributions are required towards early years need as there is sufficient capacity in the area in the next 5 years to accommodate the places being generated by this development.
62. b) Primary School - The development would generate a net increase of 7.25 children aged 4 to 8 years old. Currently there is insufficient capacity at Gamlingay First School to accommodate this extra demand. Therefore, financial contributions are sought from this development towards primary education facilities and specifically a new classroom, as part of Phase 1 of CCC's County's Milestone 2 project. Cost estimates for the classroom are still to be produced.
63. c) Secondary School - The development would generate a net increase of 7.25 children aged 9 to 13. There is sufficient capacity at Gamlingay Village College to meet the needs of the development over the next five years. Therefore no contribution is sought on this basis.
64. d) Libraries and Lifelong – There is a statutory library provision service in Gamlingay delivered through two mobile library stops. The development would result in an increase in population of 69.6 residents. The demand placed on this existing service requires a contribution of £4.08 per head of increase of population. This amounts to a total contribution of £283.97.
65. e) Strategic Waste – The application falls within the St Neots HRC catchment area for which there is insufficient capacity to meet the demands of the proposed development. New dwellings in this are required to contribute £181 per dwelling, which totals £5,249.00 in this application.
66. f) Monitoring Fees – S106 Monitoring fees of £650 are sought in this application. This is calculated on the basis of hourly officer rates of £50 to monitor various triggers within the S106 agreement.
67. **Central Bedfordshire Council** – Stratton Upper School is to be expanded by 3 forms of entry from September 2016. The need for expansion is being driven by housing development within Biggleswade and elsewhere in the catchment area for the school. A development of 29 dwellings would be expected to create around 5 upper school pupils, and should contribute to the project at Stratton Upper. No contributions are sought from the 1-bed units; contributions of £1421.72 are sought from 2-bed flats and £2843.44 from 2+bed dwellings.
68. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** – Recommends adequate provision be made for fire hydrants via planning condition or S106 agreement

69. **Ecology** - “The application is supported by an ecological assessment which does not identify any significant biodiversity constraints to development at this site without the provision of appropriate mitigation and advance compensatory habitat creation. The site has been visited and it is agreed that the grassland meadow habitat does not represent an important botanical site.
70. The site is bounded on 2 of its sides by relatively low value hedges. One of the hedges contains a number of dead and dying elms, the other appeared to be dominated by hawthorn but that hedge is to be integrated into a buffer planting screen which is acceptable.
71. At the western end of the site two medium sized oak trees appear to be relatively close to house/gardens/roads, we must seek the view of the tree officer that this is acceptable otherwise the number of dwellings may need to be reduced if these trees are being compromised.
72. The ecology report states that reptiles are present on the site and states that a scheme of mitigation will be finalised that would involve their capture and collection, and then be released in a prepared area of new habitat designed to provide for all of their life stages. That is one of the reasons why a relatively large parcel of land has been allocated for ecological gain. That approach is acceptable.
73. Nesting birds in the hedgerows are of at least local value given that nesting bullfinch was confirmed. However, this application will not result in a net loss of hedgerow habitat. Again, that is one of the reasons why the area for ecological gain contains some areas of dense scrub planting.
74. I welcome the proposed area of ecological gain, but its final design should be subject to further scrutiny. It will provide the chance to design in more than might be found in the field alone at present (such as meadows and orchards).
75. A condition must be used to secure habitat creation in advance of any site demolition, archaeological investigation, ground works or infrastructure works – otherwise the reptiles are a threat and an offence may be committed.
76. The new habitats are to be monitored and managed in the future, so a plan will need to be produced to tie that all together. This must be secured by condition and be linked to the S106 agreement so that it is in place for the duration of the development.
77. Pond restoration is also proposed and that is welcomed. Measures are also to be proposed to deliver ecological gain to the house in the form of specialist nesting boxes for swifts and for bats.”
78. **Affordable Housing Officer** – There are approximately 1700 applicants on the housing register and the greatest demand is for 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings. Therefore 12 dwellings out of the 29 proposed would be expected as affordable housing with a mixture of 1 and 2 bedroom properties. The policy on tenure split is 70/30 in favour of rented. Properties should be built to the HCA design and quality standards.

Representations

79. **Cllr Bridget Smith** – has voiced concerns through the ‘West Road Action Group’, as summarised in paragraph 80 below.

80. **Owners/Occupiers of**– 14 Cinqes Road; 26 Wootton Field; 1, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18 West Road; 18, 36, 48, 51, 57, 59 & 61 Mill Street; 49, 70 & 94 Church Street; West Road Action Group; Gamlingay Environmental Action Group; 59 & 65 Green Acres; CHS Group (Social Landlord for houses in West Road and Wootton Field):
- a) Traffic generation and impact on local area
 - b) Poor access and highway safety
 - c) Lack of parking
 - d) Urbanising effect of development on village
 - e) Increased pressure on local services & facilities
 - f) Development is outside village area and contrary to the local plan
 - g) The development is not sustainable
 - h) Lack of S106 contributions
 - i) Light, noise and air pollution
 - j) Impact on ecology/biodiversity and trees/hedgerows
 - k) Harm to historic environment, countryside and residential character
 - l) Layout, design and materials
 - m) Harm to residential amenity
 - n) Inappropriateness of proposed play area and ecology area
 - o) The application is premature in light of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan
 - p) The housing mix is inappropriate
 - q) Noise and disturbance
 - r) Disabled access not considered
 - s) Drainage problems and flood risk
 - t) Limited utility services in the area
 - u) The application is inappropriate in outline format
 - v) Limited garden spaces
 - w) Other sites (particularly brownfield sites) should be considered first

Site and Proposal

81. The site is located west of Mill Street and comprises land used mainly for the grazing of animals. The site is outside but adjacent to the boundaries of the village framework and conservation area of Gamlingay.
82. The outline application is for development of the land for residential development with up to 29 dwellings. Access is applied for in detail.

Planning Appraisal

83. The main issues to consider in this instance are the principle of the development and its sustainability in terms of economic, social and environmental objectives.

Principle of Development

84. The NPPF requires councils to boost significantly the supply of housing to identify and maintain a five-year housing land supply with an additional buffer as set out in paragraph 47.
85. On the 25 June 2014 two appeal decisions in Waterbeach found that the Council only had either a 3.51 or 3.9 year housing supply (each appeal was judged on its own evidence with slightly different conclusions reached). The council's housing supply policies in adopted and emerging plans are therefore out-of-date and do not demonstrate a five-year housing land supply.
86. 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 advice in the NPPF, which states that adopted policies that are "for the supply of housing" cannot be considered up to date where there is not a five year housing land supply. Where this is the case, paragraph 14 of the NPPF states there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It goes on to say that 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.
87. The NPPF states there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental, which are mutually dependent. These are assessed below in relation to the proposed development.

Economic

88. 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. Therefore the scheme would bring positive economic benefits thus complying with this dimension of sustainable development.

Social

(a) Provision of new housing including affordable housing

89. 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.
90. There remains a shortage of deliverable housing sites in the district. The development would provide a clear public benefit in helping to meet the current housing shortfall in South Cambridgeshire. The applicant has confirmed in section 3 of the Planning Statement that the site would deliver up to 29 residential dwellings within 5 years from the date of granting outline. Officers are of the view significant weight should be afforded to this benefit in the decision making process.

(b) Mix

91. Adopted Policy HG/2 states that developments of more than 10 dwellings should provide a range of accommodation, including one and two bed dwellings, having regard to economic viability, the local context of the site and the need to secure a balanced community. The applicant proposes the following mix in line with draft Policy HG/8:
- 30% 1 and 2 bed units
 - 40% 3 bed units
 - 30% 4-5 bed units

92. This mix is considered to accord with the aims of adopted Policy HG/2 and draft Policy HG/8. Although Policy HG/8 is not yet adopted it has been consulted on through the local plan process and so far has only received objections seeking additional flexibility in terms of housing mix. Consequently, officers are of the view that weight can be attached to this policy and that the housing mix presented in this application would meet a range of local needs. A condition is recommended to secure this housing mix.

(c) Affordable Units

93. Adopted Policy HG/3 requires 40% affordable housing on new residential schemes above a certain threshold. The proposed development is above this threshold and the applicant has confirmed the development can provide 40% affordable housing (i.e. up to 12 affordable dwellings) without comprising the financial viability of the scheme.
94. The Housing Officer has noted that there are approximately 1700 applicants on the South Cambs housing register and the greatest demand is for 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings. Housing figures for Gamlingay in 2014 reflect this position but also highlight the need for 3 bedroom properties. Therefore the range of affordable housing sizes and tenure will need to meet local need and not simply be polarised towards 1 and 2 beds. The final details of the affordable housing, together with their long term management will need to be agreed in a S106 agreement.

(d) Services and Facilities

95. The South Cambs 2014 Services and Facilities Study for Gamlingay details a range of services and facilities in the village. These include a: bakery, butchers, post office, convenience store, local superstore, pharmacy, restaurant, chinese take-away, petrol station, butchers, allotments, community centre (eco-hub), church hall, women's institute hall, sports centre (Gamlingay Village College), scout hut, recreation ground, primary school, village college, fire station, library and GP surgery.
96. The site is located less than 500m from the village centre and is within walking and cycling distance of many of these facilities as shown in Appendix 3 of the submitted Planning Statement. Residents of the development would therefore benefit from many of the walking distances to services and facilities set out in Chapter 6 of the District Design Guide. The indicative masterplan also shows generous space allocation for children's playspace on the site in the form of a Local Area of Play to comply with Policy SF/10.
97. Access to employment opportunities exist in the towns of St Neots and Biggleswade (circa 7-8 miles distance), and further afield in areas such as Royston (circa 12.6 miles distance).
98. From 6 April 2015, the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations 6th April 2010 prevent local planning authorities from pooling S106 monies from more than 5

projects towards a specific infrastructure project. Members were updated on this issue at planning committee on 13 May 2015. As the council has already sought S106 monies from more than 5 projects towards open space and indoor community facilities in Gamlingay, officers are unable to seek further generic contributions of this sought under the CIL regulations. Therefore any further contributions can only relate to a specific project and must meet the following tests under the CIL regulations:

- (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

99. In terms of local community and sports provision, the applicant proposes contributions towards the following specific projects:
- £35,000 for repairs and improvements to the Old Methodist Church
 - £35,000 for repairs and improvements to the Women's Institute Hall
 - £30,000 towards relocation of the tennis courts and bowling green
 - £35,000 towards new play equipment at Butts Playground
100. The above contributions have been specified in consultation with the parish council but insufficient evidence has been presented so far to the local planning authority to demonstrate that these projects meet the aforementioned three tests set out in the CIL regulations. As the decision maker, it is for Planning Committee to determine whether these financial contributions totalling £135,000 towards the specified indoor community and sports provisions satisfy the 3 tests as set out above and that, in the absence of these contributions, planning permission would be refused.
101. The development of this site has been assessed in terms of its cumulative impact alongside previous approved development in the village. It would generate a need for extra primary school provision given the lack of capacity at Gamlingay First School. Contributions of £104,261.59 have been put forward by the applicant towards the Milestone 2 Project for this school, which include two new classrooms and a hall extension. However, this project is not part of CCC's capital funding stream and there is a significant funding gap when considering the total cost of the project of £1,097,122.75. Funding from the Green End development is unlikely to meet this funding gap.
102. To address this issue, SCDC and CCC have considered splitting the Milestone 2 Project into smaller phases. The anticipated numbers of pupils generated from the proposal in conjunction with the Green End development (which is an allocated site) would at the very least require an additional classroom at Gamlingay First School to provide sufficient capacity. The provision of a single classroom therefore represents Phase 1 of the Milestone 2 Project and would require contributions from this development and the Green End development on a pro-rata basis. The funding required for this new classroom is currently being estimated by CCC. Consequently, the applicant has agreed to the principle of this approach and to making the necessary financial contributions towards it subject to any financial viability considerations. These contributions would be secured by way of S106 agreement.
103. CCC education officers have confirmed that there is sufficient capacity at Gamlingay Village College to cope with the extra 7.25 places generated from the development.
104. Central Bedfordshire Council has however requested financial contributions towards the perceived extra demand at Stratton Upper School from this development. Upon assessment of this request, it appears that there is no certainty that the children

arising from the development will go to Stratton school when they could go to Comberton Village College as part of Cambridgeshire's two tier education system.

105. Although Central Bedfordshire has explained how the contribution would be used (i.e. a 3 FE extension to include expanding the capacity of the 6th form) and how much this costs there is no information that would suggest the scheme would not go ahead in the absence of this request. Furthermore Central Bedfordshire estimate that only 4.64 secondary aged pupils will be generated from this development; therefore there is a question as to whether these pupils could simply be accommodated. Accordingly, officers do not consider that the contributions put forward are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms with regard to the tests set out in paragraph 204 of the NPPF.
106. In terms of health provision the applicant has confirmed a financial contribution of £21,083.00 towards the Gamlingay surgery extension, as requested by the surgery based on a contribution of £727 per dwelling. This together with other contributions will help to create an additional consulting room and 1 multi purpose room to meet forecasted demand at the surgery.
107. The applicant has confirmed contributions of £283.97 towards libraries and lifelong learning and £5249.00 towards strategic waste as required by CCC to meet the demands of the development.
108. Members should note Cambridgeshire County Council have requested a financial contribution to cover their own S106 monitoring activities but, having regard to a decision determined by the Planning Court on 3 February 2015, officers do not consider that such a request satisfies the tests as set out in CIL Regulation 122. Therefore this contribution is not proposed to be secured. For further information on this issue please refer to Oxfordshire CC v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2015] EWHC 186 [Admin].

Environmental

(a) Travel, Access and Parking

109. One of the core principles of the NPPF is to “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport.” Chapter 4 advises “the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes.” However “different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas.” In summary, the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable transport solutions, whilst recognising the difficulty of achieving this in rural areas.
110. Adopted Policy TR/1 states that planning permission will not be granted to developments likely to give rise to a material increase in travel demands unless the site has (or will attain) a sufficient standard of accessibility to offer an appropriate choice of travel by public transport or other non car modes.
111. Gamlingay does not have a train station and the nearest train stations are located in Biggleswade (6.6 miles away) and St Neots (7.5 miles away). However, Gamlingay is served by bus routes to Cambridge, Cambourne, Comberton, Biggleswade, Sandy, Hitchin, Royston and St Neots. Several bus stops are located within walking distance of the site as illustrated in Appendix 3 of the submitted Planning Statement. The frequency of these services ranges but officers are of the view the site is relatively

well served by public transport.

112. Footpath access is provided from the site to the centre of the village. A footpath/cycle link is proposed to the east boundary of the site connecting it to Mill Street. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has asked for an uncontrolled crossing at this point (i.e. a dropped kerb), which will enable users to cross over to the public bridleway on the opposite side of the road. This is achievable and can be detailed at reserved matters stage. The width of this footpath/cycle path link is shown indicatively on the masterplan and will need to be extended in width to 3.5m to accommodate the recommendations of the LHA and allay crime concerns. This can be addressed at reserved matters stage.
113. Traffic generation has been raised as a concern in this application by local residents. The submitted updated Transport Statement (dated August 2015) has identified that there is sufficient capacity to support the development without compromising highway safety taking into account the recent development of 10 dwellings along West Road. The Local Highway Authority has assessed this report and raises no objection to the principle of 29 dwellings in this location.
114. The applicant has submitted drawing SK04 to demonstrate that 2.4m x 70m visibility splays can be achieved at the junction of Mill Street and West Road. This overcomes the concern of the LHA.
115. The LHA is satisfied that the proposal will have no significant adverse effect upon the public highway subject to conditions governing: falls and levels of driveways (to prevent run-off); bound material next to access with public highway; a traffic management plan to be agreed; the provision of a footway/cycleway link of 3.5m in width to the village of Gamlingay from the development and uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points on Mill Street. All of these details can be assessed and secured at reserved matters stage except for the suggested provision of a 3.5m wide footway/cycleway from the site to the village of Gamlingay. This would involve the agreement of third party landowners, as would any footway/cycleway connection to the south along Potton Road towards the brook. As third party land is not within the control of the applicant it would be unreasonable to ask for footway/cycleway infrastructure of this kind and scale. Furthermore, no indication has been given by CCC that such infrastructure is deliverable and fairly related to the development.
116. The indicative masterplan shows that there is sufficient space to achieve 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling and 1 secure cycle space per dwelling in accordance with Policy TR/2. Visitor parking can also be achieved in addition to this.

(b) Landscape, Village and Historic Character

117. The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes Gamlingay as set on the Greensand Ridge in an undulating landscape. Gamlingay Wood is prominent to the north across open arable fields. To the east, south and west the landscape is more enclosed with small fields and hedgerows. To the south the land falls down to Millbrook and then rises again towards Potton. There are wide views north to the village from Potton Road over the large field to the south of the site which extends all the way to Millbridge Brook, with new housing visible in the distance above hedgerows. The open field to the south of the site provides the most visible element of the immediate setting for Gamlingay when approaching from the south. Arrival in the village being marked by the distinctive Listed Building at the corner of Mill Lane and Honey Hill (61 Mill Street aka 6 Honey Hill).

118. The development would continue this edge-of village character with houses set behind trees and hedges. The topography of the site is a challenge but with careful design and scaling the development can be mitigated. One of the main forms of mitigation is evident in the proposed 7m landscape buffer to the southern boundary of the site. This includes hedge and tree planting to create a strong verdant edge and glimpsed views of houses behind.
119. The development would be viewed alongside existing residential development on the opposite side of Mill Street/Potton Road, which extends further south of the village. The extent of existing development along this road presents a lopsided approach to the village in terms of built development. The development would provide more of a gateway entrance to the village and one that would not significantly encroach upon the open countryside character beyond.
120. The indicative masterplan submitted with the application shows two dwellings (Plots 15 and 16) adjacent to Mill Street. Although the location of these plots is indicative only, the approach in this case would create a greater sense of enclosure to the street and village entrance. This approach has the potential create a more distinct and defined entrance to the village whilst also reflecting the more enclosed feel of Mill Street further north into the village. In this respect, the development has the potential to conserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.
121. The applicant has provided a section drawing showing the indicative heights of plots 15 and 16 at 2.5 storeys next to the historic buildings on the opposite side of Mill Street. This section drawing confirms that the proposed 2.5 storey height of these dwellings will be dominant and unacceptable in this location relative to the heights of the surrounding historic buildings and the raised land levels on the west side of Mill Street. For this reason, a condition is recommended to ensure that dwellings within this area do not exceed 1.5 storey height. The applicant has submitted an amended parameters plan to confirm this change.
122. Final issues regarding layout, scale and design cannot be considered in this outline application and will be subject to assessment at reserved matters stage. Officers are of the view that the indicative masterplan and housing density demonstrates that the site can accommodate up to 29 dwellings and provide sufficient space for private garden areas, informal open space, children's playspace, parking, landscaping and access.
123. Officers also consider that the need to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of the conservation area and for special regard to be paid to the desirability of preserving the listed buildings at 53, 55, 57 and 61 Mill Street and the Baptist Church and School (Honey Hill) or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess can be achieved.

(c) Ecology, Trees and Hedges

124. The application is supported by an ecological assessment, which does not identify any significant biodiversity constraints to development of this site. The ecology report states that reptiles are present on the site and a scheme of mitigation will be finalised. This would involve the relatively large parcel of land to the south of the site (that is within the applicant's ownership), being allocated for ecological gain only. This approach is accepted by the council's ecology officer.
125. The ecology officer has agreed that the grassland meadow habitat does not represent an important botanical site. The site is bounded on two of its sides by relatively low value hedges. One of the hedges contains a number of dead and dying elms, the

other appears to be dominated by hawthorn that would be integrated into a buffer planting screen.

126. Local residents have objected (amongst other things) to the loss of the hedge along the eastern boundary of the site with Mill Street. The main reason for this objection is because of the age of the hedge and its contribution to the biodiversity of the area and the character of the village entrance.

127. The Hedgerows Regulations 1997 protect most countryside hedgerows from being removed. Such hedges can be removed where planning permission has been granted. Both the council's ecologist and landscape officer have assessed the hedge and confirmed it is of low value. The absence of more mature elm trees also reduces the likelihood of the White-spotted Pinion Moth being present in this hedge. Consequently the proposed removal or replacement of this hedge should not warrant the withholding of planning permission in this instance.

128. The submitted arboricultural report and tree survey (dated April 2015) confirms the location of two medium sized oak trees at the western end of the site. Their position is sufficiently distanced from the indicative dwellings and roadways to ensure their long term retention, which can be secured in the landscaping scheme to be submitted at reserved matters stage.

129. Nesting birds in the hedgerows are of at least local value given that nesting bullfinch was confirmed. However, this application will not result in a net loss of hedgerow habitat. That is one of the reasons why the proposed area for ecological gain contains some areas of dense scrub planting.

130. The final design of the ecological enhancement scheme, management and monitoring will need to be agreed as part of the S106 agreement. A clause is recommended to secure habitat creation in advance of any site demolition, archaeological investigation, ground works or infrastructure works. This is to protect any reptiles present on the site.

131. Pond restoration is also proposed and welcomed by the council's ecology officer. Public access to the pond will be created as part of this scheme. The measures to deliver ecological gain in the form of specialist nesting boxes for swifts and for bats are also welcomed.

132. Consequently, the creation of the ecological mitigation habitat and enhancements to the existing pond promote an ecologically sustainable approach to the development.

(d) Noise, Light and Air Pollution

133. The Council's acting environmental health manager raises no objection to the principle of the development subject to conditions to control:

- construction noise, vibration, dust etc;
- artificial lighting;
- an air quality assessment for any biomass boiler;
- operational waste and recycling/waste management strategy in accordance with the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit
- details of LAP and noise impact

134. These details can be controlled by way of condition or in any subsequent reserved

matters application to address the concerns of neighbours. Subject to these conditions, the development would accord with adopted Policies DP/3, NE/14 and NE/15.

(e) Residential Amenity

135. The site is surrounded by residential properties to the north, east and west. The application is only in outline form but the indicative masterplan shows sufficient back-to-back distances are achievable between the development and the neighbouring properties at West Road and Wooten Field. Most of the West Road properties to the north of the site benefit from generous rear gardens (over 25m in length) allowing rear-to-rear distances in excess of the minimum 25m distance set out in paragraph 6.68 of the council's District Design Guide.
136. Careful design will need to be applied to any dwellings near to the bungalow at 48 Mill Street, which has received planning permission for extensions (S/0598/13/FL). There is opportunity to reduce the height of dwellings in this location to single storey height to mitigate the impact on this neighbour.
137. The illustrative masterplan shows that on the whole sufficient garden spaces can be achieved for the 29 dwellings, although further negotiation on this issue will be required at detailed design stage. The comments of the urban design officer are noted in relation to the amenity of units 1-3, 24/25 and 19/20 and these points can be addressed at reserved matters stage.

(f) Archaeology

138. The comments of CCC archaeology are acknowledged. A condition requiring a programme of archaeological investigation to be secured prior to the commencement of development is recommended.

(g) Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage

139. The Cambridge County Council Flood and Water Management Team has confirmed that the surface water drainage scheme is considered acceptable in principle. A condition is recommended to secure a detailed surface water drainage scheme prior to the commencement of the development.
140. The Environment Agency raises no objection, subject to conditions and informatives governing: groundwater and contamination issues; no infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority; piling foundations; and a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control of the water environment. These conditions are agreed except for contamination, which is addressed below.

(h) Contamination

141. The comments of the Council's acting environmental health manager are noted and the site has been found suitable for residential use. No further conditions are necessary in this respect to make the development acceptable in planning terms and the recommended informative is agreed.

(i) Energy

142. The applicant has proposed a 25% reduction in carbon emissions through the use of renewable energy. This exceeds the 10% reduction required under adopted Policy NE/3. The final scheme of renewable energy is subject to further detailed design and is therefore recommended to be secured by condition.

(j) Water Conservation

143. A condition is recommended to ensure the development incorporates all practicable water conservation measures at detailed design stage in accordance with adopted Policy NE/12.

(k) Waste

144. Very little information is provided in the application on the development's compliance with the RECAP design guide. It is agreed that this is often a detailed design matter and adequate information would need to be provided on operational waste and recycling provision. This can be secured by planning condition.

(j) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening

145. The local planning authority previously considered a request for a screening opinion of this site in 2014 and confirmed that the proposed development is not EIA development. This view is maintained in this application.

Other considerations

Crime, fire and rescue, utility services, public art and local consultation

146. Crime and security will need to be considered as part of any reserved matters application. Specific concern has been raised in relation to the proposed location and width of the footpath connection through the site towards Mill Street. These issues can be resolved at detailed design stage with adjustments to the layout and boundary treatment.
147. The comments of Cambridge Fire and Rescue Services are noted and a condition is agreed to secure a scheme of fire hydrant provision to serve the site.
148. Anglian Water has confirmed that the existing foul sewerage network has capacity to serve the site. Agreement has been reached to allow a gravity connection to Manhole 5905 (situated at the southern end of Wooton Field).
149. The submitted utilities assessment confirms that National Grid is able to extend gas supply to the site and an estimated £33,500 would be required to connect electricity to the site. Based on the existing connection point along Mill Street, a substation will not be required on site. This estimate includes around 100m of offsite underground cable laying along Mill Street to the junction with West Road.
150. Cambridge Water has confirmed that there is insufficient capacity in the 90mm mains in Mill Street and Wooton Field to supply the 29 dwellings. It will therefore be necessary to lay a new 90mm HPPE water main from the junction of Honey Hill with Mill Street to the site to supply the development at an estimated cost of £16,000. In addition, onsite water mains will be needed to serve the development and this is budgeted at approximately £700 per dwelling.

151. The applicant has been encouraged to provide public art on the site and has agreed to this in principle. A condition is recommended to secure a scheme of public art in accordance with the aims of adopted Policy SF/6.
152. Objections have been raised in relation to the lack of consultation from the developer with the local community. The submitted 'Statement of Public Consultation' states that a drop-in consultation event was held on 9 December 2014 (from 1pm – 7.30pm) - at Gamlingay Ecohub. Invitation letters were sent to local members, parish councillors and properties immediately adjacent to the site, including West Road, Wooten Field, Mill Street and Honey Hill. There were also 1500 flyers distributed to advertise the event and a press release. A number of key themes were analysed from the 24 consultation responses, which are outlined in the Statement of Public Consultation document. During the application the developer has also attended meetings and engaged with the parish council and local members to discuss the application. On this basis, officers are satisfied that a reasonable level of public engagement and consultation has been carried out.

Conclusions

153. 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 set out in the NPPF is 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 Framework taken as a whole. In this case the applicant has demonstrated it is likely all of the units will be delivered within 5 years from the date of the outline consent and as such the proposal will make a contribution towards delivery of the Councils housing targets.
154. The NPPF states there are three dimensions to sustainable development - economic, social and environmental - and that these roles should not be undertaken in isolation. There are economic benefits associated with the scheme. Likewise there are clear social benefits through the delivery of up to 29 much needed houses, including 40% affordable housing. These considerations weigh in favour of the development.
155. The environmental implications are more ambiguous but, on balance, the impact of the development upon issues such as traffic, highway safety, biodiversity, local character, heritage assets and residential amenity are either acceptable, or can be satisfactorily mitigated. Members are reminded that the application is in outline form with consent only sought for access. Therefore details of the site layout, scale, landscaping and appearance are not subject to detailed consideration at this stage.
156. Overall, the proposal is considered to represent sustainable development and the application is recommended for approval subject to the requirements set out below.

Recommendation

157. Officers recommend that the Committee approve the application, subject to:

Requirements under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

158. (a) Completion of an agreement confirming payment of the following:
- Primary Education Provision (figure to be confirmed by CCC and agreed with applicant)
 - £21,083.00 towards the Gamlingay doctors surgery extension

- £283.97 towards libraries and lifelong learning
- £5249.00 towards strategic waste
- Scheme of 40% affordable housing provision to be agreed
- Scheme of on-site public open space and management to be agreed
- Scheme of ecological enhancement, management and monitoring

Conditions

- (a) Approval of the details of the layout of the site, the scale and appearance of buildings and landscaping (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced. (SC2)
- (b) Application for the approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. (SC3)
- (c) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved. (SC4)
- (d) Drawing numbers (SC95)
- (e) Landscaping (SC5)
- (f) Landscape implementation (SC6)
- (g) Housing Mix to be secured as 30% x 1 and 2 bed units; 40% x 3 bed units and 30% x 4-5 bed units unless an alternative mix would better meet local circumstances.
- (h) Water conservation statement to be agreed
- (i) Renewable energy scheme to be agreed along with an air quality impact assessment in conjunction with any biomass boiler
- (j) Detailed surface water drainage scheme (and management thereof) be agreed
- (l) Detailed foul water drainage scheme (and management thereof) to be agreed
- (m) A scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control of the water environment to be agreed
- (n) No infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground to take place other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority
- (o) Public art scheme to be agreed
- Archaeological investigation to be agreed
- (p) Fire hydrants to be agreed
- (q) Waste Management and Minimisation Strategy to be agreed
- (r) Construction traffic management plan
- (s) Construction times (SC38)
- (t) Dust management scheme to be agreed
- (u) Artificial lighting scheme to be agreed

Informatives

- 160. (a) Consent of the LHA to carry out highway works
- (b) Contamination not otherwise identified
- (c) Construction / Demolition Informative
- (d) Pilling Foundations
- (e) Surface water and foul water informatives

Background Papers:

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 Core Strategy (adopted January 2007)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)
- Planning File Ref: S/0598/13/FL

Report Author:

Andrew Winter
Telephone Number:

Senior Planning Officer
01954 713082