

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

11 May 2016

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

---

<b>Application Number:</b>	S/1818/15/OL
<b>Parish(es):</b>	Cottenham
<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline application for the erection of up to 225 residential dwellings (including 40% affordable housing) and up to 70 apartments with care (C2), demolition of no. 117 Rampton Road, introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children's play area, surface water flood mitigation and attenuation, vehicular access points from Rampton Road and associated ancillary works. All matters are reserved with the exception of the main site accesses.
<b>Site address:</b>	Land off Rampton Road, Cottenham
<b>Applicant(s):</b>	Gladman Developments Ltd
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Refuse
<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, impact on the village character and landscape, impact on heritage assets, level of services and facilities, access and transport, drainage and ecology.
<b>Committee Site Visit:</b>	Yes
<b>Departure Application:</b>	Yes
<b>Presenting Officer:</b>	Andrew Fillmore
<b>Application brought to Committee because:</b>	The application proposal raises considerations of wider than local interest.
<b>Date by which decision due:</b>	8 April 2016

## Executive Summary

1. This proposal seeks outline permission (access only for approval) for a residential development of up to 225 dwellings and up to 70 apartments with care outside the adopted village framework on a greenfield site. The development would not normally be considered acceptable in principle when set against current adopted policy as a result of its scale and location. However it is recognised 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 considered not up to date. The local planning authority must determine the appropriate weight to apply to relevant development plan policies. The NPPF states there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and where relevant policies are out of date, planning permission should be granted for development unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when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. Although Cottenham is considered a sustainable location which can accommodate the proposed level of development taking into account existing transport links and the level of local services within the village officers are of the view the application has failed to sufficiently demonstrate concerns relating to transport (including highway safety) can be adequately mitigated, and as such the benefits of providing additional residential dwellings, including 40% affordable units, does not outweigh the harm.
3. It is important to note that should the above concern be resolved the application would be supported at officer level, subject to conditions and a S106 Legal Agreement securing appropriate contributions.

## Planning History

4. None relevant.

## Policy

5. **National**  
National Planning Policy Framework  
Planning Practice Guidance
6. **South Cambridgeshire LDF Core Strategy DPD, 2007**  
ST/2 Housing Provision  
ST/5 Minor Rural Centre
7. **Adopted 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 development  
HG/1 Housing Density  
HG/3 Affordable Housing  
SF/6 Public Art and New Development  
SF/10 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space and New Developments  
SF/11 Open Space Standards  
NE/1 Energy Efficiency  
NE/3 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development

NE/4 Landscape Character Areas  
NE/6 Biodiversity  
NE/7 Sites of Geological Importance  
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  
CH/2 Archaeological Sites  
CH/3 Listed Buildings  
CH/4 Development within the curtilage or setting of a Listed Building  
SF/10 – Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments  
SF/11 – Open Space Standards  
TR/1 Planning for More Sustainable Travel  
TR/2 - Car and Cycle Parking Standards  
TR/3 Mitigating Travel Impact  
TR/4 Non-motorised Transport

**8. Supplementary Planning Document(s)**

District Design Guide SPD – adopted 2010  
Public Art SPD- Adopted 2009  
Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD – Adopted 2009  
Health Impact Assessment SPD – March 2011  
Affordable Housing SPD – 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 in new development SPD – Adopted March 2010  
Biodiversity SPD – Adopted July 2009  
Cottenham Village Design Statement SPD

**9. *South Cambridgeshire emerging 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/8 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 S 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

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

### **10. Cottenham Parish Council** (Full comments set out in Appendix A) - Recommend refusal. Comments can be summarised as:

- Cottenham is a minor rural centre incapable of sustaining a development of this scale in the chosen location so the adverse impact of this development significantly outweigh the benefits.
- Grave misgivings about the design of the access onto Rampton Road. Vehicle ownership has been seriously underestimated given local patterns of vehicle ownership. The increased intensity of traffic and lack of adequate segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles, especially at the access points, will significantly increase accident risks.
- Cottenham does need more affordable homes but not at the expense of an excessive number of market homes disconnected from the village environment
- Pre-school places – Cottenham already has an excess of demand and the proposal will increase that demand without doing anything about supply.
- Medical/day care facilities – will increase demand on already overburdened facilities.
- Leisure – current demand outstrips supply. Whilst the proposed development is located close to many of the outdoor facilities it's an unsustainable way from the core of the village.
- Easier movement in/out/around the village – the proposed development will increase rush hour traffic by 20% on already busy roads resulting in traffic flowing into junctions with problems already.
- Conservation/village core – the distance from the development to the village core will lead to an increase in traffic and parking therefore damaging the character of the village core.
- Noise/pollution – there is nothing to lessen the effects on existing residents.
- Primary school – any increase in capacity would need to be handled sensitively to limit damage the cohesive role the school plays in the village.
- Drainage – flood risk has not been taken into account
- Loss of agricultural land
- Sewerage – there are known problems of sewerage

### **11. Additional representation** (Appendix B) received from the Parish Council advising a community survey has been undertaken which identified:

- 45% of residents already have concerns over the volume of traffic and speeding in the village, with 84% of the view that development will bring more traffic and such traffic impact is sufficient to refuse the application.

- 63% of residents wish to see improvements in public transport links to Cambridge. Bus services run at 20 minute intervals and a shorter journey time to Cambridge was the single most (78%) cited incentive to use bus services more. This issue has not been addressed in the travel plan.
- 66% of residents were not in favour of large developments.
- 90% of respondents considered that preserving the character of the village and Conservation Area is important.
- 44% of respondents identified a need to increase pre-school provision.
- Increased pressure on medical facilities was identified as a significant problem by 75% of residents, with these facilities located an unsustainable distance from the development site.
- 57% saw the development of local employment as being important.
- Leisure facilities were seen as inadequate by 68% of residents in the survey, with the development located an unsustainable distance away from the core of the village.
- 62% of residents value having one primary school serving the village.
- Residents are of the view the current development proposal would make a negligible contribution that would be significantly outweighed by the adverse impacts of the proposal.
- Our assessment of the Transport Plan indicates that traffic generated will be significantly higher than that predicted due to the difficulty of replicating the particular characteristics of an affluent village adjacent a unique fast growing city, especially to its north and west. An added complication is the likely reversal of significant traffic flows on Oakington Road when its access to the A14 is closed in the planned development; a change which is likely to bring more traffic up Oakington Road adding to the congestion on Rampton and Histon Roads.

12. **Histon and Impington Parish Council** – The main concerns for Histon and Impington are the impact on school and health provision in Histon and Impington noting Cottenham is already over subscribed and increased traffic on B1049.

13. **Cottenham Design Group** – Objects on ground it will not be sustainable and conflicts with some of the guidelines in the Cottenham Village Design Statement. Community – the development offers no meaningful new facilities to support the enlarged community.

Economy – the development proposal offers little to extend employment opportunity in Cottenham.

Landscape and wildlife – the proposal will project significantly into the countryside out of character with the historic shape of the village. In addition, the open and exposed ridge-top means it has the potential to have a disproportionately adverse impact on views into and around the village.

Settlement – for a new development to be successful and sustainable it would need to be integrated into the existing community, with this site distant from local services which tend to be located in the core of the village.

Open space – whilst it is encouraging to see reasonable and open space and recreation facilities included we would expect them to be retained and augmented into any subsequent application.

Highways – Cottenham is a rural community not located near major roads and with public transport and cycle links with a high percentage of people travelling to work by car, with the highways very busy with narrow uneven roads and pavements. Developments should be located and designed where practical to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities. The location of the site is on the upper limit on what

would be acceptable for a fit person to access village amenities. The location away from the village core will generate much additional traffic both within and through the village with the bulk of traffic placing further stress on busy dangerous roads. Poor public transport facilities do not address these concerns.

South Cambridgeshire District Council

14. **SCDC Urban Design – Object.** It is not considered the current information submitted clearly demonstrates the number of units proposed can be accommodated successfully on this site. Though this is only an outline application, a scaled layout showing plot depths needs to be provided to demonstrate the 295 units (225 dwellings and 70 bed care facility) can be developed in this location that meet policy requirements and doesn't compromise the design quality and relationship to and setting of Cottenham village. From the information submitted suggests densities of 42 dph (including the apartments with care), given the edge of village location where you expect the densities to be reducing this could be too high for the site.
15. **SCDC Landscape –** The proposed development occupies an exposed and prominent site on the western edge of Cottenham, and would represent a sizeable extension to the village forming a new extended built skyline when approached from the north-west along Rampton Road. There will be inter-visibility to the new town proposed at Northstowe. The relative height of the development site will require an extensive and well-designed landscape scheme to integrate the development into the landscape.
16. **SCDC Historic Buildings –** The site is outside of Cottenham Conservation Area and the development of this site will have minimal impact on the character of the Conservation Area. There are few listed buildings in close proximity and the layout and design will need to consider views of the church spire (Grade 1 Listed).
17. **SCDC Ecology –** No objection, subject to appropriate mitigation.
18. **Environmental Health (Noise) –** No objection provided conditions are appended relating to construction noise, vibration and dust, and appropriate mitigation of existing traffic noise (suitable site layout for external noise and type of glazing and acoustic ventilation for internal noise) is undertaken.
19. **Environmental Health -** Recommend conditions requiring details of external lighting and waste recycling and waste management strategy.
20. **Environmental Health (Contamination) –** The site is at low risk in terms of potential contamination. Recommend a condition for further site investigation.
21. **Environmental Health (Air Quality) –** No objection. Recommend a condition requiring electric vehicle charging.
22. **SCDC Health –** The Health Impact Assessment as submitted has been assessed as Grade C, which fails to meet the required standards. Given the application is in outline form no further work is required at this stage. Recommend a condition requiring the subsequent reserved matters application be accompanied by a Health Impact Assessment.

Cambridgeshire County Council

23. **CCC Libraries and lifelong learning** – Request a contribution of £33,611.20.
24. **CCC Floods and Water** – Request a condition relating to details of surface water management.
25. **CCC Highways (Development Management)** – Recommend refusal on grounds of highway safety.
26. **CCC Highways (Transport Assessment)** – Holding objection. Further information relating to the access arrangements, pedestrian and cycle movements/infrastructure, public transport, parking standards, trip flows and traffic impact is required. The Transport Assessment should identify suitable measures to mitigate the impact of the development on the surrounding highway network for all modes not just motor vehicles. The proposed works to the existing road layout in Cottenham seem to be directed entirely at easing the movement of motor vehicles, there appears to have been little or no thought given to either pedestrians or cycles, both of whom sit higher in the user hierarchy.
27. **CCC Education** – (Early years and primary education) There is insufficient early years and primary education provision in the Cottenham area to accommodate the places being generated by this development and a contribution (£1, 001,700) is required to mitigate the impact arising from this scheme.
28. (Secondary Education Provision) This site lies within the catchment area for Cottenham Village College which has sufficient capacity to accommodate the places generated by this development.
29. **CCC Archaeology** – Recommend a relatively small portion (Area enclosed by blue line set out in appendix C) of the site is best preserved in situ owing to its significance and a condition requiring archaeological investigation is applied to the area enclosed by the red line. The excavation of small areas of larger sites limits understanding of the wider site and its overall significance, and is itself a destructive process that is best avoided where possible. In suggesting this option to preserve rather than to excavate we do not object to the development from proceeding as no significant archaeological evidence occurred across the majority of the site.

#### Other

30. **NHS Property Services** – The one branch GP practice and one branch surgery operating within the vicinity of the site do not have available capacity for additional growth resulting from this development. The development would generate approximately 767 residents and subsequently increase demand on existing constrained services. The development would give rise to a need for improvements to capacity by way of extension, refurbishment or reconfiguration or relocation of existing practices, the cost of which would need to be borne at least in part by the developer. Contributions are sought for £83 640 to provide a proportion of the required funding for the provision of increased capacity within the existing health care premises. Assuming the above is considered in conjunction with the current application process NHS England would not wish to raise an objection.

31. **Fire and Rescue Service** – Request that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants by way of condition or S106.
32. **Natural England** – No objection regarding statutory nature conservation sites.
33. **Police Architectural Liaison Officer** – In respect of crime prevention and fear of crime no objections are raised. Concerns are raised that given the major flow of traffic to and from the site is predominately from and to the south east the positioning of a secondary entrance causes concerns.
34. **Historic England** – The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance.
35. **Environment Agency** – No objection, subject to conditions relating to contamination including a site assessment, risk assessment, remediation strategy and verification report, and a scheme to control pollution of the ground water.
36. **Anglian Water** – (Waste Water Treatment) The foul drainage is in the catchment of Cambridge Water Recycling Centre which has available capacity. (Foul Sewerage Network) Request a condition covering the drainage strategy to ensure no unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. (Surface Water Disposal) The proposed methods of surface water disposal do not relate to Anglia Water operated assets.
37. **Old West Internal Drainage Board** – The site lies outside of the Old West Internal Drainage District, but is within an area that drains into it. The Boards Drainage system has no residual capacity to take direct surface water discharge. Any discharge rate should be limited to the Boards greenfield rate of 1.1 litres/sec/ha.
38. **Campaign for Rural England** – Object for the following reasons: a proposal of this size should come forward when the Local Plan is reviewed, great weight should be given to the emerging Local Plan, the application is located outside the village framework and insufficient infrastructure is provided.

### **Representations**

39. Fifty three letters of representation have been received opposing the development for the following reasons;
  - loss of green areas around the village
  - adverse impact on the village centre
  - no need given development planned at Northstowe
  - access is dangerous
  - insufficient infrastructure in the village
  - will exacerbate already congested roads
  - primary school is already at capacity
  - development needs to be considered holistically in conjunction with other developments
  - insufficient parking is provided in the town centre
  - medical provision is inadequate
  - sewerage infrastructure does not have capacity
  - pedestrian access is not suitable
  - loss of view



- loss of agricultural land
- loss of valuable open space
- disproportionate increase in the size of the village

### **Planning Comments**

40. The application site comprises a large arable field which extends to circa 14ha and single detached residential dwelling (117 Rampton Road), located to the south-western edge of Cottenham. The topographic survey which accompanies the application indicates the centre of the site rises to 13.92m AOD falling in both a north-west and south-east direction. The site is bound to the east by ribbon development along Rampton Road, with further agricultural fields to the south.
41. The site is located outside the village framework and is not subject to any further planning designations.
42. The application proposal seeks outline permission (access only) with the matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved for the construction of up to 225 residential dwellings and up to 70 apartments with care, demolition of no. 117 Rampton Road, introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children's play area, surface water flood mitigation, vehicular access points and associated works. 40% of the dwellings are to be affordable, on a 70/30 rented to shared ownership basis.
43. Consent is sought for two means of access off Rampton Road, with the primary access beyond the ribbon development and secondary access on land presently occupied by 117 Rampton Road.
44. A Screening Opinion (LPA Ref: S/1816/15/E1) has been undertaken which confirmed the development does not represent EIA development as defined by The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations.
45. Two parcels of land to the south are subject to residential development proposals, with application S/1952/21/OL seeking consent for 50 dwellings along Oakington Road and a pre-application enquiry for circa 140 dwellings on land between. Collectively these proposals form a continuous band of development between Oakington and Rampton roads to the south-west edge of the village.

### **Principle of development**

46. 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.
47. The Council accepts that it cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply in the district as required by the NPPF, having a 3.9 year supply using the methodology identified by the Inspector in the Waterbeach appeals in 2014. This shortfall is based on an objectively assessed housing need of 19,500 homes for the period 2011 to 2031 (as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 and updated by the latest update undertaken for the Council in November 2015 as part of the evidence responding to the Local Plan Inspectors' preliminary conclusions) and latest assessment of housing delivery

(in the housing trajectory November 2015). In these circumstances any adopted or emerging policy which can be considered to restrict the supply of housing land is considered 'out of date' in respect of paragraph 49 of the NPPF.

48. Further guidance as to which policies should be considered as 'restricting housing land supply' emerged from a recent Court of Appeal decision (Richborough v Cheshire East and Suffolk Coastal DC v Hopkins Homes). The Court extended the definition of 'relevant policies for the supply of housing' from, 'merely policies in the Development Plan that provide positively for the delivery of new housing in terms of numbers and distribution or the allocation of sites,' to include, 'plan policies whose effect is to influence the supply of housing by restricting the locations where new housing may be developed.' Therefore all policies which have the potential to restrict or affect housing supply may be considered out of date in respect of the NPPF. However even where policies are considered 'out of date' for the purposes of NPPF paragraph 49, a decision maker is required to consider what weight should attach to such relevant policies.
49. In the case of this application policies which must be considered as potentially influencing the supply of housing land include ST/2 and ST/5 of the adopted Core Strategy, adopted policies DP/7 and NE/17 (Development Control Policies) and S/7, S/8, and NH/3 of the draft Local Plan.
50. 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 for instance).
51. The site is located outside the Cottenham village framework and in the countryside where Policy DP/7 of the LDF and Policy S/7 of the emerging Local Plan states that only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted. The proposed residential development would therefore not normally be acceptable. However as noted above under policy contained within the NPPF this policy is considered out of date due to the current lack of a 5 year housing land supply.
52. It falls to the Council as decision maker to assess the weight that should be given to the existing policy. The Council considers this assessment should have regard to whether the policy continues to perform a material planning objective and whether it is consistent with the policies of the NPPF.
53. Cottenham is identified as a Minor Rural Centre under Policy ST/5 of the LDF and Policy S/8 of the emerging Local Plan where there is a good range of services and facilities and residential developments of up to 30 dwellings are supported in policy terms. The erection of up to 225 dwellings would exceed the amount of residential dwellings normally allowed in such locations. However this must be balanced against the need for housing land and the fact that Cottenham is a sustainable location which is capable of accommodating this level of

additional housing. It is considered that due to the status of Cottenham as a Minor Rural Centre policies ST/5 and DP/7 do not outweigh the need for additional housing in this instance, which should be given significant weight. The scheme remains unacceptable in highway terms, however in all other respects the proposed scheme complies with adopted and emerging policy.

Is the site a sustainable location for up to 225 residential units and up to 70 bed apartments with care ?

54. Paragraph 9 of the NPPF advises that pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements to the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in peoples quality of life, including:

- Making it easier for jobs to be created in cities, towns and villages;
- Moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains in nature;
- Replacing poor design with better design;
- Improving conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure and;
- Widening the choice of high quality homes

55. The NPPF is clear in stating there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental and that these roles should not be undertaken in isolation because they are mutually dependant and to achieve sustainable development economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously.

**Economic**

56. Paragraph 19 of the NPPF advises the Government is committed to ensuring 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.

57. 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 (where there is a concentration of jobs) and surrounding villages. For these reasons the scheme would bring positive economic benefits thus complying with this dimension of sustainable development. This positive benefit again adds weight to allowing additional housing in this location to contribute towards the necessary five year housing land supply.

**Social**

Provision of new housing including affordable units

58. 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.

59. The development would provide a clear benefit in meeting the current shortfall in South Cambridgeshire through delivering up to 225 residential dwellings (less the single dwelling proposed to be demolished), 40% of which would be affordable at a 70/30 split between rent and intermediate housing.
60. In terms of mix adopted policy HG/2 (Housing Mix) advises that in developments of 10 dwellings or more a mix of units will be sought providing a range of accommodation, including 1 and 2 bedroom properties having regard to economic viability, the local context and need to secure a balanced community. The supporting text to this policy advises the Housing Needs survey 2002 identified a need for 89% of all new market housing to be one or two bed properties.
61. Emerging Local Plan policy H/8 (Housing Mix) proposes a different mix of at least 30% 1 or 2 bed, 30% 3 bed and 30% 4 or more bed, with 10% flexibility allowance to any one of the categories. The supporting text advises it is important to plan for a mix of housing based on the needs of different communities, and that the housing stock in South Cambridgeshire has traditionally been dominated by larger detached and semi-detached family houses.
62. The Office for National Statistics figures for the existing housing stock in Cottenham identifies 31% 1-2 bed properties, 36% 3 bed and 32% 4-5 bed, slightly balanced in favour of mid sized properties. Officers are of the view that taking into account the need to create inclusive and mixed communities at least 40% of the new dwellings, including 40% of market units, should be either 1 or 2 bed. This can be secured by condition.

#### Housing delivery

63. The applicant suggests, that subject to market conditions, all of the units will be delivered within 7-8 years (25 - 30 market dwellings per year) from date of outline consent, and they have a track record of achieving this.
64. Taking into account the sites greenfield nature and delivery rates of other similar, but slightly smaller, residential sites in the district (Former EDF Depot & Training Centre - outline permission granted for 89 dwellings in May 2012; SCA Packaging, Villa Road, Histon – outline permission granted for 72 dwellings September 2012; Land at junction of Long Drove & Beach Road, Cottenham – Full application for 47 dwellings granted 15 February 2015; Land south of Station Road, Gamlingay – 85 dwellings granted 27 June 2012) which were all fully or substantially built out in 5 years of obtaining outline consent, officers are of the view this is a realistic rate of delivery.
65. In order to encourage early delivery, it is reasonable to require the applicants to submit the last of the 'reserved matters' application within 2 years from the grant of outline consent, with work to commence within 12 months from such an application being approved, thereby allowing 2 years for the properties to be built and sold.
66. At the applicants maximum predicted delivery rate (42 market and affordable dwellings per year) of circa 84 units will be delivered in 2 years (5 years from date of granting outline consent). In balancing the benefits of the scheme against the harm, Members will need to consider that not all of the housing units are likely to be delivered within 5 years.

### Services and facilities

67. 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'*.
68. Cottenham is a well served village with a primary and secondary school, fire station, two GP surgeries, library, post office, along with a number of convenience stores and a small supermarket which meet the 'day-to-day' needs of local residents. This level of provision is reflective of Cottenham's designation as a Minor Rural Service Centre, proposed to change to a Rural Centre in the emerging Local Plan.

### Primary Health Care

69. Residents living in Cottenham access primary health care services at either Cottenham Surgery or the Surgery on Telegraph Street, with NHS England advising neither of these surgeries have capacity to accommodate the additional demand (circa 767 residents). NHS England seek contributions of £83 640 to mitigate this impact, but do not identify a specific project to increase primary health care capacity in the village.
70. Further to discussions with both surgeries this contribution would be directed towards the deliverable solution of extending the Telegraph Street Surgery (the surgery have provided plans demonstrating how the building could be enlarged), which is a branch of the Firs House Surgery based in Histon.
71. Although not currently part of any published NHS strategy the primary objective for Cottenham is for a new health centre providing primary healthcare alongside acute healthcare services. At present time the location and full funding is yet to be identified and as such it is necessary for the Section 106 agreement to cover both projects. The applicant has confirmed they are willing to pay this contribution.
72. It is of note that as recent as 2013 NHS Property Services based at Capital Park Fulbourn were responding to planning applications on the basis of seeking contributions across Cambridgeshire of £845 per dwelling by way of a S106 contribution where new health infrastructure is required, higher than that sought under this application. When responding to planning applications during 2015 on at least one occasion a contribution equivalent to £638 per dwelling was sought as an alternative figure.
73. NHS consultation responses are now provided by the Estates Advisor based in Chelmsford. The methodology for calculating the primary healthcare contribution is on the basis of:
- (a) Establishing the population
  - (b) Establishing the area required by multiplying the population by the necessary area required (i.e. in order to accommodate 1750 patients a consulting room and ancillary services equivalent to 120m<sup>2</sup> is required)
  - (c) Establishing the contribution based on multiplying the area by £2,000 per m<sup>2</sup> being the capital cost of building and fitting out the consulting room etc.

### Libraries and lifelong learning

74. Cottenham is served by a level one library with an operational space of 128 sqm. The County Councils proposed solution to mitigating the impact on the libraries and lifelong learning service arising from this site would be to modify the internal area to create more library space and provide additional shelving and resources. In order to do this a developer contribution of £33,611.02 is sought which the developer has agreed to pay.

#### Village Hall

75. In 2009 the Council conducted an audit of the indoor community space within the District with a view to provide an evidence base to inform a Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. Although the need for the SPD was superseded by the CIL Regulations, officers consider that it would, prior to the adoption of CIL, create an informal policy that would provide clarity for developers on the contributions likely to be sought towards the provision of or improvement to indoor community facilities in accordance with adopted policy DP/4.

76. The informal policy, which requires the provision of 111 square metres of indoor community space per 1,000 people, is based on the recommendations of an external audit and needs assessment. The audit also highlighted relevant costs such that the Council would calculate a capital and revenue contribution from new development.

Dwelling type	Contribution (per dwelling)
1 bed	£284.08
2 bed	£371.00
3 bed	£513.04
4+ bed	£703.84

77. In applying this to a policy compliant (albeit example) housing mix an offsite community space contribution of circa £115,000 would be payable.

78. Officers are seeking to secure a greater level of contribution (£225,000) equivalent to an increase of £110,000 against what the adopted policy would require.

79. The reason for this is the significant shortage of indoor community space in the village as recognised by the audit of 2009. Cottenham is served by the Cottenham Salvation Army Hall and Cottenham Village Hall but nevertheless against the adopted standard there is a recognised shortfall of 383 square metres of indoor community space. Cottenham Parish Council has advised they intend to construct a new village hall on land that is within their control estimated at a cost of £800,000 (based on constructing a similar sized building to the new football pavilion that the Parish Council recently built). The Parish Council are in the process of engaging with an architect and have drawn up a brief for the building design. This contribution (£225 000) is agreed to be paid by the developer.

#### Open Space

80. As part of the Local Plan evidence base the Council undertook a recreation and open study that was published in 2013. The results for Cottenham are set out

below and which demonstrate a significant shortfall of both sports space and play space against the adopted standards.

Type	Provision (ha)	Requirement	Surplus/Shortfall
Sport	4.66	9.92	-5.26
Play Space	0.26	4.96	-4.70
Informal Open Space	4.00	2.48	+1.52
Allotments	10.76	2.48	+8.28

81. As this proposal contains sufficient informal open space, no contributions will be sought under this element of the policy.

82. In terms of mitigating Children’s play provision the open space in new development SPD requires the provision of a local equipped area for play (LEAP) as well as a neighbourhood equipped area for play (NEAP) onsite at developments of 200 dwellings or more. The NEAP is to comprise one or more of:

- Traditional fixed equipment with safety surfacing aimed at the older age group such as aerial run ways and more challenging and adventurous equipment
- Ball Court or “informal” MUGA
- Wheeled sport facility or skate park

83. For developments under this threshold the policy requires the provision of a LEAP but with the NEAP element payable by way of offsite contribution.

84. Officers are of the view that the development should not necessarily be required to set aside land for the provision of a NEAP, but in lieu of this a payment towards offsite contributions which will be used by Cottenham Parish Council towards the provision of a MUGA at a cost of £75 000. This contribution has been agreed by the developer.

85. In addition adopted policy requires financial contributions towards offsite sports space. In accordance with the open space in new developments SPD the requisite contributions are as follows:

Dwelling Type	Contribution
1 bed	£625.73
2 bed	£817.17
3 bed	£1,130.04
4+ bed	£1,550.31

86. In applying this to a policy compliant (albeit example) housing mix an offsite sports contribution of circa £250,000 would be payable.

87. However, the total level of contribution being sought from the Rampton Road development is only £140,000 (i.e. £110,000 less) in recognition of the higher community facility contribution that is being sought.

88. The offsite sports contribution is to go towards funding 2 projects (i) the creation of a new sports clubhouse serving sports including rugby and (ii) the levelling

and draining of the existing sports pitches that are currently not fit for purpose. The applicant has agreed to pay this contribution (£140 000).

89. The on-site open space is to be taken on by a management company and as such contributions aren't necessary for this.

### Schools

90. The site is located within the catchment of Cottenham Primary School which operates as a 3FE school (3 classes per year group) for 630 children and which has recently expanded to replace temporary accommodation. County education officials advise there is no spare capacity to accommodate the demand forecast by this development for both primary education and early years provision. In terms of secondary education the site lies within the catchment for Cottenham Village College which has available capacity over the next five years to accommodate this scheme.
91. The county's proposed solution to mitigate the early years and primary education aged pupils is to build a new 1FE primary school facility with adjoining 1 class early years facility as an expansion to the existing school (as opposed to a new school), creating a 4FE primary school. This follows discussions with the school and takes into account views of the local community that two schools would not be an appropriate solution for this village.
92. The estimated cost of a 1FE expansion at the primary school is £4, 150 000, which when proportioned to this development gives rise to a contribution of £1, 001, 700 to mitigate the impact on both early years and primary school provision. This solution of expanding the primary school will also cater for the early years and primary education needs of other proposed developments should they gain the benefit of planning consent.
93. It should be noted that in respect of early years provision the applicant did express a view the £225 000 sum towards the village hall would meet this need. Whilst it is the aspiration of the Parish Council the new village hall would be used for early years the £225 00 sum secured from this development does not guarantee the delivery of this project (which is estimated to cost £800 000). Furthermore there is no agreement in place between the Parish Council and County Council that this facility will be used for this purpose and officers are of the view the £225 00 towards the village hall would not meet requirements in terms of early years provision.

### Transport

94. 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 relates to 'Promoting sustainable transport' and advises '*the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes*', and goes on to state '*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.
95. The application proposes to introduce two priority controlled junctions on Rampton Road to serve the residential development as follows:



- Access A: Located to the west of Ramphill Farm
- Access B: Located in land presently occupied by property 117 Rampton Road

96. Off site mitigation within the village includes changes to the Rampton/Oakington Road junction, introduction of a Toucon crossing (crossing for bicycles and pedestrians) on Rampton Road and alternations to various pedestrian routes (Set out in full on Appendix D).

#### *Junction of Rampton/Oakington Roads*

97. The local highways authority (Development Management team) oppose the application on grounds of highway safety, citing concerns over the design of the upgraded roundabout at the junction of Rampton/Oakington roads. The stage 1 safety audit undertaken identifies the following deficiencies at this upgraded junction:

- Existing traffic risk striking vehicles using Moreton Close
- Manoeuvring traffic risks collisions at junction
- Excessive circulatory width will result in poor directional compliance and a 4m overrun island will do little to avoid risking head-on strikes
- Excessive entry widths and circulatory widths will lead to shunts and side swipes as vehicles leave
- Private access (2 Oakington Road) directly onto roundabout will confuse users and risk vehicle and pedestrian strikes
- Private access (34 and 40 Rampton Road) directly onto roundabout will confuse users and risk vehicle and pedestrian strikes
- Service cover in circulatory carriageway presents skidding risk to right turning vehicles and furniture strikes
- Strike risk for crossing pedestrians and cyclists

#### *Wider Transport Network*

98. In respect of the impact of the development on the wider transport network county highways advise they have not been provided with sufficient information, including mitigation measures, to fully consider the impact of the development and as such offer a holding objection. Without appropriate consideration of the impact on the highway network including off-site transport improvements insufficient information has been provided to enable a thorough assessment to be made.

99. Dialogue is continuing with the applicant and members will be updated should further progress be made.

### **Environmental**

#### Landscape

100. The council's landscape officer advises the development occupies an exposed ridge and prominent site on the western edge of the village and represents a sizeable extension to the village. When viewed from the north-west along Rampton Road the proposal will form an extensive new skyline and there will be inter-visibility with the new town of Northstowe, and as such it is

necessary to require extensive and well-designed landscape to successfully integrate the development.

101. The application is in outline form, with all matters reserved except access however the application is supported by an indicative mitigation planting plan which proposes a hedgerow and community woodland to the northwest of the development area. The principle of such an approach to mitigating the landscape impact is supported by officers and is reflective of the landscaping to the opposite side of Rampton Road.
102. Whilst the development will adversely impact on the skyline of Cottenham when viewed from Rampton road, subject to appropriate landscaping, site layout and building height this impact is not likely to be significant.

#### Effect on the built environment and housing density

103. The Cottenham Village Design Statement describes Cottenham as:

*'The settlement is based on two distinct historical patterns. The 'Lanes' (TelegraphRooks-Corbett-Margett Streets), with an irregular pattern of short rectangular plots at the centre of the village, formed the original Saxon nucleus. This is the most densely settled, enclosed and informal area of the village.*

*Medieval linear expansion to the north and south formed the dog-leg High Street. Here the pattern is more open and regular, with long plots of up to 300m backing on to the open countryside. Farmhouses are concentrated within the village and line the street: there is little space at the front of plots, with access to hard standing and yards traditionally to the side and behind. Outbuildings run along the edge of plots, many of which follow the early farmstead boundaries.*

*These patterns have remained largely undisturbed, later settlement keeping to the line of the High Street in the form of extended ribbon development and continuing infill to the north and south. Gaps remain in the line of houses and these allow important glimpses out of the village, making a vital visual connection with the open countryside.'*

104. The proposed location of the development conflicts with the 'extended ribbon development' description which currently runs west along Rampton Road. Whilst ribbon development is a characteristic of the built form along some of the edges of the village (Rampton Road, Histon Road and Twenty Pence Road), it is not the only defining character. Infill residential development can be found to the edge of the settlement along Oakington and Beach Roads and as such the layout is not considered to harm the settlement pattern.
105. The Councils Urban Design officer opposes the scheme expressing reservation the number of units proposed can be accommodated whilst still meeting policy requirements in respect of overlooking and private amenity space standards. The application seeks consent for 'up to 225 units and up to 70 apartments with care', and therefore the number of units is not fixed at this stage. Officers have strong reservations this level of housing can be accommodated which are further questioned taking into account the need to hold land in open for archaeological reasons. However securing an appropriate layout (likely with fewer units) is a reserved matters consideration and would be assessed at this stage of the application process.

106. In respect of the house to be demolished, this building is of little architectural merit and its loss from the street scene does not result in material harm.

#### Ecology

107. The application site is not located near any statutory nature conservation sites and Natural England do not raise any concerns subject to the development being carried out in accordance with the details submitted. Similarly, the council's ecologist does not oppose the development subject to appropriate mitigation, including conditions relating to relating to owls and birds. In respect of badgers, an extensive badger set can be found to the southern corner with the provision of a community orchard in this location of benefit. A further condition requiring an additional survey for badgers prior to any development commencing, including details of mitigation and compensatory measures is necessary.

108. The Environment Agency request conditions relating to groundwater and contaminated land as well as the pollution control of the water environment including foul and surface water drainage arrangements.

#### Heritage assets

109. The site is not located in or adjacent a Conservation Area, with no Listed Buildings in the immediate vicinity. Historic England do not offer comment recommending the application be determined on the basis of the councils specialised conservation advice.

110. The council's conservation officer notes the Conservation Area is already surrounded by development, and subject to layout and design (reserved matters considerations) taking into account views of the church spire (Grade 1 Listed) no harm arises.

111. Some representations raise concerns over the impact of additional traffic on the Conservation Area. Officers are of the view any additional traffic traveling through the Conservation Area will not result in material harm to the Conservation Area given the existing traffic volumes.

112. In respect of archaeological interests, the application site lies 850m south-east of the schedule earthworks remains of early medieval settlement and later Anarchy period castle remains at Giant's Hill, Rampton. Associated with these is an unscheduled/non-designated area of related earthworks that bring the whole of the known medieval settlement evidence at Giants Hill down to the flood meadow. Above the flood meadow is Little North Fen on the south-east side of Reynolds Ditch, bisected by Smithy Fen Engine Drain. West of the Catchwater Drain lies an extensive double ditched cropmark complex with formal rectilinear enclosures and subdivisions. Not excavated, these remains are undated though morphologically they can be expected to contain several phases of occupation that pre-date, and possibly postdate the dominant formal rectangular series of interlinked enclosures.

113. Approximately 530m east of this cropmark complex lies the circa 4 hectare archaeological cropmark site that is partly contained within the development application boundary, and which is now proven to be more extensive within the application boundary extending to circa 6 hectares. These cropmarks follow a south-west to north-east trend of cropmark sites that mirror water course and

drainage baseline alignments and which extend north to larger scheduled complexes at Smithy Fen and Bullocks Haste on the southern river terraces of the River Great Ouse. The area is one of known archaeological significance, attesting to the long-term preference of settlement in this landscape.

114. The recent trench based evaluation results include finding mainly Iron Age enclosures, field boundaries, evidence for buildings with purported placed deposits in the perimeter ditch of one, watering holes and quarries, although Roman and Saxon settlement was also present. These remains expand previously known evidence from aerial photographs of the cropmark site at the south-east end of the application site. Finds assemblages suggest a well connected settlement with good trade links, a large quantity of animal bone and waterlogged environmental evidence in deep features. Further important evidence provided by the trenching was that the non-intrusive geophysical survey only revealed a proportion of the features (just over half) than those on the survey plot which might suggest that the greater part of the cropmark site outside the development area might only reflect a similar proportion of the actual remains sealed beneath plough and subsoil. These archaeological remains are non-designated heritage assets.
115. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF advises the effect of an application on the significance of non-designated heritage assets should be taken into account in determination of the application, and in weighing applications that affect directly on-designated heritage assets a balanced judgement is required having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the heritage asset.
116. 'Significance' for heritage policy is defined as the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest, with significance derived not only from a heritage assets physical presence, but also from its setting.
117. Officers are of the view that excluding a tract of land (as identified in blue on Appendix E) from development or planting is justified, with further areas (shaded red) subject to a programme of archaeological work. This is agreed by the applicant.

#### Surface and Foul Water Drainage

118. The County Flood and Water team advise the applicant has demonstrated that surface water can be dealt with on site by using an attenuation pond with a discharge rate no greater than the existing greenfield run off rate, but that further information is necessary in respect of ensuring the development meets the relevant water quality requirements in respect of SUDS treatment stages. This can be addressed through condition.
119. Old West Internal Drainage Board comment that although the site is located outside of the boards drainage district it is within an area that drains into it and there is no capacity to take direct surface water discharge. There will be no increase in runoff rate above the existing greenfield rate thus addressing this concern, subject to securing appropriate maintenance in the form of a S106 legal agreement.
120. Anglian Water note there is available capacity to cope with wastewater treatment but request a condition relating to foul water. The applicants dispute

the need for this condition and a further response from Anglian Water on this matter is awaited.

#### Noise and disturbance

121. The Council's environmental health officer advises that subject to conditions (hour of construction, construction noise and dust mitigation, noise mitigation measures for the properties) no objection is raised.
122. While the existing residents along Rampton road will experience an increase in noise from vehicular traffic, this impact is likely to be negligible to low and not give rise to material harm.
123. Conditions relating to hours of delivery of the care homes and extraction/filtration devices as recommended by Environmental Health officers are not considered necessary, given the lack of detail in respect of the proposal, and would be considered as part of any reserved matters application.
124. No adverse concerns are raised with regard to air quality subject to the appending of a condition requiring a Construction Traffic Management Plan.

#### **Cumulative development**

125. As noted in paragraph 45 this application along with two further proposals forms a band of development extending from Oakington Road to Rampton Road. Adopted policy DP/5 relates to cumulative development and advises development will not be permitted where it:
  - forms part of a larger site where there would be requirement for infrastructure provision as a whole
  - would result in piecemeal, unsatisfactory form of development
  - would prejudice development of another site adjacent or nearby
126. Collectively the three development proposals would not give rise to additional infrastructure, with this application not prejudicing other developments nearby.
127. In terms of 'an unacceptable form of development', the application is in outline form (access only) with matters of layout and landscaping reserved and it is considered possible (although not ideal) to design two schemes which are of a complementary layout. Conditions can be imposed, at outline stage, to ensure permeability (pedestrians/cyclists) across the site to prevent 3 cul-de-sac style developments emerging.
128. It is important to note there is no planning application at present of the adjoining land parcel, and no guarantee such an application would be supported should it be forthcoming.

#### **Conclusions**

129. In considering this application, the following relevant adopted development plan policies are to be regarded as 'out of date' while there is no five year housing land supply:
  - ST/2: Housing provision
  - ST/5: Minor Rural Centres – indicative maximum scheme size of 30 dwellings
  - DP/1: Sustainable Development

DP/7: Village Frameworks  
HG/1: Housing density  
HG/2: Housing mix  
NE/6: Biodiversity  
NE/17: Protecting high quality agricultural land

130. This means that where planning permission is sought which would be contrary to the policies listed above, such applications must be determined against paragraph 14 of the NPPF. 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 skewed 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.

131. 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 dimension, along with limited environmental harm (relationship to settlement) 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 maintaining other services and facilities in Cottenham.

132. However this must be balanced against the fact that the application fails to provide satisfactory measures to mitigate the transport impact of the new development with the modified junction at Oakington/Rampton Roads resulting in a danger to highway safety. Officers are of the view this outweighs the benefits of the scheme as noted above.

### **Recommendation**

133. Refuse for the following reasons:

- The development will result in an unacceptable impact on the transport network and pose a danger to highway safety contrary to the requirements of adopted policy TR/3 Mitigating Travel Impact of the Development Control Policies DPD.

### **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 or elsewhere at which copies can be inspected.

- Nation Planning Policy Framework

- <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>  
Local Development Framework, Development Control Policies, Adopted July 2007  
<http://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/local-development-framework>
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, Proposed Submission July 2013  
<http://www.scambs.gov.uk/localplan>

**Report Author:** Andrew Fillmore – Principal Planning Officer  
Telephone: (01954) 713180