

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

11 May 2016

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

Application Number: S/1969/15/OL

Parish(es): Linton

Proposal: Residential Development of up to 50 Houses and 28 Allotments

Site address: Land South of Horseheath Road, Linton

Applicant(s): Ely Diocesan Board of Finance

Recommendation: Refusal

Key material considerations: Housing Land Supply
Principle of Development
Character and Appearance of the Area
Density
Housing Mix
Affordable Housing
Developer Contributions
Design Considerations
Trees and Landscaping
Biodiversity
Highway Safety and Sustainable Travel
Flood Risk
Neighbour Amenity
Heritage Assets

Committee Site Visit: 5 April 2016

Departure Application: Yes

Presenting Officer: Karen Pell-Coggins, Principal Planning Officer

Application brought to Committee because: A Local Member is one of the applicants.

Date by which decision due: 2 November 2015

Executive Summary

1. This proposal, as amended, seeks permission for a residential development outside the Linton village framework and in the countryside. This development would not normally be considered acceptable in principle as a result of its location. However, two recent appeal decisions in Waterbeach have shown that the district does not currently

have a 5 year housing land supply and therefore the adopted Core Strategy and Development Control policies in relation to the supply and restriction of housing are not up to date. The Local Planning Authority must determine the appropriate weight to apply to relevant development plan policies. The NPPF states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and where relevant policies are out of date, planning permission should be granted for development unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

2. The scale of the development proposed by this application (up to 50 dwellings) in relation to the adopted settlement hierarchy exceeds that supported by Policy ST/5 of the LDF (Maximum 30 dwellings); however this policy is out of date, given the lack of a 5-year land supply. Taking account of the range and scale of services and facilities available in Linton, including convenient accessibility to public transport, it is considered that the scale of development proposed by this application is acceptable in terms of a locational sustainability perspective.
3. The application has been submitted in outline with all matters reserved, including layout. However, the submission expressly seeks formal consent for 50 dwellings. An indicative layout has been provided to show one way in which this could be accommodated. The application site comprises a sensitive edge of settlement location within undulating landscape topography. Given the landscape and visual amenity characteristics and context of the site the Local Planning Authority does not consider that the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that a development of 50 dwellings can be accommodated on the site without causing harm to the landscape and visual amenities of the area. It is considered that a comprehensive scheme of structured landscape planting, combined with a design-led approach to the development of this site is essential, and this would be highly likely to encroach into the developable area of the site and compromise the ability to accommodate 50 dwellings. The Local Planning Authority therefore considers that a development of 50 dwellings would be likely to exert a harmful effect on the landscape and visual amenities of the area, contrary to Policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3 and NE/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD, 2007.
4. The application site is located in a highly sensitive archaeological landscape, with several recent significant archaeological finds in the local area and the potential for additional significant archaeological finds on-site. The development proposals therefore have the potential to adversely impact on significant features of archaeological interest. The County Historic Environment Team strongly advises that appropriate site survey work is undertaken (in the form of trench-based field evaluation) prior to determination of the application. In the absence of satisfactory on-site evaluation the Local Planning Authority is unable to reach a judgement as to the likely impact of the proposals upon features of archaeological interest and whether there would be harmful effects on heritage assets. The proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to Policy CH/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007 that states archaeological sites will be protected in accordance with national policy and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
5. Notwithstanding the potentially valuable contribution that this application could make, in terms of helping to meet the current shortfall in housing land supply, the provision of 20 affordable dwellings, 28 allotments for the local community, a location with good transport links and a range of services, and the creation of jobs during the construction period that would benefit the local economy, it is considered that in this case, the presumption in favour of sustainable development should not weigh in

favour of this development, having regard to the landscape and visual amenity and archaeological heritage asset concerns set out above and elsewhere within this report.

Planning History

6. None.

National Guidance

7. National Planning Policy Framework
Planning Practice Guidance

Development Plan Policies

8. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy DPD 2007**
ST/2 Housing Provision
ST/5 Minor Rural Centres
9. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007**
DP/1 Sustainable Development
DP/2 Design of New Development
DP/3 Development Criteria
DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments
DP/7 Development Frameworks
HG/1 Housing Density
HG/2 Housing Mix
HG/3 Affordable Housing
NE/1 Energy Efficiency
NE/3 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development
NE/4 Landscape Character Areas
NE/6 Biodiversity
NE/11 Flood Risk
NE/12 Water Conservation
NE/14 Lighting Proposals
NE/15 Noise Pollution
NE/17 Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
CH/2 Archaeological Sites
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
10. **South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):**
Open Space in New Developments SPD - Adopted January 2009
Biodiversity SPD - Adopted July 2009
Trees & Development Sites SPD - Adopted January 2009
Landscape in New Developments SPD - Adopted March 2010
Affordable Housing SPD - Adopted March 2010
District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010
11. **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission - March 2014**
S/3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

S/4 Cambridge Green Belt
 S/5 Provision of New Jobs and Homes
 S/6 The Development Strategy to 2031
 S/7 Development Frameworks
 S/9 Minor Rural Centres
 SS/5 Waterbeach New Town
 HQ/1 Design Principles
 H/7 Housing Density
 H/8 Housing Mix
 H/9 Affordable Housing
 NH/2 Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character
 NH/3 Protecting Agricultural Land
 NH/4 Biodiversity
 NH/14 Heritage Assets
 CC/1 Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change
 CC/3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments
 CC/4 Sustainable Design and Construction
 CC/6 Construction Methods
 CC/9 Managing Flood Risk
 SC/6 Indoor Community Facilities
 SC/7 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments
 SC/8 Open Space Standards
 SC/10 Lighting Proposals
 SC/11 Noise Pollution
 TI/2 Planning for Sustainable Travel
 TI/3 Parking Provision
 TI/8 Infrastructure and New Developments

Consultation

12. **Linton Parish Council** – Recommends refusal. Comments relate to matters including lack of community consultation, outside the village framework, provision of allotments, unsustainable location, traffic, landscape and visual impact, social cohesion, flood risk and archaeology. Full comments are set out in Appendix 1.
13. **Urban Design Officer** – Comments as amended that the revised layout has addressed the concerns about the outlook of the 8 units adjacent to the allotments by turning the units to face each other. However, this has the disadvantage of removing any opportunities for natural surveillance across the parking area.
14. A Local Area of Play has now been added to the development. This is central and adjacent to the main route to the site but could be better laid out to promote more natural surveillance and to address the open space more positively.
15. The back-to-back distances between the new housing and existing neighbouring houses and houses east of the new access road do not appear to meet the separation distances set out in the Design Guide which suggests that this number of units may not be able to be accommodated on the site.
16. The cul-de-sac development is not permeable and any opportunities to establish new connections to neighbouring streets should be pursued.
17. **Landscape Design Officer** – Comments as amended that the character on this edge of Linton comprises of an open and gently rolling landscape with long views available both over lower land and to hills featuring wooded tops. Set above the Granta valley,

the village sits between the two. The eastern built edge, adjacent to the proposed site is made up of recent detached and semi-detached bungalows and houses at Lonsdale, Harefield Rise and Kenwood Gardens, forming a harsh edge to the village. However, the development site represents a potential opportunity to improve the eastern edge in this location if handled sensitively.

18. Whilst I am not content with the landscape structure and layout shown on the revised indicative masterplan, the site does have the potential to accommodate up to 50 dwellings. Hence, the proposal is accepted in landscape terms. However, to achieve the strong landscape structure required and as described in the LVIA, it would be necessary at the Reserved Matters stage to either adjust/amend the layout, the numbers or the type of some dwellings proposed.
19. Should the development be built as the illustrative layout suggests, it has the potential to cause unacceptable landscape and visual effects. The indicative layout proposed shows a more extensive and intrusive edge than presently formed by the dwellings at Lonsdale and the adjacent bungalows at Harefield Rise, Kenwood Gardens and The Ridgeway.
20. To achieve a strong rural edge and appropriate tree planting across the site, more space for planting will be needed. I suggest that a minimum of a 5 metre strip of Landscape will be required to allow a substantial native hedge, space for trees to achieve a reasonable spread without affecting the proposed dwellings or the existing power lines, and space for maintenance access. This planting should be set within communal or public space rather than within rear gardens to ensure that the planting is managed as a whole, and will continue to receive maintenance and protection after the standard condition for a five-year maintenance period has elapsed.
21. **Ecology Officer** – Comments that the application is supported by an ecological assessment that has not identified any significant constraints to the development of an area of arable land enclosed by species poor hedgerows and grass margins. Of note from the assessment is a habitat suitable for reptiles associated with field margins such as the common lizard. Requests a reptile survey and mitigation measures if any are present on the site. Also should trees with the potential for bat roosts be removed or badger setts identified, there should be bat and badger surveys with mitigation measures.
22. The Landscape Plan identifies new planting and allotments that will bring biodiversity gain. However, consideration should be given to a wildflower buffer adjacent the hedges to avoid future lowering of hedges and trees due to shading. The landscape buffer along the boundary should be over 5 metres wide to deliver a greater variety of trees and shrubs. Questions whether the open plot in the south eastern corner could be planted as a community orchard. Requests conditions to control the removal of vegetation during the bird breeding season and ecological enhancement measures in accordance with the recommendations in the submitted report.
23. **Local Highways Authority** – Has no objections subject to conditions in relation to vehicular visibility splays and a traffic management plan. Requests a separate plan to show the visibility splays.
24. **Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Team** – Has no objections subject to widening of the footway on the south side of Horseheath Road in the vicinity of Lonsdale between its termination point opposite Wheatsheaf Way and the site boundary to 2m in width; the installation of dropped crossings with tactile paving at the crossing over Horseheath Road near to Wheatsheaf Way; the

installation of dropped crossings with tactile paving at the crossings over Lonsdale, Wheatsheaf Way, Keene Fields and the Library access road; the installation of 10 cycle parking Sheffield stands at locations to be agreed with CCC and Linton Parish Council; and a condition for a full travel plan. Requests that should this application and application reference S/1963/15/OL be approved, a contribution would be required towards an improvement of the junction with the A1307 and Linton Village College as a result of the cumulative impact of the developments. Also requires a parking/ traffic study for the High Street to identify ways to reduce delays to buses and contributions towards such measures.

25. **Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team** – Comments as amended that the planning agents have been aware of the need for pre-determination evaluation of this land parcel since 2012, owing to the presence of Saxon cemetery evidence immediately south of the proposal area and other archaeological activity in the vicinity of the site.
26. The recent submission of geophysical survey evidence for this plot presents new information for a field within which no archaeological evidence was previously known, though suspected to be present. The survey has yielded important new evidence of a ring ditch of what can easily be attributed to a barrow, or burial monument in the south-east corner of the site, 100m north of the Saxon cemetery. These monuments are typically, though not exclusively, Bronze Age in date and contain inhumations and/or cremation burials usually within the enclosed space, and sometimes within their ditches. They are occasionally used as boundary markers or moots in later periods (typically in the Saxon period).
27. Further to this are a number of linear features, some of which have been described as relating to cultivation remains (eg ridge and furrow of Medieval and later date), and ephemeral linears, not easily attributable to any specific function, but supposed to be field drains and boundaries that conform to trends showing on an Enclosure map of 1838. Other traces of linear and discrete features are present but have not been discussed and remain untested.
28. Both CgMs Consulting, the applicant's archaeological consultant, and the geophysical specialist, Headland Archaeology, have concluded that this survey data represents the sum total of archaeological presence in the plot. To aid this interpretation, CgMs cite recent work at Bartlow Road (S/1963/15, Historic Environment Record ref ECB4331), where geophysical survey data had also asserted that the sum total of archaeological evidence at that site in Linton surmounted to a few linear ditches. Evaluation evidence amended and augmented this understanding in revealing the presence of at least one early Saxon house ('sunken floored building') and associated features in the north west corner of that development area (to the south of Bartlow Rd) as well as a series of undated features located on the edge of relict channels and ponds in the floodplain of the River Granta at the southern end of the site, though this went unreported in the agent letter of 15 December 2015 and other submissions.
29. It is disappointing to be presented once again with assertions that geophysical survey evidence is an accurate and true depiction of all the archaeological remains of an area, when there are so many cases that simply deny this as fact. For example, detailed geophysical surveys that have been undertaken across the landscape of the new settlement area of Northstowe in the north western area of South Cambridgeshire demonstrate this clearly as factually incorrect.
30. This is not to say that the geophysics data does not provide a certain level of archaeological understanding, indeed this office holds much store by this non-

intrusive technique - but we advise that it is used as part of a suite of evaluation techniques that together provide the evidence required on which to base a sound planning decision. Excavations of part of the Phase 1 development area concluded at Northstowe in late autumn 2015, finding extensive Middle Bronze Age field systems (large ditched rectangular or square enclosures) and occupation evidence, Iron age and Roman settlement evidence and cemetery, and discrete areas of Saxon settlement, including a cemetery area of small barrows and flat graves. The Middle Bronze Age evidence, together with the Roman cemetery and all of the Saxon archaeology did not show in geophysical survey data at all - only late prehistoric and Roman settlement features, Medieval ridge and furrow and more recent field boundaries and drains.

31. In other words, robust linear features of the Iron Age and Roman settlement were evident (i.e. with 'dirty' humic fills with artefacts and charcoal present) on the survey plots but none of the discrete and ephemeral features that constitute settlement and funerary evidence (shallow cuts, usually non-humic), and interestingly not the huge, long-distance triple ditches of a Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age boundary division ("territory marker"?).
32. It is unlikely that planning inspectors, when reading appellants' cases for commuting archaeological pre-determination recommendations, are aware of the scale, extent and significance of archaeological evidence found by post consent trench based evaluation and are unfamiliar with the viability tests then put in place by developers when needing to include hitherto unplanned archaeological investigation programmes and publications within their already constrained financial forecasts. It is not helpful, then, that CgMs Consulting and the applicant have presented results for planning cases for which archaeological programmes have been moved to being undertaken post-consent by a planning appeal, without also indicating what was later found on those sites and how this affected the financing and timetabling of the scheme.
33. This stance is neither helpful to applicant, developer or planning committees. Neither does it help this office in advising the LPA as to the best course for the management of the archaeological resource through the planning process. We are presently far away from understanding the character, complexity and significance of the new ring ditch/barrow and its broader landscape, let alone what the more ephemeral evidence on the geophysical survey actually represents and what more evidence the site may hold that would not be evident on a non-intrusive survey plot.
34. Lastly, and importantly, the suggested strategy of placing allotments over a burial site, surcharged or otherwise, is wholly inappropriate as this would not safeguard against future impacts, damage and destruction of human remains and funerary evidence. Allotments holders usually wish to have mains water supplies to their rented or owned holdings, and/or may 'double dig' as a horticultural device should soil improvement be needed. Where human remains can be expected on an archaeological site, as they would be within a barrow, they are to be treated with appropriate respect, an exhumation licence being obtained and the area worked by professional excavators to lift, study and store or rebury any such remains as of if they are encountered. This is unlikely to occur in an allotment which would probably see a rotation of part-time/rented land holders without an appropriate signed legal document outlining for this to occur. Ignorance of the presence of human remains would not be a realistic excuse.
35. Given the potential for:
 - * Saxon settlement and/or further funerary evidence to be located in this plot;
 - * the new barrow/funerary monument

- * the lack of evidence regarding soil depths over archaeological remains
- * the unknown condition, character and significance of the monument
- * unknown archaeological character of the rest of the site

it is advised that the results of a trench-based field evaluation should be presented prior to a planning decision being reached so that unassailable evidence is used to provide the basis for both a planning determination and the design of an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy.

36. **Cambridgeshire County Council Flood & Water Team** – Comments as amended that the applicant has now demonstrated that surface water can be dealt with on site by infiltration into the ground or discharge into the River Granta at a run off rate not greater than the existing by using SUDS features such as permeable paving, infiltration trenches and soakaways. The applicant has there met the minimum requirements of the NPPF and no objections are raised subject to a condition to agree a detailed surface water drainage scheme that includes a restriction run-off, infiltration testing and maintenance of the drainage scheme.
37. **Environment Agency** – Has no objections as amended subject to a condition in relation to a scheme for surface water disposal. Comments that although the site lies above a principal aquifer within source protection zone 2, the proposal is not considered to be high risk in relation to contamination. Requests informatives.
38. **Anglian Water** – Comments that the sewerage system at present has available capacity for foul drainage flows from the development. Further comments that the drainage of surface water to the public water system is not acceptable as it is the last option after firstly infiltration on site and secondly discharges to a watercourse. Requires a surface water drainage scheme condition to ensure the development would not result in an increase in the risk of flooding.
39. **Environmental Health Officer** – Has no objections subject to conditions in relation to the hours of construction works and construction related deliveries to and from the site, a programme of measures to minimise the spread of dust, external lighting and a waste management strategy.
40. **Contaminated Land Officer** – Comments that the site is being redeveloped into a sensitive end use (housing) and although the site does not appear to be high risk in terms of contamination, it is a large site and potential sources of contamination on agricultural land do exist. Requests a Phase 1 Study to determine whether the site is suitable for its proposed end use. This should include soil sampling in proposed garden areas. Requires a condition for the detailed investigation of contamination and remedial measures for the removal of any contamination found.
41. **Air Quality Officer** – Has no objections providing the source of energy to the site is not by biomass boiler.
42. **Environmental Health Officer** – Comments that the identification and assessment of the health impacts of the development are satisfactory in the revised Health Impact Assessment.
43. **Affordable Housing Officer** – Comments that the site is located outside the development framework, and should be treated as an exception site and developed for 100% affordable housing to meet the local housing need of Linton, in accordance with Policy H/10 of the Local Plan. However, if this site is not treated as an exception site, then 40% affordable housing should be provided as part of this development in accordance with policy H/9. Therefore, for this proposal of 50 dwellings, (up to) 20

affordable properties should be provided.

44. Our district wide policy for tenure split is 70/30 in favour of rented and not 50/50 as proposed by the developer. There are currently 1,600 applicants registered on the Homelink housing register in South Cambs who require good quality affordable housing, 65 of these applicants have a local connection to Linton. The highest demand both in Linton and across South Cambridgeshire is for 1 and 2 bedroom accommodation. Therefore, our preferred mix is:

Rented	Intermediate/Shared Ownership
5 x 1 beds	3 x 2 beds
6 x 2 beds	3 x 3 beds
3 x 3 beds	

45. **Section 106 Officer** – Comments as amended that a Local Equipped Area of Play has been provided on site to address the need for children’s play space and informal open space. Off-site contributions are required towards outdoor sports and indoor community space projects as identified by Linton Parish Council.
46. **Cambridgeshire County Council Growth Team** – Comments that there are sufficient early years, primary and secondary education places available to accommodate the development. Requires a libraries and life long learning contribution towards the reorganisation of the layout of Linton library to enable extra shelving and resources to serve the additional residents. Requires a strategic waste contribution towards an expansion in the capacity of the Thriplow Household Recycling Centre if 5 contributions have not been pooled.
47. **NHS England** – Comments that there is currently GP capacity in the Linton locality and is not requesting any contributions towards health.

Representations

48. **90 letters of objection have been received from local residents** in relation to the application. They raise the following concerns: -
- i) Outside village envelope and in the countryside.
 - ii) Adverse impact upon landscape setting of village due to level changes in area.
 - iii) Visual impact on view approaching the village from the east.
 - iv) Impact upon historic character of village.
 - iv) Scale of development in a Minor Rural Centre where maximum allowance is 30 dwellings- suburban sprawl- smaller infill developments should be encouraged.
 - v) Cumulative impact of development with proposal at Bartlow Road.
 - vi) Would set a precedent for future developments around the village.
 - vii) Increase in traffic on to the A1307 at a dangerous junction and through the village.
 - viii) Access point on to Horseheath Road where traffic speeds are high.
 - ix) Safety of pedestrians along footways in village.
 - x) Distance from services in village and lack of parking.
 - xi) Flood risk.
 - xii) Impact upon sewers.
 - xiii) Loss of agricultural land.
 - xiv) High density development.
 - xv) Design at odds with Linton traditions.
 - xvi) Village infrastructure inadequate- schools, health centre, shops, public transport, employment.
 - xv) Lack of on-site parking.

- xvi) Traffic pollution.
 - xvii) Poor consultation – the whole village should have been notified of the development.
 - xviii) The applicants would not develop the land and the plans could be different.
 - xix) Inadequate reports supporting the application.
 - xx) Glebe land cannot be sold for profit.
49. **Two letters of support have been received from local residents** in relation to the application. They raise the following points: -
- i) Retention of a green space between the village and the A1307.
 - ii) Much needed market and affordable housing.
 - iii) Allotments to serve the village.
50. **The Headteachers of Linton Heights Junior School and Linton Infants School** are concerned about the impact upon the schools. The Junior School is a tired and unsuitable building. There is not enough space to house the current pupils so for a number of years a temporary portacabin has been used as a classroom. Any increase in children would require significant improvements. The Infant School has had a number of alterations over the years and is at maximum capacity in terms of the hall and toilets and in order to offer a quality education, 4 of 6 classrooms are undersized. Neither school would be able to welcome new families moving into the area.
51. **Chair Linton Village College Governors** – Comments that the County Council assessment in relation to the capacity of Linton Village College (LVC) to take more students is correct. However, this is based upon the designated feeder schools only and the following points should be noted: -
- i) LVC is an Academy and makes its own admissions policy;
 - ii) LVC is oversubscribed. The PAN for 2016/17 is 165 students. 180 have been accepted and there is a waiting list of around 40.
 - iii) LVC has historically admitted 20% of students from outside the catchment area and mostly in Suffolk.
 - iv) LVC has recently expanded its catchment to include some primary schools in Essex. This is because of the expansion of Saffron Walden and that the County High can no longer guarantee places.
 - v) LVC is an OFSTED rated Outstanding school- it has been and is oversubscribed. As the Multi Academy Trust expands, there have been three new applications from primary schools, one in Suffolk. This means that there is pressure to give priority for admissions to members of the Trust.
- Many of these points have not been considered by the County Council and it is considered that the formula for calculating capacity is out of date and should not be given weight.
52. **The applicants** have outlined the following points in support of the application:
- i) The Diocese is a not-for-profit organisation, whose income is devoted to supporting its approx.180 priests in South Cambridgeshire and elsewhere in the Diocese who provide considerable community support alongside their religious activities.
 - ii) In keeping with the community status, we aim to be responsible developers.
 - iii) We propose the full 40% allocation to affordable housing.
 - iv) We are proposing 30 allotments to meet the need we identified when we spoke to the village.
 - v) We will build a mix of houses to suit local needs if approval is granted.
 - vi) We have only had five comments from members of the public and two were enquiring how they could buy the houses.

- vii) The site is not in the Green Belt.
- viii) The current lack of a 5 year housing land supply justifies granting approval.

- 53. The applicants challenge the requirement for a trench based evaluation required by Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team prior to the determination of the application on two grounds. Firstly, this would be impractical because the crops have to be safeguarded. Secondly the additional financial cost associated with an archaeological evaluation would be very expensive and the owner is a Charity and mindful of costs. A condition of Section 106 agreement is requested to address this issue as an alternative.
- 54. The benefits of the development are considered to point towards consent on land use grounds. Reference is made to the conclusion of Lord Keith's peroration in the British Railways Boards case "the function of the planning authority is to decide whether or not the development is desirable in the public interest...but there is no absolute rule that the existence of difficulties, even if apparently insuperable, must necessarily lead to refusal of planning permission for a desirable development". Our archaeologist's opinion is that there will be abundant space for up to 50 dwellings and Inspectors have determined at appeals at Corhampton and Clerkenwell that a condition is considered appropriate.
- 55. The applicants have brought officer attention to a site at Love Farm in St Neots where the Cambridgeshire County Council requested an archaeological evaluation prior to determination of the application. In this case, the officer considered that a condition was suitable.

Site and Surroundings

- 56. The site is located outside of the Linton village framework and in the countryside. It is situated to the north east of the village and is an L shaped parcel of arable land that measures approximately 2.88 hectares in area. There is currently landscaping along the majority of the northern, western and southern boundaries. The eastern boundary is open. Residential developments lie to the south and west. A dwelling lies to the north. A public footpath lies to the north east. A hedge and public footpath lie to the east with open agricultural land and the A1307 road beyond.
- 57. The site is situated within the East Anglian Chalk Landscape Character Area on grade 3 (good to moderate) agricultural land. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). No. 28 Horseheath Road is a grade II listed building that lies approximately 150 metres to the west of the site. The Linton conservation area lies 500 metres to the west.

Proposal

- 58. The proposal as amended seeks outline permission for a residential development on the site of up to 50 dwellings and 28 allotments. The access, layout, design and external appearance, and landscaping are matters reserved for later approval.
- 59. 20 of the dwellings would be affordable in nature. The mix would be 2 x one bedroom houses, 8 x 2 bedroom houses and 10 x 3 bedroom houses. The tenure would be 50% social rented and 50% intermediate. The remaining 30 dwellings would be available for sale on the open market. The mix would be 10 x two bedroom houses, 10 x 3 bedroom houses and 10 x 4 bedroom houses (should the site be capable of accommodating 50 dwellings).
- 60. The development is intended to be predominantly two-storeys in height with a small

number of single storey bungalows. There would be and a range of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties arranged around a main spine road and offset. A Local Equipped Area of Play has been provided within the northern part of the development and 28 allotments would be provided to the south east.

61. The allotments would be for community use.

Planning Assessment

Housing Land Supply

62. 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.
63. 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.
64. Further guidance as to which policies should be considered as 'relevant policies for the supply of housing' emerged from a recent Court of Appeal decision (Richborough v Cheshire East and Suffolk Coastal DC v Hopkins Homes). The Court defined 'relevant policies for the supply of housing' widely so not to be restricted '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,' but also 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 (if any) weight should attach to such relevant policies.
65. 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 and adopted policies DP/1, DP/7, CH/2 and NE/17 of the adopted Development Control Policies. Policies S/7, S/9 and NH/3 of the draft Local Plan are also material considerations but are also considered to be relevant (draft) policies for the supply of housing.
66. 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).

Principle of development

67. The site is located outside the Linton village framework and in the countryside where Policy DP/7 of the LDF and Policy S/7 of the Draft Local Plan states that only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted. The erection of a residential development of up to 50 dwellings is not therefore considered acceptable in principle. However, this policy is considered out of date due to the current lack of a 5 year housing land supply.
68. Linton is identified as a Minor Rural Centre under Policy ST/5 of the LDF and Policy S/8 of the emerging Local Plan where there is a reasonable range of services and facilities and residential developments of up to 30 dwellings are supported in policy terms. The erection of a residential development of up to 50 dwellings would therefore not under normal circumstances be considered acceptable in principle. However, this policy is considered out of date due to the current lack of a 5 year housing land supply as set out below.

Deliverability

69. There are known technical constraints to the site's delivery. Officers are therefore of the view that the site may not be delivered within a timescale whereby significant weight can be given to the contribution the proposal could make to the 5 year housing land supply.

Sustainability of development

70. The NPPF states that there are 3 dimensions to sustainable development, economic, social and environmental. The aspects are considered in the assessment of highlighted issues below.

Scale of Development

71. This proposal for 50 dwellings (along with the proposal under planning application S/1963/15/OL for 78 dwellings and which remains undetermined) would result in a total of 128 new dwellings within Linton. Given the current lack of a 5 year housing land supply and the fact that policy ST/5 is out of date, a judgement needs to be made as to whether the scale of the development is acceptable for this location in terms of the size of the village and the sustainability of the location.
72. The Services and Facilities Study 2013 states that in mid 2012 Linton had an estimated population of 4,530 and a dwelling stock of 1,870. It is one of the larger villages in the district. An additional 128 dwellings would increase the number of dwellings by 7%. This is not considered to be out of scale and character with the size of the village.
73. Whilst it is acknowledged that the most preferable location for development is first on the edge of the city of Cambridge and secondly in Rural Centres, it is considered that Linton is a sustainable location to accommodate increased housing development. The Services and Facilities Study 2013 identifies a wide range of services and facilities in the village that include a secondary school, junior school, infant school, health centre, dentist, post office, 4 food stores plus a small supermarket, other services such as hairdressers, florists etc., 3 public houses, a village hall and 3 other community centres, a recreation ground and a bus route to Cambridge and Haverhill with a service every 30 minutes during the day Mondays to Saturdays and hourly on

Sundays.

74. The majority of the services and facilities are located on the High Street. The site is situated on the edge of the village at a distance of approximately 800 metres from the shops and 600 metres from the nearest bus stop. There is an existing public footway up to the western boundary of the site that would ensure that there is convenient accessibility by walking and cycling to the centre of the village.
75. The village is ranked at jointly at No. 6 in the Village Classification Report 2012 in terms of access to transport, secondary education, village services and facilities and employment. It only falls below the Rural Centres that have slighter better accessibility to public transport. Given the above assessment, the future occupiers of the development would not be wholly dependent upon the private car to meet their day-to-day needs and wider needs could be served by public transport. Linton is therefore considered a sustainable location for a development of this scale and the weight associated with Policies DP/7 and ST/5 is limited and not considered to outweigh the need for housing.
76. In contrast, it should be noted that Waterbeach has a significantly lower score and has been considered sustainable for a greater number of dwellings.

Character and Appearance of the Area

77. The site is currently a piece of arable land that is located outside the Linton village framework and in the countryside. It forms part of the landscape setting and sensitive settlement edge to the village. These are important material planning considerations.
78. The site is situated within the East Anglian Chalk Landscape Character Area and the landscape character of the site and its immediate surrounding are typical of East Anglian Chalk comprising large agricultural fields separated by clipped hedges, set in an open and gently rolling landscape, with long views available both over lower land and to hills featuring wooded tops. The development would result in the introduction of development in an area that is currently undeveloped, and given the site characteristics and landscape setting, development of the scale proposed has the potential to result in a loss of openness to the countryside and landscape and visual harm. The application has been submitted in outline with all matters reserved, including layout. However, the submission expressly seeks formal consent for up to 50 dwellings at a sensitive edge of settlement location within undulating landscape topography. Given the landscape and visual amenity characteristics and context of the site, and notwithstanding the fact that detailed matters such as layout and scale are currently reserved, the Local Planning Authority does not consider that the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that a development of up to 50 dwellings can be accommodated on the site without causing harm to the landscape and visual amenities of the area. It is considered that a comprehensive scheme of structured landscape planting, combined with a design-led approach to the development of this site is essential, and this would be highly likely to encroach into the developable area of the site and compromise the ability to accommodate 50 dwellings. The Local Planning Authority therefore considers that a development of 50 dwellings would be likely to exert a harmful effect on the landscape and visual amenities of the area, contrary to Policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3 and NE/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD, 2007. Policy DP/1 is considered to relate to the supply of housing, and is therefore considered as being out of date. However, one of the aims of the policy is the need to conserve and if possible enhance local character, which is supported by the aims of the NPPF, and Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the adopted LDF. Policies DP/2 and DP/3 are not considered to be

housing supply policies and are not therefore considered to be out of date. Officers are of the view that considerable weight can therefore be given to Policy DP/1.

79. The Landscape Design Officer has also expressed concerns about the landscape structure and layout shown on the indicative masterplan, and in the absence of detail to demonstrate otherwise the Local Planning Authority considers that a development of the scale formally proposed at this location would have harmful effects on the landscape character and visual amenity of the settlement edge.

Housing Density

80. The site measures 2.24 hectares in area (net). The erection of up to 50 dwellings would equate to a maximum of 22 dwellings per hectare. Whilst this density would be below the requirement of at least 40 dwellings per hectare for sustainable villages such as Linton under Policy HG1 of the LDF, the sensitive nature of the site on the edge of the village and need for comprehensive landscaping dictates that a lower density of development is both reasonable and necessary for this particular site. This policy can be given considerable weight as the development may compromise local character.

Affordable Housing

81. 20 of the 50 dwellings (or pro rata) would be affordable to meet local needs. This would comply with the requirement for 40% of the development to be affordable housing as set out in Policy HG/3 of the LDF and Policy H/8 of the emerging Local Plan to assist with meeting the identified local housing need across the district. However, the proposed mix of 2 x one bedroom houses, 8 x 2 bedroom houses and 10 x 3 bedroom houses and the tenure mix of 50% rented and 50% intermediate is not agreed. Given that the application is currently at outline stage only, it is considered that the exact mix and tenure of the affordable dwellings could be agreed at the reserved matters stage.

Housing Mix

82. The remaining 30 dwellings would be available for sale on the open market. The proposed mix of 10 x two bedroom houses (33.3%), 10 x 3 bedroom houses (33.3%) and 10 x 4 bedroom houses (33.3%) would comply with Policy HG/2 of the LDF that requires a mix of units providing accommodation in a range of types, sizes and affordability, to meet local needs and H/8 of the emerging Local Plan that requires market homes in developments of 10 or more homes will consist of at least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes, at least 30% 3 bedroom homes, at least 30% 4 or more bedroom homes with a 10% flexibility allowance that can be added.

Developer Contributions

83. Appendix 2 provides details of the developer contribution required to make the development acceptable in planning terms in accordance with Policy DP/4 of the LDF band paragraph 204 of the NPPF. The applicants have agreed to these contributions in addition to the contributions required as a result of the cumulative impact of this development and the proposal under reference S/1969/15/OL.
84. Members will note that the Cambridgeshire County Council Growth Team consider there is sufficient early years, primary and secondary school capacity but that this is contested by the Headteachers of both the local Junior and Infants schools. The comments of the Headteachers of the Junior and Infants Schools and the Governors

of Linton Village College are noted. Whilst the schools are well attended Cambridgeshire County Council Growth Team has advised that in-catchment demand indicates there is sufficient capacity to accommodate new development (although any further future development beyond these sites may see this position reviewed). In effect the schools fill with out-of-catchment pupils, who in future would be accommodated in their local catchment. The Council would have no basis on which to seek education contributions, that would be CIL compliant.

85. NHS England considers there is sufficient GP capacity to support the development.

Design Considerations

86. The application is currently at outline stage only. All matters in terms of access to the site, the layout of the site, scale, external appearance and landscaping are reserved for later approval.
87. The amended indicative layout shows a an L shaped cul-de-sac development with a linear pattern of dwellings together with small groups of two dwellings arranged around shared driveways on the western part of the site. 8 dwellings and 28 allotments for community use are shown on the south eastern part of the site. A Local Area of Equipped Play is provided alongside the main access road on the northern part of the site close to the entrance to the development. The application has been submitted in outline with all matters reserved, including layout. However, the submission expressly seeks formal consent for up to 50 dwellings. The application site comprises a sensitive edge of settlement location within undulating landscape topography. Given the landscape and visual amenity characteristics and context of the site, the Local Planning Authority does not consider that the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that a development of up to 50 dwellings can be accommodated on the site without causing harm to the landscape and visual amenities of the area. It is considered that a comprehensive scheme of structured landscape planting, combined with a design-led approach to the development of this site is essential, and this would be highly likely to encroach into the developable area of the site and compromise the ability to accommodate 50 dwellings. The Local Planning Authority therefore considers that a development of 50 dwellings would be likely to exert a harmful effect on the landscape and visual amenities of the area. The weight associated with this is assessed, on balance, against the delivery of housing.

Trees/ Landscaping

88. The proposal would not result in the loss of any important trees and hedges that significantly contribute towards the visual amenity of the area. The majority of the trees and hedges along the northern, southern and western boundaries of the site that are in a good condition would be retained and protected.
89. The development is therefore capable of complying with adopted policies DP/2 and DP/3 in relation to the safeguarding of existing planting and natural landscape features.

Biodiversity

90. The site is dominated by arable land and is surrounded by species poor hedgerows/trees and grass margins. It is considered to have a low ecological value but the margins could provide habitats for reptiles and badgers and the trees could have bat roosts. Conditions would be attached to any consent for resurveying the site for reptiles, badgers and bats prior to the commencement of any development and

ecological enhancements such as bird and bat boxes in accordance with the recommendations of the submitted report and the provisions of policy NE/6.

Highway Safety and Sustainable Travel

91. Horseheath Road leads from the centre of the village to the A1307 (Cambridge to Haverhill Road). It has a speed limit of 30 miles per hour from the village to the point at the entrance to the site where it changes to 60 miles per hour.
92. The development would result in a significant increase in the level of traffic in the area. However, no objections have been raised by Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Team in relation to the impact of the development upon the capacity and functioning of the public highway. The proposal would not therefore be detrimental to highway safety.
93. The access width of the main road into the site at 5.5 metres would accommodate two-way traffic into the site and would be acceptable. The 2.0 metres footpaths on each side are adequate and would provide safe pedestrian movements. The proposed vehicular visibility splays of 2.4 metres x 90 metres to the west and 2.4 x 215 to the west are acceptable. The access would therefore accord with Local Highways Authority standards.
94. There is a bus stop on the High Street approximately 600 metres to the west of the site. This gives direct public transport access to Cambridge and Haverhill by a 30 minute service Monday to Saturdays. This is accessible by walking via a public footpath along the southern and northern side of Horseheath Road. A Section 106 legal agreement would be required to secure the provision of a 2 metre wide footway along the south side of Horseheath Road to connect to the existing footpath and dropped crossings with tactile paving across Horseheath Road and Lonsdale, Wheatsheaf Way, Keene Fields and the library access road. It is also accessible by cycling and has cycle parking available. A section 106 legal agreement would be required to secure further cycle parking in the village.
95. The Transport Statement commits to the provision of a travel plan to encourage the use of alternative modes of transport other than the private motor vehicle for occupiers of the new dwellings prior to occupation. Measures include the appointment of a travel plan co-ordinator and the provision of information packs to new residents. However, further details are required and a full travel plan would need to be submitted following first occupation of the dwellings. These would be conditions of any consent.
96. The development therefore has the potential to comply with the requirements of adopted policies DP/3, DP/4, TR/1, TR/2 and TR/3

Flood Risk

97. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). The River Granta is the most significant watercourse in the area that is located 350 metres to the south of the site. There are no other notable watercourses within the vicinity of the site. A small part of the south western corner of the site is subject to surface water flooding (low risk). There would be no material conflict with adopted policy NE/11.
98. The surface water drainage system would comprise SUDS in the form of infiltration systems such as soakaways to accommodate surface water from a 1 in 100 year storm event plus climate change. The design of the surface water drainage system would be agreed through a condition attached to any consent along with the

management and maintenance of the system.

Neighbour Amenity

99. Whilst it is acknowledged that there would be a change in the use of the land from an open field to residential dwellings, the development is not considered to result in a significant level of noise and disturbance that would adversely affect the amenities of neighbours. A condition would be attached to any consent in relation to the hours of use of power operated machinery during construction and construction related deliveries to minimise the noise impact upon neighbours.
100. The impact of the development itself on neighbours in terms of mass, light and overlooking will be considered at the reserved matters stage. It is noted that the land falls southwards. As such the development is capable of being in compliance with policy DP/3.

Heritage Assets

101. The County Council's Historic Environment Team has provided an in depth consultation response. The site is located within an area of high archaeological potential due to the number of heritage assets in the area recovered from previous developments. A geophysical survey has been submitted that provides new evidence from the development site where no evidence was previously known but was suspected to be present. This shows that the site may have important archaeological features such as a Saxon settlement and/ or further funerary evidence and a new barrow/ funerary monument that need to be protected.
102. A trench based field evaluation is required to investigate this matter further and gain evidence of soil depths over archaeological remains, details of the condition, character and significance of the monument and archaeological character of the rest of the site to ensure that an appropriate mitigation strategy is planned that would ensure that any important archaeological features are not destroyed.
103. Critically, the view is taken that this is required prior to the determination of the application in case there are any areas that need to be retained in situ that may affect the number of dwellings that could be accommodated on the site.
104. Archaeological sites need to be protected in accordance with adopted policy CH/2. Whilst Policy CH/2 is considered to be a policy that restricts the supply of housing, and is therefore considered out of date, officers are of the view that significant weight can be given to Policy CH/2 in this case. The NPPF states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the positive contribution that their conservation can make to sustainable communities. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the asset or development within its setting. Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments should be subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.
105. The County Council's concerns are considered to be material and the significance of the archaeological potential of the site has been explained. There is no suggestion at present that field evaluation at this stage will prevent development in principle and its objection appears to be entirely reasonable. This objection weighs significantly

against the proposal at the present time.

106. Whilst the comments of the applicant in relation to the reasons why an archaeological evaluation cannot be carried out at this point in time are acknowledged, the comments of Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team are clear in that further works needs to be carried out to determine whether the site can accommodate up to 50 dwellings without harm to undesignated heritage assets. I have dealt with an application recently where an archaeological exclusion zone prevented development on a large part of the site following an evaluation. The details of the appeal examples referenced are not known in detail and each application needs to be determined upon its own merits. The application referenced in St Neots related to a significantly larger site and in that case, the officer considered that there was sufficient flexibility at the reserved matters stage to allow for the retention of any remains in situ without reducing the developable area. This case is not comparable. It is in the public interest to safeguard heritage assets and it therefore this matter has to be seriously considered in the balance of the application and the final recommendation in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF. It is considered that the weight associated with Policy CH/2 and paragraph 135 of the NPPF would outweigh the need for the delivery of housing in this case.
107. The site is located 150 metres from the nearest listed building at No. 28 Horseheath Road. The development is not considered to harm the setting of the listed building as it is limited to its immediate surroundings of existing residential development.
108. The site is located 500 metres from the boundary with the conservation area. The development is considered to preserve the setting of the conservation area given that there are no views of the site from the conservation area or views from the site to the conservation area and the increase in traffic through the village is not considered significant when taking into consideration the size of the village.
109. Thus the statutory requirements in sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 respect of listed buildings and conservation areas would be met as would compliance with adopted plan polices CH/4 and CH/5.

Other Matters

110. The development is not considered to result in a risk of contamination providing a condition is attached to any consent to control any contamination identified during the development.
111. The site is located on grade 3 (good to moderate) agricultural land. The development would result in the permanent loss of this agricultural land contrary to policy NE/17. However, this policy does not apply where land is allocated for development in the LDF or sustainability considerations and the need for the development are sufficient to override the need to protect the agricultural use of the land. In this case, this is considered satisfactory given the absence of up-to-date policies for the supply of housing in the district. Therefore, limited weight can be attached to this policy.
112. The lack of any employment within the proposal is not a planning consideration in this particular case as the site is not located within any designated employment area.
113. Whilst the need for allotments in the village is noted, there is no policy requirement for the provision of allotments within developments. The provision of 28 allotments would, however, make some contribution to the identified need. Any application for

development of the allotments in the future would be determined upon its own merits.

114. The documents submitted with the application are sufficient to determine the application. A heritage statement is not required as the development is not considered to affect the setting of the conservation area or listed buildings. A summary of public consultation is satisfactory. The application form has been corrected.
115. The lack of consultation with the local community is regrettable as this is encouraged by the Council but would not warrant refusal of the application.
116. The ownership of the land is not a planning consideration that can be taken into account in the determination of the application.

Conclusion

117. In considering this application, the following relevant adopted Core Strategy and Development Plan policies are to be regarded as out of date while there is no five year housing land supply:
118. Core Strategy
ST/2: Housing Provision
ST/5: Minor Rural Centres
119. Development Plan
DP/1: Sustainable Development
DP/7: Village Frameworks
HG/1: Housing Density
HG/2: Housing Mix
CH/2: Archaeological Sites
120. 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.
121. This report sets out that the scale of development proposed (50 dwellings) would be likely to have a harmful effect on the landscape character and visual amenities of the sensitive settlement edge. Moreover, insufficient evidence has been submitted to determine the likely impact of the development proposals on heritage assets. In combination, these two material considerations weigh significantly against supporting the application proposals, despite the shortfall in housing land supply and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
122. These adverse impacts must be weighed against the following benefits of the development:
 - i) The positive contribution to be made by the application towards increasing housing land supply in the district based on the objectively assessed 19,500 dwellings target set out in the SHMA and the method of calculation and buffer identified by the Inspector.
 - ii) The provision of 28 allotments for community use.
 - iii) Developer contributions towards public open space and community facilities in The village.
 - iv) Suitable and sustainable location for this scale of residential development given the position of the site in relation to access to public transport, services and facilities and local employment.

- v) Improvement of footpath along southern side of Horseheath Road
- vi) Upgrade of crossing points
- vii) Employment during construction to benefit the local economy.
- viii) Greater use of local services and facilities to contribute to the local economy.

123. Overall it is considered that the landscape and visual amenity and heritage asset concerns set out within this report are sufficient to demonstrate that the application proposals do not constitute sustainable development.
124. Whilst it is acknowledged that the policies for the determination of housing in the adopted Development are out-of-date, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits offered by this application.

Recommendation

125. It is recommended that the Planning Committee refuses the application for the following reasons: -
- (1) Insufficient information has been submitted in relation to the impact of the proposal upon features of archaeological interest to demonstrate that the proposal could be accommodated on the site without harm to heritage assets. The proposal cannot be supported until the results of a trench-based field evaluation have been carried out prior to approval being granted. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CH/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007 that states archaeological sites will be protected in accordance with national policy and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 that states the effect of the proposal upon the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account when determining an application having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
 - (2) The application has been submitted in outline with all matters reserved, including layout. However, the submission expressly seeks formal consent for up to 50 dwellings. The application site comprises a sensitive edge of settlement location within undulating landscape topography. Given the landscape and visual amenity characteristics and context of the site the Local Planning Authority does not consider that the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that a development of up to 50 dwellings can be accommodated on the site without causing harm to the landscape and visual amenities of the area. It is considered that a comprehensive scheme of structured landscape planting, combined with a design-led approach to the development of this site is essential, and this would be highly likely to encroach into the developable area of the site and compromise the ability to accommodate 50 dwellings. The Local Planning Authority therefore considers that a development of 50 dwellings would be likely to exert a harmful effect on the landscape and visual amenities of the area, contrary to Policies DP/1, DP/2, DP/3 and NE/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD, 2007 and the adopted Design Guide.

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 Development Control Policies DPD 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission 2014
- Planning File References: S/1969/15/OL and S/1963/15/OL

Report Author:

Karen Pell-Coggins
Telephone Number:

Principal Planning Officer
01954 713230