

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

7 September 2016

AUTHOR/S: Head of Development Management

Application Number:	S/1963/15/OL
Parish(es):	Linton
Proposal:	Outline application for residential development of up to 55 Houses
Site address:	Land North and South of Bartlow Road
Applicant(s):	Pembroke College, University of Cambridge and G W Balaam & Sons Ltd.
Recommendation:	Delegated Approval
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:	6 September 2016
Departure Application:	Yes
Presenting Officer:	Karen Pell-Coggins, Principal Planning Officer
Application brought to Committee because:	The officer recommendation conflicts with the recommendation of Linton Parish Council and the development would represent a departure to the Local Development Framework
Date by which decision due:	9 September 2016 (Extension of Time)

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 (i) its size and (ii) its out of village framework location. However, the Council acknowledges at present it cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and so our housing supply policies must be considered out of date. In light of a recent High Court decision, the Local Planning Authority must determine the appropriate weight to apply to out of date policies relevant to their planning function. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and as such policies that seek to guide development to the most sustainable locations have a clear planning function. Where relevant policies are out of date, the NPPF says that planning permission should be granted for development unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

2. In light of the lack of five-year housing land supply and having regard to recent local appeal decisions, the rural settlement policies are considered to continue to have significant weight in the determination of planning applications adjacent to or within close proximity to village frameworks. This will help ensure that development proposals outside and in close proximity to village frameworks have due regard to the availability of an appropriate level of services, facilities, employment and sustainable transport options. For Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, subject to all other relevant material considerations, it is considered that there is a case to be made that conflict with those policies should not be given significant weight, under the circumstances of a lack of five-year housing supply. Subject to other material considerations, this would mean in principle that the Council may grant permission for development in and adjacent to our larger villages. This is in the context of paragraph 14 of the NPPF and the test that permission should be granted unless there would be evidence of significant harm. This is consistent with local appeal decisions in this category of village since the lack of five-year supply.
3. The development would have some visual impact upon the landscape setting and setting of listed buildings of the village. However, it is considered that the landscape impact is limited and can be successfully mitigated as part of the outline application and the preservation of the setting of listed buildings can be achieved through the design of the development at the reserved matters stage.
4. These limited adverse impacts must be weighed against the benefits of the positive contribution of up to 55 dwellings towards the 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, the provision of 40% affordable homes, developer contributions towards sport space, children's play space, community facilities in the village and improvements to traffic schemes in the village, employment during construction to benefit the local economy and greater use of local services and facilities to contribute to the local economy.
5. The scale of the development proposed by this application (up to 55 dwellings) exceeds that supported by Policy ST/5 of the adopted Core Strategy of the LDF in relation to Minor Rural Centres (maximum 30 dwellings). Taking account of the range and scale of services and facilities available in Linton, including convenient accessibility to public transport, and in the context of a lack of five-year supply, the departure to policy due to the scale of development proposed by this application and its location adjacent to the village framework is justified as it would not cause significant demonstrable harm.

Planning History

6. S/1109/80/O - Bungalow and Garage - Refused (North of Bartlow Road)
SC/1170/73/O - Agricultural Dwelling - Refused (North of Bartlow Road)
SC/0172/68/O - Residential Development - Refused (North of Bartlow Road)
SC/0091/63/O - Residential Development - Refused (North of Bartlow Road)
SC/0144/62/O - Residential Development - Refused (North and South of Bartlow Road)

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/7 Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance
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
CH/4 Development Within the Setting of a Listed Building
CH/5 Conservation Areas
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
Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD - Adopted January 2009

Listed Buildings SPD - Adopted July 2009
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/5 Provision of New Jobs and Homes
S/6 The Development Strategy to 2031
S/7 Development Frameworks
S/9 Minor Rural Centres
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/5 Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance
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. The full comments to the amended scheme are set out in Appendix 1. A summary of the concerns are set out below: -

- i) The site is outside the village framework and the sites were rejected in the SHLAA and Local Plan as having no development potential.
- ii) Linton is classified as a Minor Rural centre which allows a maximum of 30 dwellings.
- iii) The site has been submitted for development over the last 50 years and rejected.
- iv) Significant and damaging to Linton and the floodplain and have a wider effect along the river valley.
- v) Adversely affect views and the setting of Linton in the open landscape.
- vi) Impact upon the approach to the conservation area, listed buildings and the character of the village.
- vii) Noise impact from the A1307.
- viii) Total destruction of archaeology.
- ix) Limited separation of village and A1307 and loss of soft edge to the village.
- x) Housing mix should reflect the needs of the village for bungalows and smaller affordable homes.
- xi) The development has no potential for employment.
- xii) Self-contained developments that would discourage community life.

- xiii) Distance to village centre long and access poor.
- xiv) Occupiers would not use village facilities due to parking and congestion in village.
- xv) Add to traffic parking and congestion in village.
- xvi) Infrastructure is at capacity particularly the schools.
- xvii) Impact upon utilities and services.
- xviii) The safety and capacity of junctions on to the A1307.
- xix) Additional traffic through the village that would impact upon the conservation area.
- xx) Traffic impact on Bartlow Road from number of accesses.

13. **Conservation Officer** – Comments as amended that there are no designated heritage assets adjacent to the site. However, there is a grade II* listed building and grade II listed structure close to the site at Barham Hall. The site of Barham Hall is slightly elevated and has views over the development site. Therefore impacts upon the setting need to be taken into account. The development seeks to retain a green buffer along Bartlow Road and to the north east of the site. The helps keep the development form in line with Linton and retain the rural character of the site. Although the principle of developing this site for residential purposes is largely acceptable, its impact upon the nearby heritage assets needs to be considered and mitigated where possible. This will be through a suitable layout, appropriate form and design and use of high quality materials at the reserved matters stage.
14. **Urban Design Officer** – Comments as amended that the revised layout with a reduced developable area and reduced number of units (from 78 to 55) is welcomed. This set back from the eastern boundary, relocation and thinning of the woodland boundary, and the retention of some agricultural land to the east will reduce the visual impact of the development, and help retain a rural setting to the village. The density is fairly low (approx. 17dph), but this is appropriate given the edge of village location, and should allow space for mature landscaping elements to develop between the houses to reduce the negative impact this development will undoubtedly have on the surrounding open landscape character. Request further points to be considered in relation to the detailed layout such as character areas, siting of buildings, focal points, surveillance from public rights of way and position of open spaces.
15. **Landscape Design Officer** – Comments as amended that the previous concerns have been addressed through the reduction in the number of dwellings on the site and the revised site area being pulled back to allow a foreground of open land behind which sits a filtering woodland to the edge of the settlement. This would also retain views from Rivey Hill from the south and the development would not protrude into the river valley when viewed from public land to the east. Some negative landscape and visual impacts would remain but these have been reduced and therefore the site would be able to accommodate up to 55 dwellings with suitable landscape mitigation so as to not harm the landscape setting of the village.
16. **Trees and Landscapes Officer** – Comments that the site comprises two parcels of land that are currently agricultural. Trees present are confined to the outer boundaries of each parcel. Has no objections as the application is supported by a comprehensive report that shows the existing trees overlaid on to the illustrative masterplan. The tree works are agreed and the development would provide an opportunity to improve the volume and diversity of green infrastructure. Requires a condition to be attached to any consent in relation to an updated aboricultural assessment and tree protection strategy.
17. **Ecology Officer** – Comments that the application is supported by an Ecology Report that does not identify any significant biodiversity constraints to development except for species rich hedgerows and the occurrence of otters using the River Granta but

does consider a suitably wide buffer zone adjacent to the River Granta to be important. The species rich hedgerows on the northern and southern site should be retained and integrated within the development and not fall under private ownership.

18. There is a small area of woodland that would provide some screening of the development from the River Granta. The River Granta is a County Wildlife site and the application should provide some form of enhancement or assist in the positive management of the river. An objection is raised as the application is not providing any specific enhancement to the river. It is screening itself from it, providing an off-set from it and providing a pond that is necessary for the development. The northern bank of the river is being kept secluded through the retention of scrub and tall vegetation. The River Granta being a County Wildlife Site must be protected. The provision of the wild buffer zone presents much opportunity for the integration of ditches, scrapes, and other wetland features to truly enhance this area of land and compliment the setting of the setting of the river as well as to control the movement of people to reduce disturbance to some areas.
19. The design of the attenuation pond should allow for suitable variations in shore line depths and draw down zones for wading birds. The use of swales through the development is welcomed as it would allow water quality to be improved. The pond should connect to the river via a ditch rather than a closed pipe to provide a habitat corridor. The headwall as an outfall to the river would be oversized and detract from the natural status of the area when viewed from Leadwell Meadows. The setting of the pond is compromised by the 5 dwellings closest to it as the whole development could enjoy and attractive vista to the river if these were removed.
20. The proposal has serious implications to increase flood risk to the built up-area of Linton as the Parish Council see the meadow as part of the natural catchment to the river. A positive that could come from the development is the opportunity to contribute to flood protection and alleviation of the risk to the village. A number of discussions have taken place in recent years to discuss how flood moves across Leadwell Meadows and where would be the best position to have a bund to hold back water and give the village a greater degree of protection. The backing up of water may cause water to be extended beyond its current floodplain. The development should not compromise the delivery of future flood protection for the village by developing at all within the floodplain or on land that may be flooded by future flood protection schemes. An alternative approach would be hold back water upstream of the A1307 bridge by means of a bund increasing the floodplain towards Barham Hall. The development may provide a means to fund proper investigation of flood protection options.
21. A reliable report has been received that states there is a population of Roman Snails in a ditch to the west of the southern field close to the River Granta. These are a protected species and a survey should be carried out to prior to determination to see if they are present on site. If so, appropriate avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures would be required to inform the application.
22. Suggests conditions in relation to a scheme of ecological enhancement a strategy for the management of the pond and River Granta.
23. **Local Highways Authority** – No objection. Comments that drawing number 101 Revision A is acceptable for the accesses to the site.
24. **Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Team** – Comments that the peak flows have demonstrated that there is adequate capacity at the Bartlow

Road junction with the A1307 for the development and that the junction impact assessment of the Bartlow Road junction with the A1307 is appropriate and the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon this junction. Further comments that there are westbound queues on the A1307 at peak times and the proposal would result in an additional 32 vehicles joining the queue.

25. Requires a contribution toward the review and recalibration of the operation of the junction of the A1307 with Linton Village College. Has no objections as amended subject to a condition for a Travel Plan Welcome Pack and the following mitigation measures being secured through a condition or section 106 agreement: -
 - i) Widening of the footway on the west side of Barlow Road to a minimum width of 1.8 metres between the site boundary and its junction with Crossways. This is in place of the grass verge to allow more room for walking with children away from moving vehicles. To be provided as part of a S278 agreement.
 - ii) Relocation of the Cambridge and Haverhill bus stops at the site in order that they can accommodate bus stop shelters at each stop. The location and design of the bus stops and shelters will need to be agreed with the County Council and Parish Council. The applicant to incorporate this provision into the designs of the frontages of both sites on the north and south side of Bartlow Road. The bus stop shelters to be directly implemented by the applicant with commuted sum for maintenance by Linton Parish Council to be secured as part of a S106 agreement;
 - iii) The applicant is required to install 10 cycle parking Sheffield stands at locations to be agreed with CCC and Linton Parish Council as part of S278 works.
 - iv) To contribute a sum of £25,000 towards City Deal proposals for bus priority measures along the A1307 in Linton, principally to go towards a review and recalibration of the operation of the junction of the A1037 with Linton Village College to update the operation of the junction to improve its performance.
 - iv) We would require the applicant to make a contribution of £10,000 towards City Deal proposals for reducing bus journey times along High Street Linton.
26. **Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team** – Comments that an archaeological evaluation was carried out prior to the submission of the application. The evidence can be summarised as sparse remains of low significance in the area north of Bartlow Road that does not require a mitigation strategy and Roman and Saxon remains to the south of Bartlow Road that were not extraordinary or of national significance that would require a strategy for recording and preservation. No objections subject to a condition requiring a scheme of investigation to the south of Bartlow Road.
27. **Historic England** – Comments that the application should be determined in accordance with the national and local policy guidance and the on the basis of the Council's specialist conservation advice.
28. **Cambridgeshire County Council Flood & Water Team** – Comments as amended that the impermeable area has reduced to 1.09 hectares and the development would only be acceptable if a surface water drainage condition is attached to any consent.
29. **Environment Agency** – Comments that the site is located above a principal aquifer, a Source Protection Zone 2 and within a WFD Drinking Water Protected Area. Considers the previous agricultural use and infrastructure ground activities to be potentially contaminative. Due to the high proximity to the River Granta and high vulnerability of groundwater, the site is considered of high sensitivity and further investigation is necessary. Has no objections to the scheme as amended subject to conditions in relation to contamination, surface water disposal and piling. Further comments that the Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that the development is

within flood zone 1 (low risk) and has no objections subject to a condition ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment. Also requests informatives with regards to surface water drainage, foul water drainage, pollution control and flood risk.

30. **Anglian Water** – Comments that foul drainage from the development is in the catchment of the Linton water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows and that the sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows via a gravity connection to manhole 1502 or via a pumped regime at 3.8 l/s to manhole 7501. Further comments that from the details submitted with the application, the proposed method of surface water drainage does not relate to Anglian Water assets.
31. **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, pile driven foundations, a programme of measures to minimise the spread of dust, construction phases of the development, noise and vibration impact assessment and mitigation for gas governor, noise protection for dwellings from traffic noise from the A1307, external lighting and a waste management strategy.
32. **Contaminated Land Officer** – Comments that the proposed residential end use is sensitive to land contamination and agrees with the conclusions of the report, in that the potential for contamination is generally low but further site investigation is recommended. Requires a condition for the detailed investigation of contamination and remedial measures for the removal of any contamination found.
33. **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. 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 1,700 applicants on the housing register in South Cambs and Linton has a housing need for 79 applicants. The highest demand both in Linton and across South Cambridgeshire is for 1 and 2 bedroom accommodation.
34. **Section 106 Officer** – Comments that contributions are required towards outdoor sport space, community facilities, waste receptacles and monitoring. Informal open space and children's play space would be provided on the site. These would be secured by a section 106 agreement.
35. **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.
36. **NHS England** – Comments that due to capacity levels in Linton, current priorities, and the size of this development, there is not an intention to seek contribution on this occasion.
37. **Crime Prevention Design Advisor** – Has no objections.

38. **Huntingdonshire District Council Sustainability Officer** – Comments that the requirements of policy are recognised and the efficiency measure suggested should go some way to achieving energy and carbon savings when compared to current building regulations. Although limited information has been provided in the form of a water conservation strategy, the development would not use more than 103 litres per person per day making it compliant with policy. The document provides a good feasibility of numerous renewable energy technologies. Solar thermal panels and a centralised heating system using a biomass boiler would meet the 10% requirements of the policy. However, the solar pv panels would not meet the policy. There are some inconsistencies in the figures and a condition should be attached to ensure further information is provided in the form of worked up examples of the preferred option to ensure policy compliance.
39. **Campaign for the Protection of Rural England** – Comments that although the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, this is being addressed through the local plan process and other important material considerations should not be overridden by this. The emerging plan is at an advanced stage and sites outside development frameworks should come forward through this process. Evidence at the hearings should demonstrate that the housing needs forecasts for the district can be met by the proposed sites in the emerging plan. Further comments that the development would break out into the open countryside and entail the loss of good agricultural land. There would be an adverse impact upon rural landscape by also the valley of the River Granta. Linton is a Minor Rural Centre and the development would exceed the indicative maximum size of 30 dwellings within the development framework.

Representations

40. Approximately **135 letters of objection** have been received from local residents in relation to the application. They raise the following concerns: -
- i) Outside village framework and sprawl to the countryside. Departure to local plan.
 - ii) Scale of development exceeds the limit of 30 dwellings in Minor Rural Centres.
 - ii) Development on the floodplain and increased risk of flooding to the village and other villages downstream.
 - iii) The area is within part of a flood relief scheme.
 - iv) Increase in traffic through village and on to the A1307 which is a dangerous road.
 - v) Pressure on infrastructure that is already at capacity- schools, doctors, roads, drainage etc.
 - vi) Significant distance to village facilities and narrow pavements.
 - vii) Would add to parking congestion in village and potential withdrawal of bus service.
 - viii) Impact upon character of the village due to reduction in separation from the A1307.
 - ix) Harm to conservation area and landscape.
 - x) Impact upon ecological environment of Leadwell Meadows and detract from the environment of the Pocket Park.
 - xi) Loss of archaeological features.
 - xii) Noise and pollution due to proximity to the A1307.
 - xiii) Housing does not address local needs and lack of affordable housing.
 - xiv) No provision for commercial development.
 - xv) Potential contamination of river.
 - xvi) Isolated development from the rest of the community.
 - xvii) Planning history of rejected proposals.
 - xviii) Inadequate public consultation.
 - xix) No benefits to the local community.

- xx) Incorrect viewpoint assessments.
- xxi) Need more planting and wildlife corridors.
- xxii) Lack of energy efficiency measures.
- xxiii) Layout does not reflect village characteristics.
- xxiv) Lack of on-site parking would lead to on-street parking.
- xxv) Potential for further village expansion and better sites in the village.
- xxvi) Impact upon residents amenities.
- xxvii) No space to expand businesses in the village.
- xxviii) Close to gas pipeline.

41. **One letter of support** has been received from a local resident in relation to the application that makes the following points: -
- i) The housing would help more young people stay in the village.
 - ii) Local businesses would benefit.
- However, the resident also comments that the Bartlow Road junction needs improvement.
42. 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.
43. **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.
44. 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.

Site and Surroundings

45. The site is located outside of the Linton village framework and in the countryside. It is situated to the east of the village and comprises land to the north and south of Bartlow Road. It measures approximately 3.5 hectares in area. The land rises to the north.
46. The land to the north of Bartlow Road comprises open grassland. There are hedges

along the majority of the northern boundary and western boundaries. The eastern boundary is open. The southern boundary has a number of young trees. Open agricultural land lies to the north and south. Open grassland, a hedge and public footpath lie to the east. A residential development (The Ridgeway) lies to the west.

47. The land to the south of Bartlow Road comprises open arable land and a water meadow. There are hedges along the northern and western boundary of the site. The eastern boundary is open. The A1307 runs along an embankment on the south eastern boundary of the site. The River Granta is a County Wildlife Site that runs within a valley to the south west. Residential developments lie to the north (Bartlow Road) and west (Finchams Close). Open land lies to the east and south beyond the A1307.
48. The site is situated within the East Anglian Chalk Landscape Character Area on grade 3 (good to moderate) agricultural land. The site lies mainly within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) but the part to the far south lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3 (medium and high risk).
49. The Linton conservation area lies approximately 420 metres to the west. The nearest listed buildings are the grade II* Barham Hall that is 350 metres to the south east and grade II Tower Mill that is 360 metres to the south west.

Proposal

50. The proposal as amended seeks outline permission for a residential development on the site of up to 55 dwellings including two access points to the site. The layout, design and external appearance, and landscaping are matters reserved for later approval.
51. 40% of the dwellings would be affordable in nature. No details of the affordable mix and tenure split are known to date. These mixes will be determined at the time of the reserved matters application to reflect the most up-to-date position. The remaining 60% of the dwellings would be available for sale on the open market. No details of the market mix are known.
52. The development is intended to be predominantly two to two and a half storeys in height. The illustrative masterplan shows that the dwellings would front Bartlow Road and be arranged around the two main access roads. The development would incorporate a range of detached and semi-detached properties. A Local Area of Play and informal open space in the form of a small village green would be provided within the development to the north of Bartlow Road. A Local Equipped Area of Play and informal open space in the form of a linear green space that links Bartlow Road to the woodland paths would be provided within the development to the south of Bartlow Road. The total amount of open space would be 1.35 hectares. Strategic landscape buffers would be provided to the east of both developments at the entrance to the village.

Planning Assessment

53. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application relate to housing land supply, the principle of the development, housing density, housing mix, affordable housing, developer contributions and the impacts of the development upon the character and appearance of the area, highway safety, ecology, trees and landscaping, heritage assets and neighbour amenity.

Housing Land Supply

54. The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF) requires councils to boost significantly the supply of housing, including by meeting their objectively assessed need for housing and by identifying and maintaining a five-year housing land supply with an additional buffer as set out in paragraph 47.
55. The Council accepts that it cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply in the district as required by the NPPF, having regard to appeal decisions in Waterbeach in 2014, and as confirmed by more recent appeal decisions. The five-year supply as identified in the latest Annual Monitoring Report (February 2016) for South Cambridgeshire is 3.9 years on the basis of the most onerous method of calculation, which is the method identified by the Waterbeach Inspector. This shortfall is based on an objectively assessed housing need of 19,500 homes for the period 2011 to 2031. This is identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 together with the latest update undertaken for the Council in November 2015 as part of the evidence responding to the Local Plan Inspectors' preliminary conclusions. It uses the latest assessment of housing delivery contained in the housing trajectory November 2015. The appropriate method of calculation is a matter before the Local Plan Inspectors and in the interim the Council is following the method preferred by the Waterbeach appeal Inspector.
56. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that adopted policies "for the supply of housing" cannot be considered up to date where there is not a five year housing land supply. This includes the rural settlement policies and village framework policy.
57. 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 as not to be restricted to '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.
58. 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/3, CH/5, NE/4, NE/6 and NE/17 of the adopted Development Control Policies. Policies S/7, S/9, HQ/1 and NH/3 of the draft Local Plan are also material considerations and considered to be relevant (draft) policies for the supply of housing.
59. However the Court also made clear that 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 be attached to such relevant policies having regard to compatibility with the NPPF.
60. The rural settlement classification in the adopted and emerging development plans identifies the sustainability of villages in South Cambridgeshire, having regard to the level of services and facilities within a village and the availability and frequency of public transport to access higher order services in Cambridge and elsewhere. They are a key factor in applying paragraph 14 of the NPPF which says that where a five-year supply cannot be demonstrated, permission should be granted 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. The NPPF also includes as a core principle that planning should “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable”.

61. In light of the lack of five-year housing land supply and having regard to recent local appeal decisions, the rural settlement policies are considered to continue to have significant weight in the determination of planning applications adjacent to or within close proximity to village frameworks. This will help ensure that development proposals outside and in close proximity to village frameworks have due regard to the availability of an appropriate level of services, facilities, employment and sustainable transport options.
62. As a general principle, the larger, better served villages categorised as Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres are likely to be more able to support unplanned housing growth than the smaller, less well served Group and Infill Villages, without fundamentally undermining the development strategy for South Cambridgeshire. This has some commonality with the approach taken in the submitted Local Plan where a limited number of housing allocations in the rural area were included for Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, including for larger sites that the windfall threshold in Minor Rural Centres, but no allocations for Group and Infill Villages other than a very limited number where they were put forward by Parish Councils under the Localism agenda.
63. As such, in Rural Centre and Minor Rural Centres, subject to all other relevant material considerations, it is considered that there is a case to be made that conflict with relevant settlement hierarchy policies should not be given significant weight, under the circumstances of a lack of five-year housing supply and in light of paragraph 14 of the NPPF and the test of significant demonstrable harm. This is consistent with the recent appeal decision in Melbourn where the Inspector said that as the rural settlement policies are out of date due to a lack of five-year supply, but that the conflict with those policies “carried limited weight”. However, given the limited sustainability of Group and Infill villages, there is a case to continue to resist proposals that would conflict with the rural settlement policies which would allow for unsustainable forms of development, unless there are particular site specific considerations that indicate that there would not be significant demonstrable harm.
64. Notwithstanding the above, each planning application must be considered on its own merits taking account of local circumstances and all other relevant material considerations.

Principle of Development

65. 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 state that only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted.
66. 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 55 dwellings would therefore not under normal circumstances be considered acceptable in principle.
67. Given the current lack of a 5 year housing land supply and the fact that policies DP/7

and ST/5 are 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. As set out in the Housing Land Supply section above, it is considered that significant weight can be given to the rural settlement and framework policies. Nevertheless, in light of a five year land supply and recent appeal decisions, as a matter of general principle the scale of development proposed relative to the comparative accessibility of this minor rural centre would not conflict significantly with the thrust of the core development principle of the NPPF and will not in itself create demonstrable harm.

Sustainable Development

68. The NPPF states that there are 3 dimensions to sustainable development, economic, social and environmental.

Economic Aspects

69. The provision of up to 55 new dwellings will give rise to employment during the construction phase of the development and would have the potential to result in an increase in the use of local services and facilities, both of which will be of benefit to the local economy.

Social Aspects

Provision of Housing

70. The development would provide a benefit in helping to meet the current housing shortfall in South Cambridgeshire through the delivery of up to 55 dwellings. The applicants own the site and it is available for development now subject to securing the necessary planning consents. It is intended that construction work could commence in 2016/2017 with the residential element being complete within 5 years of the outline consent. There are no known technical constraints to delivery.

Scale of Development and Services

71. 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 55 dwellings would increase the number of dwellings in the village by 3%. This is not considered to be out of scale and character with the size of the village.
72. 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 reasonably 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.
73. 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 (10 minutes) and immediately adjacent a bus stop. These distances are

considered acceptable. There is an existing public footway along the northern boundary of the site to the south of Bartlow Road. This would ensure that there is convenient accessibility by walking and cycling to the centre of the village.

74. 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 slightly 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.

Housing Density

75. The site measures 2.15 hectares in area (net). The erection of up to 55 dwellings would equate to a maximum of 26 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

76. 40% of the development would consist of affordable housing to meet local needs as set out in Policy HG/3 of the LDF. 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.

Market Housing Mix

77. The development would provide a range of dwelling types and sizes that range from one and two bedroom homes to larger family homes to comply with Policy HG/2 of the LDF or Policy H/8 of the emerging Local Plan as some weight can be attached to this policy. Given that the application is currently at outline stage only, it is considered that the exact mix of the market dwellings could be agreed at the reserved matters stage, albeit a condition will be needed to secure this.

Developer Contributions

78. Development plan policies state that planning permission will only be granted for proposals that have made suitable arrangements towards the provision of infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.
79. Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations states that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development of the obligation is: -
- i) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - ii) Directly related to the development; and,
 - iii) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
80. The Recreation and Open Space Study 2013 identified that Linton had a deficit of 4.19 hectares of sports space. Linton has one recreation ground with a senior football pitch and a cricket pitch with the cricket square next to the football goal area and a bowl green. The pavilion is in very good condition with home and away changing, a

bar area and kitchen. There is a need for an additional football pitch to meet local need and improved drainage at the existing facility. The cricket club also require an additional pitch to meet the demand for additional junior teams. The study did not take account of the facilities at Linton Village College, which although at the current time are available for public hire, are not guaranteed through a community access agreement.

81. Off-site contributions are required towards additional facilities to meet the demand for the development in accordance with Policies SF/10 and SF/11 of the LDF.
82. Linton Parish Council highlights the lack of infrastructure in the village to cope with the development and comments that it ideally requires additional land to provide the facilities required for the village but states that this is not possible at present as no landowner would be prepared to sell for agricultural rates while the Council does not have a 5 year housing land supply. It has therefore put forward projects that would be located on the recreation ground. These include a BMX/skate park, climbing wall and replacement of bowls area with a multi-use games area, and trim trail on the recreation ground. The contribution required would be tariff based contribution of approximately £55,000.
83. The Recreation and Open Space Study 2013 identified that Linton had a deficit of 3.41 hectares of children's play space. The development would be located approximately 1.8km from the nearest play area and therefore it is paramount that a formal play area is provided on the site. Given that a Local Equipped Area of Play and Local Area of Play would be provided within the development.
84. No off-site contributions are required towards additional facilities to meet the demand for the development in accordance with Policies SF/10 and SF/11 of the LDF.
85. The Recreation and Open Space Study 2013 identified that Linton had a surplus of 0.27 hectares of informal open space. The development would provide informal public open space in the form a linear parkland north to south through the development and woodland walks.
86. No off-site contributions are therefore required towards additional facilities to meet the demand for the development in accordance with Policies SF/10 and SF/11 of the LDF. However, contributions are required for maintenance of the space if it adopted by the Parish Council.
87. The Community Facilities Audit 2009 states that Linton is served by Linton Village Hall which is run by a charity and can accommodate 170 seated and 200 standing. It holds an entertainment licence but no alcohol license, public dances, disabled access and toilets. There is only a basic kitchen but no food preparation area. Linton Village Hall is not considered to satisfy the Council's indoor facilities standard in terms of quantity of space and quality of space.
88. Off-site contributions are required towards community facilities to comply with Policy DP/4 of the LDF.
89. Linton Parish Council again highlights the lack of infrastructure in the village to cope with the development. It has therefore put forward a project to build a multi-purpose community centre with a focus aimed at young people and which will be available for hire by scouts, guides, brownies and other users. This would need to be funded by other sources but at present these have not been identified. The contribution required would be tariff based contribution of approximately £27,000.

90. The RECAP Waste Management Design Guide requires household waste receptacles to be provided for the development. Off-site contributions are required towards the provision to comply with Policy DP/4 of the LDF. The contribution would be £72.50 per dwelling and £150 per flat.
91. To ensure the provision and usage of on-site infrastructure, a monitoring fee of £1,000 is required.
92. The development is expected to generate a net increase of 17 (16.5) early years aged children of which 9 are liable for contributions. In terms of early years' capacity, County education officers have confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the area to accommodate the places being generated by this development. Therefore no contribution for early years provision is required.
93. The development is expected to generate a net increase of 20 (19.25) primary school places. The catchment school is Linton Infant & Linton Heights Junior schools. In terms of primary school capacity, County education officers have confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the area to accommodate the places being generated by this development. Therefore no contribution for primary education is required.
94. The development is expected to generate a net increase of 14 (13.75) secondary school places. The catchment school is Linton Village College. County education officers have confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the area to accommodate the places being generated by this development. Therefore no contribution for secondary education is required.
95. The proposed increase in population from this development (55 dwellings x 2.5 average household size = 138 new residents) will put pressure on the library and lifelong learning service in the village. Linton library already serves a population of nearly 5,000 including the villages of Linton, Hildersham and Horseheath. A contribution of £42.12 per increasing population for enhancement to the library in Linton, a total of £5,812.56 (138 new residents X £42.12). This contribution would be used towards the reorganisation of the layout of Linton Library including the remodelling of the existing library counter, to enable extra shelving units and appropriate resources (both Adult and Junior) to be installed in the library to serve the additional residents.
96. This development falls within the Thriplow Household Recycling Centre catchment area for which there is currently insufficient capacity. The development would require a contribution of £461.45 (£8.39 x 55) towards the project to expand capacity unless 5 schemes have been pooled towards this project.
97. NHS England considers there is sufficient GP capacity to support the development. Therefore no contributions are required towards health facilities.
98. 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 and paragraph 204 of the NPPF. It is considered that all of the requested contributions to date meet the CIL tests and would be secured via a Section 106 agreement. Confirmation is awaited from the applicants to agreement to these contributions.
99. 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.

Environmental Aspects

Character and Appearance of the Area

100. The site is currently open grassland and 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.
101. 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.
102. The proposal would result in the introduction of development in an area that is currently undeveloped. Given the site characteristics and landscape setting, development of the scale proposed has the potential to result in some loss of openness to the countryside and visual harm to the setting of the village.
103. The application has been submitted in outline with all matters reserved, including layout. It is considered that up to 55 dwellings could be accommodated on the site with limited harm to the landscape setting of the village. The amended scheme would retain open land and the water meadows that provide a rural setting to the village from close views on the A1307 and longer distance views from Rivey Hill. In addition, a significant landscape buffer would be provided around the whole of the development that would mitigate the visual impact of the proposal and enhance biodiversity. It is therefore considered that limited weight can be given to Policy NE/4 of the LDF.

Design Considerations

104. 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. The masterplan is therefore illustrative only at this stage.
105. The plan shows the site to the north of Bartlow Road to comprise development concentrated around a single road with a small open space at the centre. There would be farmstead design development adjacent to Bartlow Road at the entrance to the village to reflect the transition from the open landscape to the built-up modern development in The Ridgeway. There would be a LAP in the north eastern corner.
106. The land to the south of Bartlow Road would comprise a linear form of development along Bartlow Road that would respect the existing linear pattern of dwellings and a curved layout that would works with the different land levels. There would be a central

LEAP and an area of open space running north to south that would provide pedestrian links to woodland paths within the structural landscape planting to the east.

107. The main characteristics of the layout are supported and are considered to result in a high quality development that would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. The provision of detached and semi-detached properties of two to two and half storey scale would reflect the surroundings. However, the Urban Design Officer has raised some points in relation to the layout that would require further consideration at the reserved matters stage.

Trees/ Landscaping

108. 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 would be retained and protected. The only hedges removed would be to provide accesses to dwellings on to Bartlow Road in an area that is more built-up and less rural character.
109. A substantial amount of landscaping is proposed within the development that includes structural planting in the form of a landscape buffer to the east of the site, planting within the open space that runs north to south through the site and planting within the water meadow to the south of the site. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy NE/6 of the LDF that seeks to maintain, enhance, restore or add to biodiversity.

Ecology

110. The site is located immediately to the north of the River Granta that is a County Wildlife Site. The existing water meadow to the north of the river would be retained as a buffer and protected and enhanced as part of the development. The amended plan does not show this area to be accessible to the public in order to retain its interest features in the form of the rural environment and biodiversity richness. Measures for enhancement include the provision of a surface water attenuation pond and a wild zone. Precise details of enhancement and management of this area would be agreed through conditions attached to any consent. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy NE/7 of the LDF that seeks to ensure that the intrinsic natural features of particular interest are safeguarded or enhanced.
111. The 5 dwellings to the south of the site are considered to be situated an adequate distance away from the buffer zone to ensure that the County Wildlife Site is protected.
112. The final location and design of the headwall would be subject to a condition as the drainage strategy is currently at outline stage. It would need to meet the requirements of the Environment Agency. Alternatively, the headwall could discharge to a ditch prior to entering the River Granta.
113. Roman snails have been found in a ditch close to the site that is a protected species. A survey is required to be carried out prior to the determination of the application to ensure that the development would not result in the loss of this protected species. Members will be updated on the report at the meeting.

Highway Safety and Sustainable Travel

114. Bartlow 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.

115. 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 is not therefore considered to be detrimental to highway safety to sustain a reason for refusal.
116. The access widths of the main roads into the site to the north and south of Bartlow Road would measure 5.5 metres and accommodate two-way traffic. They would have 2.0 metres footpaths on each side to would provide safe pedestrian movements. The proposed vehicular visibility splays to the site to the north of Bartlow Road that measure 2.4 metres x 120 metres to the west and 2.4 metres x 121 metres to the east to the junction with the A1307 and 2.4 metres x 80 metres to the southern kerbline would be achievable. The proposed vehicular visibility splays to the site to the south of Bartlow Road that measure 2.4 metres x 70 metres to the west and 2.4 metres x 90 metres to the east would also be achievable. The accesses would therefore accord with Local Highways Authority standards.
117. There is a bus stop on Barlow Road immediately adjacent the site. This gives direct public transport access to Cambridge and Haverhill by a 30 minute service Monday to Saturdays. This is easily accessible by walking. A Section 106 legal agreement would be required to secure the widening of the footway on the southern side of Bartlow Road to the junction with Crossways to allow more space for pedestrian movements, the relocation of the bus stops within the sites so they are able to accommodate shelters, the installation of cycle parking in the village, a contribution of £25,000 towards bus priority measures along the A1307 principally to review and recalibrate the operation of the junction of the A1307 with Linton Village College, and a contribution of £10,000 to reduce bus journey times along the High Street. The plan also shows the provision of a crossing point on Bartlow Road.
118. 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. However, further details are required and a full travel plan would need to be agreed prior to first occupation of the dwellings. This would be a condition of any consent.
119. The development therefore has the potential to comply with Policies DP/3, DP/4, TR/1, TR/2 and TR/3 of the LDF that seek to ensure that the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon from traffic generation.

Flood Risk

120. The site is located within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 (low, medium and high risk). It currently comprises arable land and a water meadow that discharges into the river at the natural greenfield run-off rate.
121. The River Granta is the most significant watercourse in the area that is located immediately to the south of the site. There are no other notable watercourses within the vicinity of the site. The main sources that would increase the risk of flooding to the site are therefore fluvial flooding from the river and surface water flooding.
122. The design of the development has utilised the sequential approach. The built-up areas including gardens would be wholly located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). The buffer zone to the south would be partially located within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 (low,

medium and high risk). The surface water attenuation pond would be located outside the critical 1 in 100 year plus climate change floodplain.

123. The development has a 'more vulnerable' flood risk classification due to the residential use. An appropriate surface water drainage system of sustainable drainage techniques is therefore required to ensure that it would not increase the risk of flooding to the site and surrounding area. In addition, appropriate ground and floor levels would need to be incorporated into the scheme.
124. 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 on the site to the north of Bartlow Road. To the south of Bartlow Road, a surface water attenuation pond would be provided along with a piped outfall to restrict the run-off from the development to existing greenfield run-off rates. This could also include infiltration to the surrounding land. In addition, other measures such as permeable paving and storage tanks could be incorporated.
125. Floor levels would be set a minimum of 150mm above ground levels and external hard surfaces would be designed to fall away from dwellings.
126. Given the above outline strategy, no objections have been raised to the development by the Environment Agency or County Flood Team. Conditions would be attached to any consent to secure a detailed surface water drainage scheme together with its maintenance and management. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy NE/11 of the LDF that seeks to ensure that the development would not increase the risk of flooding to the site and surrounding area.
127. Any future flood relief scheme on Leadwell Meadows to the south of the river would need to consider the impact upon the development should permission be granted.

Neighbour Amenity

128. 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.
129. The impact of the development itself on neighbours in terms of mass, light and overlooking will be considered at the reserved matters stage and would need to comply with Policy DP/3 of the LDF. It is noted that the land falls southwards.

Heritage Assets

130. The site is located in an area of high archaeological potential. However, an evaluation has been carried out that has not found any significant features of archaeological interest. A condition would be attached to any consent to secure a programme of excavation together with the recording and preservation of any features. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy CH/2 of the LDF that seeks to protect features of archaeological importance.
131. The site is located approximately 420 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.

132. The site is located approximately 350 metres from the nearest listed buildings at Barham Hall and Tower Mill. The development is unlikely to harm the setting of these listed buildings given that their immediate settings comprise open land and the development would be surrounded by a landscape buffer. However, given the elevated position of Barham Hall, the detailed design of the development would need to take account of the current rural setting. This would be determined at the reserved matters stage.
133. Thus the statutory requirements in sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in respect of listed buildings and conservation areas would be met and the proposal would comply with Policies CH/4 and CH/5 of the LDF.

Other Matters

134. 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.
135. 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.
136. The Parish Council has raised that the development does not provide for potential for employment. However, the local planning authority is considering the development proposal as it stands and whether it comprises sustainable development, including access to employment, which is addressed above.
137. The site is not located within or close to any designated employment area and it is not necessary to consider the lack of any employment within the proposal is not .
138. The gas main that runs across the site to the north of Bartlow Road is located outside the site.
139. The comments of Linton Parish Council in relation to the submission of inaccurate or incomplete assessments is noted. However, the reports are considered satisfactory and they do not necessarily form the basis of the recommendations of the specialist consultees and officers which are based upon the situation on the ground.
140. 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.
141. A condition would be attached to any consent to secure fire hydrants in the interests of safety given the scale of the development.

Conclusion

142. 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:

143. Core Strategy
ST/2: Housing Provision
ST/5: Minor Rural Centres
144. Development Plan
DP/1: Sustainable Development
DP/7: Village Frameworks
HG/1: Housing Density
HG/2: Housing Mix
NE/4 Landscape Character Areas
NE/6: Biodiversity
NE/17: Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
CH/2: Archaeological Sites
CH/4: Development Within the Setting of a Listed Building
CH/5: Conservation Areas
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.
145. This report sets out that the development would have some visual impact upon the landscape setting and setting of listed buildings of the village. However, it is considered that the landscape impact is limited and has been successfully mitigated as part of the outline application and the preservation of heritage assets could be achieved by the design of the development at the reserved matters stage and the use of an appropriate condition in respect of archaeological interests.
146. These limited adverse impacts must be weighed against the following benefits of the development:
i) In the context of a lack of five-year housing land supply, the positive contribution of up to 55 dwellings towards the housing land supply in the district based on the objectively assessed need for 19,500 dwellings and the method of calculation and buffer identified by the Waterbeach Inspector.
ii) Contribution of 40% affordable housing in the context of a high level of district wide housing need and a local housing need for 79 applicants
iii) Potential for access to public transport, services and facilities and local employment.
iv) Developer contributions towards sport space, children's play space, community facilities in the village and improvements to traffic schemes in the village.
v) Employment during construction to benefit the local economy.
vi) Greater use of local services and facilities to contribute to the local economy.
147. Whilst it is acknowledged that the policies for the determination of housing in the LDF are out-of-date, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission are not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits offered by this application.

Recommendation

148. It is recommended that the Planning Committee approves the application subject to the following: -

Conditions

- a) Outline planning permission- submission of reserved matters
- b) Approved Plans (where relevant)
- c) Hard and Soft Landscaping Scheme, including boundary treatments
- d) Landscaping Implementation
- e) Visibility Splays
- f) Travel Plan
- g) Contamination Investigation
- h) Flood Risk Assessment
- i) Surface Water Drainage Scheme including maintenance and management
- j) Foul Water Drainage
- k) Noise and Deliveries During Construction
- l) Waste Management Strategy
- m) Spread of dust
- n) Construction Phases
- o) Noise Protection
- p) Species Survey
- q) Ecological Enhancement
- r) Ecological Management
- s) Archaeological Work
- t) External Lighting
- u) Renewable Energy Statement
- v) Housing Mix
- x) Fire Hydrants

Section 106 agreement

- a) Affordable Housing
- b) Open Space
- c) Community Facilities
- d) Waste Receptacles
- e) Strategic Waste
- f) Transport Requirements

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/1963/15/OL

Report Author:

Karen Pell-Coggins
Telephone Number:

Principal Planning Officer
01954 713230