

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

2 November 2016

**AUTHOR/S:** Head of Development Management

---

<b>Application Number / type of application:</b>	S/1745/16/OL / Outline planning application
<b>Parish(es):</b>	Bassingbourn
<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline planning permission for development of up to 30 dwellings, additional parking for Bassingbourn Surgery including vehicular access, pedestrian links, public open space, drainage, landscaping and associated works. All matters reserved except for access.
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Approval subject to a Section 106 Agreement covering the issues detailed in the main report and conditions based on the draft list in paragraph 151 of the report.
<b>Material considerations:</b>	Five year supply of housing land Principle of development Sustainability of the location Density of development and affordable housing Character of the village edge and surrounding landscape Ecology Public Right of Way Highway safety Residential amenity of neighbouring properties Surface water and foul water drainage Provision of formal and informal open space Section 106 Contributions
<b>Site address:</b>	Land East of Spring Lane, Bassingbourn
<b>Applicant(s):</b>	E. W. Pepper Limited
<b>Date on which application received:</b>	01 July 2016
<b>Site Visit:</b>	01 November 2016
<b>Conservation Area:</b>	No
<b>Departure Application:</b>	Yes
<b>Presenting Officer:</b>	David Thompson, Principal Planning Officer
<b>Application brought to Committee because:</b>	The officer recommendation of approval conflicts with the recommendation of Bassingbourn Parish Council and approval would represent a departure from the Local

## Plan

**Date by which decision due:** 02 November 2016 (agreed extension)

### **A. Update to the report**

**Paragraph 9** of the main report details the comments made by Bassingbourn Parish Council in relation to the initial consultation. Since that time the Parish Council were included in the re-consultation on the additional information received in relation to drainage and transport.

On 27 October 2016, the Parish Council submitted additional comments which are as follows:

The emerging Local Plan is now in its final stages, being examined by an Inspector and the policies within the document demonstrate a five year supply of housing land. Significant weight should therefore be attached to this in the decision making process. The site lies outside of the village framework as defined in the emerging Local Plan and should be refused.

The application is considered to be premature and would prejudice the emerging Local Plan objective of prioritising development in the Cambridge fringe areas and new settlements.

Whilst the proposed development site is in flood zone 1 (low risk), land immediately west of the site is in flood zone 3 (high risk). Pluvial flooding has already been experienced in 2016 in Spring Lane and Pepper Close, next to the site. Test pits show that the permeability of the ground of the ground varies across the site with much of the site being poorly drained. The location of the attenuation tank in the amended information will improve this situation. However, the permeable surfacing proposed would cover extensive areas of impermeable ground. Changes in levels between the site and the rear of the properties on Elm Tree Drive and also between the site and Spring Lane have not been fully considered.

Broadband speeds in the locality are not sufficient to accommodate the additional capacity requirements resulting from the development. This is contrary to guidance within the NPPF and therefore the proposal cannot be considered sustainable development.

The setting of the adjacent Public Right of Way would be adversely affected.

Adequate visibility splays have not been demonstrated from the site access. The proposal does not include sufficient car parking spaces. These issues combined would have an adverse impact on highway safety in Spring Lane.

The proposal would result in increased congestion on High Street, which already suffers from high levels of congestion.

Bats have been seen in the trees on the site and fly over Clarkes Way adjacent to the site.

**Paragraph 70** should read that there is a 2 week waiting time for appointments at the dental surgery.

**Paragraph 85** should read 'The indicative layout plan shows an infringement of the Right of Way....' (infringement pf being a typographical error).

**Paragraph 113** should read that the Health Impact Assessment was awarded a Grade C by the Environmental Health Officer but is considered to be acceptable given the scale of the development and the need to assess the sustainability of the scheme from an environmental and social perspective as part of the planning process. This reflects the comments in paragraph 12 of the report as published.

**Appendix** – there is an error on page 8 which refers to Over. Officers can confirm that the details of the figures and the proposed projects for which contributions are being sought apply to Bassingbourn and to this proposal.

**Site plan** – the red line site area included within the report pack places a red line around an area larger than the application site. This has been amended and the correct version (reflecting the plan submitted by the applicant) is appended to this update report (appendix 1).

## **B. Further Information received after publication of the agenda report.**

An assessment of the revised flood risk information submitted by the applicant has been received from a member of the public specifically in relation to flood risk. The assessment was accompanied by a written objection to the proposed development, which summarised the findings of the assessment. The following paragraphs outline the content of the objection and officers' response to those comments.

The objection states that the test pit location map included within appendix H of the amended Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) have not been accurately plotted and therefore an accurate comparison between the updated report and the original cannot be made. The report has been forwarded to the County Council as Lead Local Flood Risk Authority (LLFRA) and is appended to this report (appendix 2).

The objector comments that test pits 5 and 6 have a reasonable infiltration rate, with pit 4 showing an infiltration rate that is 5 times slower than test pit 6. The Environment Agency (EA) has been contacted by the objector and they have responded that the site is within the Lower Chalk geology area, which is an area where bore hole readings suggest the ground is less permeable than other geological areas – which is reflected in the test pit results on this site.

The objection refers to the topographical survey of the site (undertaken in February 2016) which shows that there is a fall in levels from the north east of the site towards the south west, at the entrance to the site from Spring Lane. The northern boundary of the site is at a higher land level than the southern boundary, suggesting that surface water will flow southwards. The site levels drop 3.905 metres across the 320 metre (approximately) length of the site. The change in levels ensures that water is likely to run in a south westerly direction.

The objection refers to the drop in levels adjacent to the rear of the properties at 41 and 43 Elm Tree Drive (to the north of the site) and comments that surface water from those properties flowing south west across the site would increase flood risk. In relation to Spring Lane, the land level is higher on the northern side than on the southern side of the road, suggesting that surface water run off would progress towards the substation on Spring Lane.

Appendix G of the amended FRA submitted by the applicant shows assumed impermeable areas within the site outlined in pink, with permeable areas outlined in blue. Test pit TP1 and TP2 results suggest that the area along the northern boundary (shown in blue) is impermeable. Test pits 2 and 3 are considered to demonstrate that the area adjacent to the site entrance, shown to be covered in permeable paving, is also considered to be impermeable. The permeable roads coloured yellow in the southern part of the site are in a location which has not been subject to testing.

The objector comments that the drainage strategy proposed by the applicant is to channel the surface water run off from the whole development to the underground cellular storage tank in the north eastern part of the site (with a volume of 699 cubic metres). Excess run off in an exceptional storm would channel towards the drainage ditch to the east of the site. In order to achieve this, the level of the road would raise from the south west, to allow gravity fed flows of water to the location of the underground storage tank.

The objector considers that the level of the ground on the site would mean that the natural flow of water would be north east to south west across the site. If the land is re-levelled to allow water to flow in a north easterly direction, this would increase the flows to the drainage ditch to the east of the site, presenting a major flood risk issue.

Excess water on the site would natural drain south westwards towards the area beyond the site which is considered to be at a high risk of flooding (Flood Zone 3) and this is considered to be unacceptable.

The County Council as Lead Local Flood Risk Authority (LLFRA) have been consulted on the objection received. The LLFRA consider that whilst the existing site levels do fall from north east to south west, the site levels would be raised as part of the development to ensure that water does not drain at the current rate in a south western location but instead would flow north eastwards, towards the revised location of the attenuation tank.

Infiltration tests carried out as part of the evidence base for the revised FRA submitted by the applicant are considered to demonstrate that infiltration is possible on the site. This is considered to be more relevant to this specific proposal than the general characteristics of chalk hydrology referred to in the objector's response. Hydraulic modelling outputs are considered to demonstrate that volume of attenuation to be provided on site is more than adequate to accommodate the run off from a 1 in 100 year flood event and an additional 40% allowance for the impact of climate change.

The revised FRA submitted by the applicant makes specific reference to the finished ground floor levels of the dwellings being raised a minimum of 150mm above the external ground level and that site levels should be profiled so that the ground slopes away from vulnerable areas. The finished level of the proposed access road would be 200mm above the existing ground level. The LLFRA are content with this approach and have re-iterated that they do not object to the proposals. A condition requiring details of the finished levels to be agreed prior to the commencement of development can be attached at this outline stage.

Permeable paving is considered to be over and above the amount of attenuation required i.e. even if it was not effective, the amount of additional surface water run off created by the development would be accommodated by the attenuation tank to be installed. However, the permeable paving is considered to increase the storage

capacity of the site during a 1 in 10-0 year event and is therefore a measure which provides more resilience o flood risk than is required by the NPPF.

### **C. Conclusion**

Having considered the assessment of the revised FRA submitted by a member of the public, officers have consulted the LLFRA and are content that the proposal makes adequate provision for the attenuation of flood water and therefore complies with local and national planning policy in this regard.

In light of this and the consideration that the response of the Parish Council to the amended documentation does not introduce issues which have not been considered in the main report, the officer recommendation remains approval as outlined in the report. This is subject to the inclusion of the finished ground levels condition referred to in this update report.

**Additional Background Papers:** the following background papers (additional to those referred to in the agenda report) were used in the preparation of this update:

No additional papers

**Contact Officer:** David Thompson – Principal Planning Officer  
Telephone: (01954) 713250