

**MAIN CASE**

**Reference No:** 20/00996/OUM

**Proposal:** Proposed outline application for residential development for up to 70 dwellings and the demolition of 18 Wilburton Road (all matters reserved except for access)

**Site Address:** Land South Of 18 Wilburton Road Haddenham  
Cambridgeshire

**Applicant:** Land Allocation Ltd

**Case Officer:** Angela Briggs Planning Team Leader

**Parish:** Haddenham

**Ward:** Haddenham  
Ward Councillor/s: Gareth Wilson

**Date Received:** 31 July 2020      **Expiry Date:** EOT Requested

**Report Number W7**1.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 Members are recommended to REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development is located within the countryside outside the defined settlement boundary of Haddenham, where new development is strictly controlled. The construction of up to 70 dwellings in the countryside does not meet any of the defined exceptions within Policy GROWTH2 and would therefore give rise to an inappropriate development with no justification to override the normal presumption against development in the countryside. As such it is contrary to adopted East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 Policy GROWTH2 and the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to protect the countryside and the setting of towns and villages.
2. Haddenham is one of the highest points in the Fens and the application site sits at a key vantage point in the District. From this part of Haddenham, there are attractive and locally valued views from the ridge down across the Fens to Cambridge, and the site takes in part of this existing vista. This is a highly distinctive landscape in the local area and is an important part of the setting, not only of Haddenham, but also of the Isle of Ely. The open and attractive vista also forms an important gap between Haddenham and Wilburton, with the highway between the two running along the top of the ridge.

Due to the existing landscape features, the topography of the area and the position of the public highways, the proposed scheme will result in a development which would not positively contribute to the character of Haddenham and would give rise to adverse landscape effects. The proposed development would create another cul-de-sac development on the edge of the village which is poorly connected and, given its indicative form and layout, would not create a distinctive addition to the village nor retain open rural views. This is not a hard edge, but a transitional zone, which provides an attractive setting for the village and is part of a locally valued landscape. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within paragraph 170 of the NPPF which states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, and conflict with the principles of Chapter 15 of the NPPF 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment'.

## 2.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

- 2.1 The application seeks outline planning permission for up to 70 dwellings and the demolition of no.18 Wilburton Road. Approval is sought for means of access only, with all other matters such as appearance, landscaping layout and scale, reserved.
- 2.2 The site is roughly an 'L-shaped' and covers an area of 4.14 hectares (10.23 acres) and is situated outside of the development envelope. An indicative site layout plan accompanies the application which indicates some landscaping and SuDs features and open space areas within the site. The plan also shows an indicative housing layout of how the site could be developed. The proposed access would be formed following the demolition of no.18 Wilburton Road.
- 2.3 The planning history of the site consists of two main applications for this site which are outlined below in section 3. Ref: 14/00130/OUM was an outline proposal for up to 100 dwellings (all matters reserved except for access). The application was refused by Planning Committee for 4 reasons in relation to: Unsustainability of the site, landscape visual impact, impact on archaeology and lack of foul water drainage details. Please refer to **Appendix 1** for a copy of the decision notice. A further application was submitted in 2019, Ref: 19/00214/OUM which was an outline application for up to 110 dwellings, with all matters reserved, except for access. This application was also refused by the Planning Committee for 5 reasons in relation to: Landscape visual impact, highway safety, impact on biodiversity, impact on existing Primary Health Care, and failure to provide 5% self-build properties. Please refer to **Appendix 2** for a copy of the decision notice and full details of the reasons for refusal.
- 2.4 The application is accompanied by the following documents:
- Design and Access Statement
  - Planning Supporting Statement
  - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
  - Arboricultural/Tree Impact Assessment
  - Flood Risk Assessment (plus Addendum)

- Contaminated Land study/Groundsure data
- Utilities Statement
- Transport Assessment
- Biodiversity Net Gain/Ecological Assessments
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Open Space Assessment
- Odour Assessment
- Draft Heads of Terms (S106)
- Foul Sewerage Assessment
- Affordable Housing Statement
- Archaeological Evaluation Report
- Tree/Hedgerow Survey Report
- Protected Species reports

2.5 A Social, Economic and Environmental Benefits Statement was submitted in February 2021, following consultee comments which seeks to set out an analysis and benefits of the proposed housing development, in accordance with the NPPF Paragraph 11 (d) part ii in the context of the *'tilted balance'* as to whether *"any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of this Framework taken as a whole"*. This document was sent out for re-consultation and will be covered in more detail within this report.

2.6 The application is being brought to Planning Committee as the scheme is proposing up to 70 dwellings, in accordance with the Council's Constitution.

2.7 The full planning application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online via East Cambridgeshire District Council's Public Access online service, via the following link <http://pa.eastcambs.gov.uk/online-applications/>.

### 3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

3.1

14/00130/OUM	Outline application for up to 100 residential units with all matters reserved except for means of access	Refused – 7 <sup>th</sup> August 2014
19/00214/OUM	Residential development for up to 110 dwellings	Refused – 8 <sup>th</sup> November 2019

### 4.0 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

4.1 The site is located on the south eastern edge of Haddenham on land outside the development envelope. The site lies to the south of Wilburton Road (A1123), from which a single vehicular access is proposed.

4.2 The 'L-shaped' site covers an area of 4.12 hectares (10.23 acres), and is predominantly arable farm land, classed as Grade 2 in the National Agricultural Land Classification, comprising two field parcels separated by a farm access track. There is an agricultural barn on the site between the two parcels of land. The site

also includes no.18 Wilburton Road, a detached two storey dwelling, which is proposed to be demolished as part of the proposal in order to facilitate the new access. Part of the site (southern part) is situated within the Water Treatment Works Safeguarding Area.

- 4.3 The site does not have any local or national ecological designations and there are no registered public rights of way crossing the site or running along the boundaries. The site is situated within Flood Zone 1 and it is in an area of groundwater vulnerability.
- 4.4 The site sits on a ridge and the land falls away to the south. There are existing trees and hedges along parts of the eastern and western boundaries as well as the northern boundary with Wilburton Road. However, within the site itself, there is little in the way of hedges or trees.
- 4.5 The majority of the surrounding land to the north east and south is undeveloped agricultural land, with some scattered residential dwellings and other buildings. Immediately to the west is no.16 Wilburton Road, a single storey dwelling, with Orchard Way and the adjoining Pear Tree Close, also to the west of the site.

## 5.0 RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES

- 5.1 Responses were received from the following consultees and these are summarised below. The full responses are available on the Council's web site.

### 5.2 **Design Out Crime Officers - 19 August 2020**

I have viewed the documents in relation to crime, disorder and the fear of crime and have searched the Constabulary crime and incident systems covering Haddenham for the last 2 years and would consider this to be an area of low risk to the vulnerability to crime at present. Relevant crimes recorded for this village during the above period are listed below: -

2 x dwelling burglary  
11 x vehicle crime (10 theft from and 1 theft of)  
28 x criminal damage offences  
3 x drug offences  
64 x anti-social behaviour incidents

There is mention in the Design and Access statement of NPPF para 127 sub-para f which states that policies and decisions should ensure that developments: - Create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

There is also a section headed Design out Crime on page 52 of the Design and Access statement.

While this is at an early stage of development it is important that security and crime prevention are considered and discussed at the earliest opportunity to ensure that the security of buildings, homes, amenity space and the environment provide a safe place for residents and visitors. With this in mind our office would be happy to discuss

Secured by Design and measures to reduce the risk to vulnerability to crime when there is more context to the design and layout, prior to a reserved matters application.

5.3 **The Ely Group of Internal Drainage Board - No Comments Received**

5.4 **Strategic Planning - No Comments Received**

5.5 **ECDC Trees Team - 3 September 2020**

There are no trees of significance within the main body of the site as it is under agricultural management, therefore any trees are within the boundary hedges or small 'copses'.

The arboricultural report identifies that there are no 'A' category trees, mainly 'B' and 'C' grade with nothing of note being removed. There is scope within the proposed layout for a robust landscaping scheme to be implemented through applying a landscaping condition.

There are no arboricultural reasons to object to this application.

5.6 **Cambs Wildlife Trust - 2 October 2020**

I have reviewed the spreadsheet for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and would concur with the calculations made within. I am satisfied that the net gain figure is an accurate reflection of what is likely to be realised at the site (but see comments below in relation to habitats for great crested newts).

The bat surveys completed at the site are adequate and I particularly welcome the completion of the surveys by adequately experienced and qualified bat surveyors.

However, I query the absence of any great crested newt (GCN) surveys and the lack of provision of suitable compensatory habitat, especially as the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal report states:

As GCN have been recorded within the local area, and the Site is functionally connected to a waterbody 130 m away which was assessed to provide good habitat for breeding, further survey works will be necessary to establish the presence or likely absence of GCN at the Site.

If ponds were not accessible for eDNA sampling or bottle trapping/torch surveys then onsite terrestrial surveys could have been carried out to attempt an assessment of presence/absence within the terrestrial habitats that will be lost. As the suitable terrestrial habitat will be lost to development I am unclear how impacts on this species can be addressed in the absence of survey data and would say that this is definitely not in accordance with best practice.

However, given the situation we find ourselves in, my comments would be as follows:

- The Protected Species Mitigation report states 'the proposed development will result in reduced foraging and sheltering opportunities, increasing predator exposure and the likelihood of unsuccessful hibernation' And so clearly this needs to be adequately addressed, perhaps by the temporary retention of some of the existing ruderal habitat and provision of suitable hibernacula with

scrub cover. Whilst I would agree that, over time, the new grassland may provide some suitable foraging habitat, firstly, this will take time to become suitable and also, it does not deliver compensatory hibernation habitat which will be lost when spoil piles, dense scrub and possibly also Building 1 is removed. The problem with devising mitigation plans in the absence of survey data is that a precautionary approach is required. We would suggest that an updated landscape plan incorporating GCN precautionary mitigation measures should be produced (with associated documents such as the Protected Species Mitigation report also updated). An updated BNG assessment may be necessary should the revised landscaping plans significantly change the balance of habitats. I would be happy to take a look at revised plans for GCN habitat, if you feel that would be helpful.

- If any great crested newts are found on the site at any stage, then the works must halt and Natural England be contacted. The Protected Species Mitigation Strategy report is, in my opinion, too weak on its stance in this regard; given the lack of surveys and therefore a lack of understanding of the numbers of newts that could be present on the site, I would say that contacting Natural England should be the first response.
- The Protected Species Mitigation Strategy report and accompanying plans should be amended and then, when these are satisfactory, I would recommend that the measures within the report be subject to condition, should you be minded to grant planning permission. These should be pulled into a new report (such as a Construction Environmental Management Plan, or similar) that provides an instruction manual for how to proceed, for example 'trenches will not be left uncovered overnight' rather than the current wording ' it is recommended that no excavations or trenches are left uncovered overnight during development works'.

It is surprising that reptiles were ruled out from the site assessment as the ruderal, scrub and hedgerow habitat appeared potentially suitable. Measures for ensuring no reptiles are killed or injured would be similar to those for newts and so they two can be covered at the same time in the precautionary approach to site clearance, but I would suggest that reptiles be included in the site toolbox talk and accompanying plan/report. The protected species mitigation strategy will also need to be updated accordingly.

The implementation of the Biodiversity and Ecological Management Plan (BEMP) should also be included as a condition, should you be minded to grant planning permission. The report says that 'monitoring (of created grassland habitat) will be undertaken as part of general Site maintenance. If germination of grassland species is poor, this will be reviewed and re-seeded as appropriate in the next available planting season. It is unclear how general site maintenance would determine whether the grassland is succeeding in its aims or not, and I would suggest some guidance sheet should be produced and then supplied to maintenance staff, such that they can determine if there is an issue or not, and what to do to remediate. I would suggest that more detailed guidance is supplied within the BEMP to set out how habitats will be monitored and maintained in the long-term.

**Cambs Wildlife Trust (following further information) - 3 November 2020**

I have reviewed the updated PSMS and BEMP. I am happy with the approach to newts in the PSMS now that it includes for hibernacula and brush piles.

With regards to the BEMP, my final outstanding comment is to ask that for the grassland creation section, a commitment to producing a detailed guidance sheet will be produced, which sets out details for the management and monitoring of the grassland, and including what remedial action can be undertaken if it is not developing as expected. This is really important, otherwise we end up with areas of grassland that promise so much but after a few years may not deliver. I feel a commitment to this aftercare needs to be set within the BEMP so that it is taken forward to the detailed stage of the development, and not forgotten.

Please do also feed back to the ecologists that overall I thought the BEMP was good and I hope it can deliver some really good habitats for the residents (another time, it would be good to consider information leaflets for new residents, telling them about the habitats that have been created on their doorstep, why there are holes in their fences etc).

**5.7 Lead Local Flood Authority - 21 September 2020**

At present we **object** to the grant of planning permission for the following reasons:

**1. Inappropriate discharge rates**

Option B proposes to discharge surface water into the Anglian Water surface water sewer inside the western boundary of the site at a rate of 5 l/s during all events up to and including a 1 in 100-year storm event plus a 40% allowance for climate change. However, the QBAR greenfield runoff rate has been calculated as 3.8 l/s.

As outlined in paragraph 6.3.6 of the SPD, all new developments on greenfield land are required to discharge the runoff from impermeable areas at the same greenfield runoff rate, or less than, if locally agreed with an appropriate authority or as detailed within the local planning policies of District and City councils.

The applicant has not demonstrated that the peak discharge rate for all events up to and including the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) critical storm event, including an appropriate allowance for climate change, will not exceed that of the existing site. This may increase the flood risk on site and in surrounding areas. Anglian Water are increasingly open to accepting discharge rates lower than 5 l/s in line with the latest Design and Construction Guidance (DCG), particularly when the development incorporates SuDS to provide surface water treatment and the self-cleaning velocity requirement is no longer applicable.

**2. Evidence of Anglian Water agreement required**

According to Section 6.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment, Anglian Water have accepted discharge into their surface water sewer in principle. However, evidence of this in principle agreement has not been provided.

**Lead Local Flood Authority (following further information) - 14 October 2020**

Thank you for your re-consultation which we received on the 2nd October 2020. We have reviewed the following documents:

- Flood Risk Assessment - Addendum For Lead Local Flood Authority, Flood Risk UK. Dated: September 2020.
- Flood Risk Assessment, Flood Risk UK. Dated: June 2020.

Based on these, as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) **we can now remove our objection to the proposed development.**

The above documents demonstrate that surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the use of permeable paving and a series of swales and attenuation basins. Surface water will then either infiltrate into the ground (subject to BRE DG 365 infiltration testing) or discharge into the Anglian Water surface water sewer at 3 l/s during a 1 in 1-year storm event, and 5 l/s during the 1 in 30 year and a 1 in 100 year (plus a 40% allowance for climate change) storm events.

The LLFA is supportive of the use of permeable paving, swales and attenuation basins as in addition to controlling the rate of surface water leaving the site they also provide water quality treatment.

The site is located entirely within flood zone 1 and is at very low risk to surface water flooding.

Water quality has been adequately addressed when assessed against the Simple Index Approach outlined in the CIRIA SuDS Manual.

We request conditions are imposed in relation to a surface water drainage scheme and long term maintenance arrangements.

5.8 **Cadent Gas Ltd** - No Comments Received

5.9 **Anglian Water Services Ltd** - 15 September 2020

No objection.

#### Section 1 - Assets Affected

There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted.

Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore, the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.

#### Section 2 - Wastewater Treatment

The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Haddenham Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows



### Section 3 - Used Water Network

The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows. If the developer wishes to connect to our sewerage network they should serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. We will then advise them of the most suitable point of connection.

### Section 4 - Surface Water Disposal

The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option. Building Regulations (part H) on Drainage and Waste Disposal for England includes a surface water drainage hierarchy, with infiltration on site as the preferred disposal option, followed by discharge to watercourse and then connection to a sewer.

From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse. Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.

## 5.10 **CPRE** - 29 October 2020

CPRE Cambridgeshire & Peterborough **objects strongly** to this application for the following reasons (summarised):

- Contrary to the Local Plan – the proposed site is not listed as a potential development site in East Cambs Local Plan, 2015.
- Sustainability - the site is unsustainable and will add further pressure on the locality and existing infrastructure.
- Health Services – Impact on the existing Primary Health Care service
- Traffic and Pollution – Impact on traffic congestion and highway safety and consequently air quality
- Landscape – Impact on the wider landscape setting of the village and the Haddenham ridge.
- Best and Most Versatile Land – impact on Grades 2 and 3a quality agricultural land
- Sustainability and Sea Level Rise – Impact on global warming and the risk of turning the Isle of Ely into an Island again
- Speculative Development – This is the third time an application has been made at this site, the previous applications in 2014 and 2019 having been soundly rejected by the Planning Committee.

## 5.11 **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** - No Comments Received

## 5.12 **Parish Council** - 3 September 2020

The Parish Council met yesterday evening to consider the above application. It was resolved to recommended outright refusal and submit the following comments in addition;

- Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that developments should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. Haddenham is one of the highest points in the Fens and the view across the ridge at the top of the development is highly distinctive. The view across the Fen to Cambridge is highly valued by local residents and also forms an important gap between the settlements of Haddenham and Wilburton.
- The site sits in open countryside and, contrary to Policy Growth 2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015, there is no justification to override the usual presumption of refusal of such applications.
- The proposal would be visually intrusive and would cause demonstrable harm to the character of the rural landscape. It's setting within the countryside would be contrary to the requirements set out by Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the Local Plan.
- The proposed development would result in significant adverse effects on the setting of the village, contrary to ENV1 of the Local Plan 2015. The site sits within a transitional zone between the two villages and to develop a "hard edge" here would be completely uncharacteristic to this part of the village.
- The site sits outside of the development envelope, Haddenham can demonstrate adequate housing supply elsewhere and this site is simply not appropriate; it is damaging and not required.
- A Neighbourhood Plan is currently in progress and the first stage of consultation with residents is complete. Approving this application seriously undermines the work done to identify suitable housing land supply within the Parish.
- A development of this scale would result in an unsustainable amount of residential development for the area; especially when the sites already given permission to within the Parish are taken into account too.
- This proposal is sited on the village extremity with no connection to the rest of the village and as such would be difficult to regard as integrated.
- The limited employment opportunities within the village, coupled with very limited public transport serving the village, would force more commuters onto the already congested local roads.
- In relation to the above point, there is already a significant pollution problem along the A1123 through Wilburton, as many commuters make their way into Cambridge each day.
- The proposal will result in a loss of residential amenity to neighbouring properties.
- There are serious concerns that the visibility at the top of the hill would not be sufficient especially when combined with the existing junction. This would result in a dangerous junction to negotiate and would contravene COM7 of the Local Plan which requires all development to provide safe and convenient access to the highway network.

- There is already pressure upon both the local Doctors Surgery and Primary School. This development fails to mitigate against the impact on these services and therefore does not comply with Policy Growth 3 of the Local Plan.
- There has been no consultation with local people at all.
- There are concerns that the bottom of the development would be prone to flooding; the land here lies very wet.
- The National Planning Policy Framework seeks to retain high quality agricultural land. The land here is of very good quality and should be protected for future generations.
- The foul water system that serves this part of the village is already overworked and during the winter months regularly overflows.
- It should be noted that a very similar application at this site was refused in 2014 and 2019 and that the 2014 appeal was withdrawn by the applicant. At that time, the District Council were without a 5-year land supply.
- The Council consider that these adverse effects would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any positives the development would bring to addressing the housing shortfall.

**Parish Council (following additional information) - 8 April 2021**

The Council met to consider the Amendment to the above application yesterday and it was agreed that that outright refusal continue to be recommended, and the following comments be returned to the Planning Officer;

In relation to the new Benefits Statement:

- The entire document is based upon the "tilted balance", and with the present 7-year land supply ECDC can demonstrate, "tilted balance" does not apply. Although the move to a 7-year supply is recent (Addendum to Five Year Land Supply Report - Published 1st March 2021), it should be noted that the Benefits document is dated February 2021 when ECDC had confirmed a 6-year land supply. (Five Year Land Supply Report - Published 18th December 2020).
- The benefits statement contains a number of inaccuracies and errors throughout.

The Council concur with the comments below made on 21st October 2020 by Alison Farmer, Landscape Consultant.

"The proposed scheme will result in a development which would not positively contribute to the character of Haddenham and would give rise to adverse landscape effects. The proposed development would create another cul-de-sac development on the edge of the village, which is poorly connected and, given its indicative form and layout, would not create a distinctive addition to the village nor retain open rural views."

The Council also wished to reaffirm the comments made previously (As stated above)

The Council consider that these adverse effects would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any positives the development would bring to addressing the housing shortfall which does not in fact exist.

5.13 **Local Highways Authority - 07 September 2020**

The highways authority **objects** and would recommend refusal for the following reasons:

1. The application is not supported by sufficient highway information to demonstrate that proposed junction arrangement is laid out and designed to the correct guidance and highways authority standards

The proposed development access is in the close proximity of a junction with a busy A Classified Road. There has been no road safety audit provided with this Outline application, which is for access only. This is required by both the planning and highways authority to demonstrate safe means of access can be achieved. This road safety audit must either be completed by CCC or reviewed by a CCC prior to the determination of this application.

2. The application is not supported by sufficient highways Transport Assessment information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be prejudicial to the satisfactory functioning of the highway or highway safety

I am unable to determine the queue lengths that would be caused with the junction with the information submitted. Therefore, I cannot accurately assess the impact on highways safety or if it would be detrimental to the free-flowing nature of the highway, where the principal function is that of carrying traffic freely and safely between centres of population

3. Inadequate pedestrian infrastructure has been proposed to serve the development proposed.

There has been no adequate footways or pedestrian crossing points to desired destinations of the residents of the development. If permitted in its current form this would be detrimental to highways safety

4. The application is not supported by sufficient highway and transport information, including dimensions, gradients/ levels, or vehicle tracking to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be prejudicial to conditions of highway safety.

**Additional Information**

The site lies immediately adjacent to the A1123 Principal Distributor Road, the primary function of which is carrying traffic freely and safely between centres of population. Should the proposed junction arrangement be permitted without the proper and necessary audits, it is likely that it will have a negative and adverse impact on the primary route and to the detriment to highway safety.

**Local Highways Authority (following further information) - 26 October 2020**

After a review of the submitted information I can confirm that my concerns and the issues previously raised have not been overcome. As such my objection and recommendation for refusal remains.

**Local Highways Authority (following further information) - 11 March 2021**

This is acceptable and now resolves all of the issues in the Road Safety Audit raised. Subject to the relevant and appropriate conditions **my objections have been overcome.**

**5.14 County Highways Transport Team - 10 September 2020**

The document reviewed is the Transport Assessment dated July 2020 produced by Newell Edwards Ltd. The proposals comprise the erection of up to 70 dwellings on the land south of 18 Wilburton Road, Haddenham.

Transport Assessment Review

**Accessibility**

The site is situated within acceptable walking and cycling distance to key facilities and amenities.

The existing pedestrian network in the site vicinity is not considered satisfactory to accommodate the development. It comprises a narrow 1.1m to 1.3m wide footway on the northern side of Wilburton Road which currently terminates at the junction with the A1123 whilst no footway infrastructure is present on the southern side of Wilburton Road between the Wilburton Road/A1123 junction and the Wilburton Road/Orchard Way junction. A narrow footway of 1.0m to 1.2m in width is present on the northern side of New Road in the vicinity of the A1123/New Road/Wilburton Road junction. It is noted that there is no footway infrastructure available on the southern side of New Road between the A1123/New Road/Wilburton Road junction and the New Road/Elizabeth Way junction or pedestrian crossing points in this vicinity to enable pedestrian access to New Road from the site. It is noted the development proposals comprise improvements to the surrounding pedestrian network in the form of a 2m wide footway from the junction with the A1123 to the junction with Elizabeth Way. The applicant should clarify whether such footway improvements are proposed on the southern side of New Road or Wilburton Road as this is not made clear as no plans have been submitted showing the proposed works. Furthermore, the applicant should undertake a highway boundary search to demonstrate such improvements can be delivered. Safe and satisfactory pedestrian infrastructure is crucial given the location of the site within acceptable walking distance to key sites such as Haddenham Pre-School and Robert Arkenstall Primary School.

It is noted there are no specific cycle facilities within the vicinity of the site. Cyclists are currently anticipated to use on-road routes.

The closest bus stops to the site are situated c60m northwest of the site access junction on either side of New Road. It is noted the eastbound bus stop comprises a flag and pole and timetable information, whilst no infrastructure is present at the westbound stop. Two further bus stops which facilitate an additional service are located on Wilburton Road c150m west of the site access junction. The stops comprise a flag and pole at the westbound stop, whilst no infrastructure is present at the eastbound stop. Bus stop infrastructure improvements are required. As previously noted, there are deficiencies to the existing pedestrian infrastructure providing access to the existing bus stops on New Road and Wilburton Road.

The bus stops on New Road serve the Citi 8 and Citi X8 services. The Citi 8 and Citi X8 services both comprise 1 service per day in each direction between March and Cambridge via Histon and Cottenham. The bus stops on Wilburton Road serve the Ely Zipper service which comprises an hourly service between midday and the peak periods between Witcham and Ely.

### **Existing Road Network**

The description of the surrounding highway network is agreed.

Traffic surveys undertaken on Wednesday 26th June 2019 between 07:00 and 10:00, and 15:00 and 19:00 for the following junctions have been used within this assessment:

- The Green/Station Road/Hop Row/High Street staggered crossroads
- Orchard Way/Wilburton Road priority junction
- New Road/Wilburton Road/A1123 junction

Full survey outputs should be submitted for the Highway Authority to review in order to accept the survey data used within the assessment.

The speed surveys undertaken on New Road on the 30mph stretch circa 50m northwest of the New Road/Wilburton Road/A1123 junction on Monday 22nd July 2019 between 16:30 and 17:00 are acceptable for use. It is noted the general speeds on the A1123 past the site are slightly above 30mph.

### **Accident Data**

Accident data obtained from the CrashMap has been used within this assessment. This is not acceptable for use within this assessment. As per our Transport Assessment Requirements (2019), the latest 60 months accident data should be obtained from the County Council via: [business.intelligence@cambridgeshire.go.uk](mailto:business.intelligence@cambridgeshire.go.uk). CrashMap does not provide the latest available data. Full CCC outputs should be provided.

### **Development Proposals**

The development proposals comprise the erection of up to 70 dwellings with a new access proposed off Wilburton Road in the form of a priority junction with 2m wide footways situated on either side.

Both car and cycle parking provision are anticipated to accord to the parking standards outlined within the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2015).

Site access, servicing, and internal layout details should be agreed with Highways Development Management who will provide separate comments.

### **Trip Generation**

The development is anticipated to generate 41 two-way vehicular movements in the AM peak and 47 two-way vehicular movements in the PM peak. This is not agreed. TRICS software has been used to determine vehicle trip generation for the site. Whilst it is noted Irish and Greater London sites have been excluded from the TRICS analysis, it should also be noted that the Highway Authority do not accept Greater Manchester sites within the analysis as such sites are not considered to be

representative. To provide a robust trip generation assessment and to determine the multi-modal trip generation for the development, the applicant should calculate the TRICS 'total-person' trip rates in conjunction with 2011 Census mode share data for the East Cambridgeshire 005 MSOA as per the methodology set out within our Transport Assessment Requirements (2019).

### **Trip Distribution**

The assignment of development traffic onto the surrounding highway network is not agreed. Whilst use of 2011 Census data to help inform the development trip distribution is agreed by providing the likely origins and destinations of development trips, it is not made clear within the assessment how development trips have been assigned onto the local network. The Highway Authority consider more development traffic heading to/from westbound is anticipated to use the staggered crossroads in Haddenham. Therefore, further information is required. Subject to the outcome of the revised trip assignment, the traffic flow diagrams should be further extended to consider the Stretham Road/Twenty Pence Road junction. Furthermore, whilst the trip distribution may have been agreed as part of the previous application for the site, it should be noted the Highway Authority reviews applications on a site by site basis using the evidence provided to us and does not make agreements based what was previously accepted. Additional information is required.

### **Traffic Impact Analysis**

The committed development included within the assessment is agreed. The assessment year scenarios examined within the assessment are acceptable for use.

The TEMPRO Growth Factors used within the assessment are agreed.

The impact of development traffic on the surrounding highway network cannot be determined until such a time as the baseline surveys, trip generation, and trip distribution are agreed.

The applicant is advised to include the Hop Row/High Street/The Green/High staggered crossroads within the junction capacity analysis.

Junction modelling should be undertaken using a DIRECT profile type as per our Transport Assessment Requirements (2019) as this will give the most accurate results and does not rely on assumptions to be made.

### **Mitigation Strategy**

At this stage it is not possible to determine what mitigation is needed to make the development acceptable. Once the full impact of the development is known, mitigation measures can be assessed.

### **Welcome Travel Packs**

Welcome Travel Packs should be submitted alongside the application as per our Transport Assessment Requirements (2019). These should include details of existing surrounding sustainable travel options as listed within our Transport Assessment Requirements document. The Travel Packs should also comprise incentives such as bus taster tickets and/or cycle vouchers to promote sustainable travel by residents

to/from the site. The Welcome Travel Packs will be subject to a condition should approval be given.

### **Conclusion**

The application as submitted does not include sufficient information to properly determine the highway impact of the proposed development. Were the above issues addressed, the Highway Authority would reconsider the application.

The Highway Authority therefore requests that this application not be determined until such time as the additional information above has been submitted and reviewed.

**County Highways Transport Team (following further information) - 3 November 2020**

These comments concern the additional information submitted by the applicant in response to the County Council's comments date 10<sup>th</sup> September 2020.

### **Accessibility**

The existing pedestrian network in the site vicinity is not considered satisfactory to accommodate the development. Existing infrastructure comprises a narrow 1.1m to 1.3m wide footway on the northern side of Wilburton Road which currently terminates at the junction with the A1123 whilst no footway infrastructure is present on the southern side of Wilburton Road between the Wilburton Road/A1123 junction and the Wilburton Road/Orchard Way junction. A narrow footway of 1.0m to 1.2m in width is present on the northern side of New Road in the vicinity of the A1123/New Road/Wilburton Road junction. It is noted that there is no footway infrastructure available on the southern side of New Road between the A1123/New Road/Wilburton Road junction and the New Road/Elizabeth Way junction or pedestrian crossing points in this vicinity to enable pedestrian access to New Road from the site. A 2m wide footway is proposed to be delivered on the western side of New Road between the A1123/New Road/Wilburton Road junction and the New Road/Elizabeth Way junction as part of the proposals.

The proposed level of improvement works alone is inadequate to serve the development as it does not facilitate safe and adequate access for all users to key destinations in the village. The improvement works should also comprise suitable pedestrian crossings across Wilburton Road to allow pedestrians to safely access key destinations within the village, widening of the footway on northern side of Wilburton Road within the vicinity of the site to 2m where possible to provide safe access to the new footway proposed by the applicant on the southern side of New Road, and a suitable pedestrian crossing across New Road to link the proposed footway on New Road to the existing footway on the northern side of New Road and the A1123 Haddenham Road. These works are required to both improve access to key locations within the village from the site via sustainable modes and to safely accommodate the development. The applicant should undertake a highway boundary search to demonstrate such improvements can be delivered. Safe and satisfactory pedestrian infrastructure is crucial given the location of the site within acceptable walking distance to key sites such as Haddenham Pre-School and Robert Arkenstall Primary School.



The closest bus stops to the site are situated c60m northwest of the site access junction on either side of New Road. It is noted the eastbound bus stop comprises a flag and pole and timetable information, whilst no infrastructure is present at the westbound stop. Two further bus stops which facilitate an additional service are located on Wilburton Road c150m west of the site access junction. The stops comprise a flag and pole at the westbound stop, whilst no infrastructure is present at the eastbound stop. Bus stop infrastructure improvements are required. Such improvements should comprise a flag and pole with timetable information at the west bound stop on New Road, timetable information at the westbound stop on Wilburton Road and a flag and pole with timetable information at the eastbound stop on Wilburton Road.

### **Existing Road Network**

The traffic surveys undertaken on Wednesday 26th June 2019 between 07:00 and 10:00, and 15:00 and 19:00 are acceptable for use within this assessment.

The traffic flow diagrams are not agreed. The traffic flows in the 'Base 2019 Traffic (PCU)' diagrams do not match the traffic count data obtained from the traffic surveys. The Highway Authority have checked the PCU traffic flow diagrams against the survey data as both PCUs and vehicle counts and neither match the survey data. The 'Base 2019 Traffic (PCU)' traffic flow diagram should be revised in addition to the 'Base 2020 Traffic (PCU) with/without development' and 'Base 2025 Traffic (PCU) with/without development' traffic flow diagrams accordingly.

### **Accident Data**

The latest 60 months accident data obtained from the County Council has been used within this assessment alongside CrashMap data. No accident cluster sites have been identified. This is acceptable for use.

### **Development Proposals**

Site access, servicing, and internal layout details should be agreed with Highways Development Management who will provide separate comments.

### **Trip Generation**

The development is anticipated to generate 41 two-way vehicular movements in the AM peak and 47 two-way vehicular movements in the PM peak. This is not agreed.

The applicant should demonstrate the trip generation used within this assessment is robust. This should be demonstrated by calculating the TRICS 'total-person' trip rates (excluding Irish, Greater London and Greater Manchester sites) in conjunction with 2011 Census mode share data for the East Cambridgeshire 005 MSOA as previously requested by the Highway Authority and comparing the results alongside the trip generation currently included within this assessment. The most-robust trip generation should be used within this assessment.

### **Trip Distribution**

It is noted development traffic has been distributed and assigned onto the surrounding network using 2011 Census origin-destination data. This method is agreed. The distribution and assignment of development traffic onto the surrounding highway network is therefore acceptable for use within this assessment.

### **Traffic Impact Analysis**

The impact of development traffic on the surrounding highway network cannot be determined until such a time as the traffic flow diagrams and trip generation are agreed. It is noted 8.8% of development traffic (4 vehicles) is anticipated to use the Hop Row/High Street/The Green/High staggered crossroads in the peak periods. The Highway Authority are satisfied that this junction does require a capacity assessment.

### **Mitigation**

As part of the development, the applicant has proposed to deliver the following:

A 2m wide footway to be delivered on the western side of New Road between the A1123 Haddenham Road/New Road/Wilburton Road junction and Elizabeth Way  
As previously mentioned, the proposed level of improvement works alone is inadequate to serve the development. Therefore, in addition to the above works proposed by the applicant, the Highway Authority request the following off-site highway works are included within the mitigation package for this development:

- Suitable pedestrian crossing points across Wilburton Road to be identified by the applicant
- Widening the footway on northern side of Wilburton Road within the vicinity of the site to 2m where possible to the new footway proposed on the southern side of New Road
- Suitable pedestrian crossing across New Road to link the proposed footway on New Road to the existing footway on the northern side of New Road and the A1123 Haddenham Road
- Installation of a flag and pole with timetable information at the westbound stop on New Road
- Installation of timetable information at the westbound stop on Wilburton Road
- Installation of a flag and pole with timetable information at the eastbound stop on Wilburton Road

The proposals will result in an increase in residents walking to and from the site to Haddenham village centre, the schools within this vicinity, and the nearest bus stops to the site. The above off-site highway works will improve access, amenity and safety for new residents utilising the pedestrian route to these locations via New Road and Wilburton Road which in turn will encourage travel to/from the site to these locations by sustainable modes. Therefore, having reviewed the proposed impacts of the development on the surrounding area, the above off-site highway works are considered essential. Should consent be given, the above works will be conditioned to be delivered by the applicant through a S278 agreement. The above improvements comply with both para's 108 and 110 of the NPPF (2019).

At this stage it is not possible to determine whether further mitigation is needed to make the development acceptable. Once the full impact of the development is known, mitigation measures can be assessed.

### **Welcome Travel Packs**

Welcome Travel Packs should be submitted alongside the application as per our Transport Assessment Requirements (2019). These should include details of existing

surrounding sustainable travel options as listed within our Transport Assessment Requirements document. The Travel Packs should also comprise incentives such as bus taster tickets and/or cycle vouchers to promote sustainable travel by residents to/from the site. The Welcome Travel Packs will be subject to a condition should approval be given.

### **Conclusion**

The application as submitted does not include sufficient information to properly determine the highway impact of the proposed development. Were the above issues addressed, the Highway Authority would reconsider the application. The Highway Authority therefore requests that this application not be determined until such time as the additional information above has been submitted and reviewed.

### **County Highways Transport Team (following further information) - 13 January 2021**

These comments concern the Technical Note dated November 2020 submitted by the applicant in response to the County Council's comments dated 3rd November 2020.

### Transport Assessment Review

#### **Traffic Flow Diagrams**

The traffic surveys undertaken on Wednesday 26th June 2019 between 07:00 and 10:00, and 15:00 and 19:00 are acceptable for use within this assessment. The Base 2019 traffic flow diagrams have been checked alongside the survey data and are acceptable for use.

#### **Development Proposals**

Site access, servicing, and internal layout details should be agreed with Highways Development Management who will provide separate comments.

#### **Trip Generation**

Multi-modal trip generation for the development has been calculated using TRICS 'total-person' trip rates in conjunction with 2011 Census mode share data for the East Cambridgeshire 005 MSOA. Whilst 1 Irish site has still been included within the TRICS analysis, the Highway Authority will accept the trip rates used within this assessment on this occasion given that they look to be robust. The development is anticipated to generate 54 two-way vehicular movements in the AM peak and 46 two-way vehicular movements in the PM peak. This is agreed.

#### **Traffic Impact Analysis**

It is noted 8.8% of development traffic (5 vehicles) is anticipated to use the Hop Row/High Street/The Green/High staggered crossroads in the peak periods. The Highway Authority are satisfied that this junction does not require a capacity assessment.

The site access junction is anticipated to operate within capacity in the future year scenarios. The development is not anticipated to cause detriment to the capacity of the Wilburton Road/A1123 junction.

#### **Mitigation**

The following mitigation package proposed to be delivered by the applicant is agreed:

- A 2m wide footway on the south side of Wilburton Road which will extend along the site frontage
- Tactile paving crossing points on Wilburton Road either side of the site access and a tactile paving crossing point on New Road to the north of the A1123/Wilburton Road junction
- Widening of the existing footway on the north side of Wilburton Road to 2m to tie into the existing footway to the west and the proposed footway to be delivered on the western side of New Road
- A 2m wide footway to be delivered on the western side of New Road between the A1123 Haddenham Road/New Road/Wilburton Road junction and Elizabeth Way
- Installation of a flag and pole with timetable information at the westbound stop on New Road
- Installation of timetable information at the westbound stop on Wilburton Road
- Installation of a flag and pole with timetable information at the eastbound stop on Wilburton Road

The proposals will result in an increase in residents walking to and from the site to Haddenham village centre, the schools within this vicinity, and the nearest bus stops to the site. The above off-site highway works will improve access, amenity and safety for new residents utilising the pedestrian route to these locations via New Road and Wilburton Road which in turn will encourage travel to/from the site to these locations by sustainable modes. Should consent be given, the above works will be secured through planning conditions. The above improvements comply with both para's 108 and 110 of the NPPF (2019). Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that such improvements can be delivered within the highway boundary.

### **Welcome Travel Packs**

Welcome Travel Packs will be secured through a planning condition should approval be given. The Travel Packs should include details of existing surrounding sustainable travel options as listed within our Transport Assessment Requirements document. They should also comprise incentives such as bus taster tickets and/or cycle vouchers to promote sustainable travel by residents to/from the site.

### **Conclusion**

The Highway Authority **does not wish to object to the application** subject to the conditions relating to provision of offsite footway improvement and crossing works, off site bus stop improvement works and provision and implementation of Welcome Travel Packs.

#### **5.15 Housing Section - 17 August 2020**

The Strategic Housing Team supports the above application in principle, as it will meet Policy HOU 3 of East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 (as amended) to deliver 30% affordable housing on site. (Up to 70 dwellings will secure up to 21 affordable dwellings)

Developers will be encouraged to bring forward proposals which will secure the affordable housing tenure as recommended by the most up to date SHMA at 77% rented and 23% intermediate housing.

Detailed discussions are recommended with the developer prior to submission of the reserved matters application in order to secure an affordable housing mix that meets the housing needs of the area. Early indications suggest that we will be requiring an affordable housing mix of one to four-bedroom homes on site.

It is recommended that the space standards for the affordable dwellings should meet the minimum gross internal floor area as defined within the DCLG

Should consent be granted, I would request the s106 Agreement contains the following Affordable Housing provisions:

1. That 30% Affordable Housing is secure with the tenure requirement of 77% rented and 23% intermediate housing.
2. That the dwellings will be Affordable Housing in accordance with the definition contained in NPPF.
3. That the dwellings will transfer to a provider of social housing approved by the Council, either a Private Registered Provider or an alternative affordable housing provider (including but not limited to a housing trust or company, a community land trust or an almshouses society).
4. That the tenure of each dwelling will be Affordable Rent, Social Rent or Shared Ownership, and no subsequent alteration will be permitted without the Council's prior approval.
5. That the rent charged for the Affordable Rented properties will not exceed Local Housing Allowance rate for the equivalent property size.
6. That the Affordable Dwellings are constructed to DCLG, National Described Space Standards or as a minimum all new dwellings should meet Building Regulation Part M (Volume 1), Category 2, unless there are exceptional design reasons why this is not possible.
7. The affordable dwellings are not clustered in parcel greater than 15 dwellings. This will ensure we create a balanced and sustainable community.
8. That the Provider will not dispose of any dwelling by outright sale (except any sale to a tenant under statutory provisions)
9. That occupation will be in accordance with a nomination agreement.
10. That these affordable housing conditions shall be binding on successors in title, with exceptions for mortgagees in possession and protected tenants.

5.16 **Ward Councillors** - No Comments Received

5.17 **Environmental Health (Scientific Officer)** - 17 August 2020

Thank you for consulting me on the above application. I have read the Phase 1 Contamination Study dated January 2019 prepared by Flood Risk UK and accept the findings. The report recommends further investigation to delineate the extent of any contamination. I recommend that standard contaminated land conditions 1 and 4 are attached to any grant of permission.

5.18 **Environmental Health (Domestic)** - 12 August 2020

We have commented on this site previously and I include our previous comments below for reference.

I have read the Design and Access Statement which advises this is a resubmission of 19/00214/OUM and seeks to address the reasons for refusal in 2019.

Due to the proposed number of dwellings and the close proximity of existing properties I would advise that construction times and deliveries during the construction phase are restricted to the following:

07:30 - 18:00 each day Monday - Friday  
07:30 - 13:00 on Saturdays and  
None on Sundays or Bank Holidays

I would also advise that prior to any work commencing on site a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) regarding mitigation measures for the control of pollution (including, but not limited to noise, dust and lighting etc) during the construction phase. The CEMP shall be adhered to at all times during the construction phase, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority (LPA).

If it is necessary to undertake ground piling I would request that a method statement be produced and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) before work takes place. If there is no intention to utilise ground piling then I would request this be confirmed in writing and a condition which prevents it be attached until such time as a ground piling method statement is agreed with the LPA.

The Odour Impact Assessment is the same as previously submitted so I have no additional comments to make concerning this.

5.19 **Cambridgeshire Archaeology** - 17 August 2020

We have found this latest planning application on the Weekly Lists and advise you that archaeological remains relating to prehistoric to Roman settlement are present in this fen edge location that are of moderate regional importance. This was established via a trench-based field evaluation in 2014 (CHER ref ECB4264).

As the remains are not of national importance or so sensitive that they warrant management through a designed preservation in situ strategy, we recommend that the mitigation of construction impacts on these archaeological remains can be achieved through the implementation of an appropriately designed archaeological investigation programme secured by a suitable planning condition placed on any planning consent that your authority may be minded to grant. This will allow excavation to occur prior to construction according to an agreed timetable.

We recommend the inclusion of a planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological works.

5.20 **CCC Growth & Development** - 26 August 2020

The following education contributions are required to mitigate the proposed development:

	Contribution	Project	Trigger
<b>Early Years</b>	£243,964*	Expansion of Robert Arkenstall Primary School to provide additional Early Years places	50% prior to first occupation AND 50% prior to 50% occupation of development
<b>Primary</b>	£766,744*	Expansion if Robert Arkenstall Primary School from 280 to 420 places	As above
<b>Secondary</b>	£668,500*	1 form of entry expansion of Witchford Village College	As above
<b>Libraries</b>	£10,207	Haddenham Community Library	100% prior to occupation of 50% of the development
<b>Strategic Waste</b>	n/a		
*indicative cost			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£1,689,415</b>		

5.21 **Minerals and Waste Development Control Team - 18 August 2020**

Thank you for consulting Cambridgeshire County Council, as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA), on the above planning application. I have reviewed the available documentation and wish to make the following comments:

The detail in the design and access statement given to construction waste management and commitment to prepare a site waste management plan is welcomed. However, if the Local Planning Authority is minded to grant planning permission, it is requested a condition securing a detailed waste management and minimisation plan is imposed, in order to ensure compliance with Policy CS28 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.

5.22 **Waste Strategy (ECDC) - 2 September 2020**

No objection.

5.23 **NHS England - No Comments Received**

5.24 **Natural England - 17 August 2020**

Natural England has no comments to make on this application.

5.25 **Council's Landscape Consultant – 21 October 2020**

I have reviewed the response by Guarda dated September 2020 and also note the new Natural Environment Supplementary Planning Guidance.

The Guarda Report helpfully provides clarification on a number of points and in particular confirms that:

- The trees at the entrance to the site will be retained and the no dig construction will be employed to avoid damage to tree roots.
- The orchard trees in the grounds of property No 18 Haddenham Road will be removed – this was not previously mentioned in the LVIA.
- The maximum buildings heights proposed are 7.5m and 5.2m to ridge height for 2 and 1.5 storey dwellings respectively.
- The proposed access is the only physical connection of the site to the village.
- The tree heights used in the visualisation are 10m for large scale trees and 7m for small scale tree based on conservative growth rates by year 15.

Having considered the points made in the Guarda report I am still of the view that the proposed scheme will result in a development which would not positively contribute to the character of Haddenham and would give rise to adverse landscape effects. The proposed development would create another cul-de-sac development on the edge of the village which is poorly connected and, given its indicative form and layout, would not create a distinctive addition to the village nor retain open rural views.

If the Local Authority is minded to approve this scheme, it is recommended the following aspects are conditioned:

- The maximum height of buildings on the site
- The minimum width of boundary landscaping/planting
- The retention of open rural views from Haddenham Road
- Provision of sections to demonstrate effective reduction of visual effects and appropriate place making
- The preparation of a detailed landscaping scheme and importantly a secured mechanism for future management and net biodiversity gain in accordance with the SPG.
- The use of building materials and built form which reflects the local vernacular and edge of village/rural location of the site, especially on the mid slopes.

5.26 A site notice was displayed near the site on 2 September 2020 and a press advert was published in the Cambridge Evening News on 20 August 2020.

5.27 **Neighbours** – 160 neighbouring properties were notified and the responses received are summarised below. 49 responses were received in objection. No letters of support were received. A full copy of the responses is available on the Council's website.

#### **Visual Impacts**

- Affects public views
- Landscape Impact
- Development too large and out of character with the village
- Haddenham has well established develop envelope which provides necessary degree of separation from Wilburton. This development would encroach further towards Wilburton.
- Gap between Haddenham and Wilburton is an important contribution to the setting of the village.



- Haddenham highest village in area and the ridge on which the development is proposed is important to the isle setting of Haddenham in terms of views and landscape.
- Development would reduce green belt land detracting from village and separate identity.
- Form and character
- Affects streetscene
- Development would be highly visible for miles around.
- Development is of higher density than surrounding developments being out of character

### **Residential Impacts**

- Loss of privacy
- Noise sensitive – noise from people and cars
- Overbearing
- Overlooking properties and gardens
- Pollution issues
- Existing properties losing public views
- Housing backing onto my property with views directly into my property resulting in overlooking, loss of privacy and noise and disturbance.

### **Policy**

- Contrary to policy
- Land has previously had planning rejected twice before – these reasons still stand.
- Outside development envelope
- Nothing has changed from previous rejected applications infrastructure wise
- ECDC currently has 5-year land supply quota.
- No proven need for development of this scale
- Preparation for Neighbourhood plan shows majority of residents favour smaller developments within the existing village boundary. This proposal would go against local preference.
- Adverse effects of previous applications still would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits the development would bring.
- Haddenham has identified infill sites as part of local plan. Development is not needed.
- Currently 162 houses have either begun or been completed in last few years. No need for 70 additional houses.
- All core reasons for previous rejections still exist.

### **Transport/Highways**

- Highway Safety
- Junction difficult to get out of. Increased pollution from traffic and congestion.
- Increase in traffic, resulting in extra 140 cars causing severe congestion and high levels of traffic in village and at the junction with Twenty Pence Road in Wilburton.
- Increasing traffic on A10 which is already heavily congested due to commuters who do not work on bus route or train line route.
- No further developments should be allowed under upgrade to A10.

- No parking on High Street. Not safe for pedestrians due to volume of traffic.
- Improvements needed to bus service to connect Haddenham with surrounding and wider area.
- Same problems with road junction as last development proposal.
- Difficult egress viewing onto road
- Additional traffic joining Duck Lane from this site would exacerbate risk of accidents.
- Moving access from the previous application's proposal does not address previous concerns.
- Does not agree that development of 70 houses is forecast to only result in 31 additional peak time vehicle movements.
- Secondary education is outside of village necessitating additional car journeys.
- No cycle lanes for commuters to Cambridge, either via A10 or Twenty Pence Road. Unsafe cycling conditions on all roads around Haddenham due to high levels of traffic and lack of cycle paths.
- The proposed access was previously rejected in 2014.

### **Services/Water/Drainage/Sewage**

- Land is within a water treatment safeguard area
- No access to mains gas in this part of village
- Sewage would need additional capacity

### **Environmental Impacts/Wildlife**

- Need to consider Haddenham is a countryside village and that the countryside and wildlife needs to be preserved, need to minimise loss of habitat and species and improve and maintain environment for general well-being of everyone.
- Impacts to wildlife which is diverse including deer, bats, hares, pheasants and others
- Pollution from congested traffic at Wilburton which may well be above legal limits.
- Effect on local wildlife specifically presence of great crested newts.
- Impact on trees and wildlife

### **Village Facilities**

- Doctors and school already oversubscribed – no room to expand on current site
- Existing developments around Haddenham already having increased impact on existing facilities.
- Development would place strain on village infrastructure, schools and doctors.
- Medical services are under severe pressure
- Application gives not concrete proposals on the level of funding to be provided for expansion of schools or other infrastructure.

### **Other**

- Development will devalue our property
- Plan does not state types of housing 1,2 or 3 storey?
- Road access to the site involves demolition of perfectly good house.
- Land currently farmed.
- Landowner not affected by disruption and upset of development as does not live in village.

- No provision for jobs on site making development unsustainable and is designed to accommodate commuters increasing road congestion and pollution.
- Haddenham already has additional housing agreed.
- Asking once again for this to be rejected in such a way resident are not subjected to the distress and anxiety of this ever-frequent cycle.
- Application is only for demolition of 18 Wilburton road and construction of entrance road with all matters reserved giving no commitment to following a proposed layout. Does not agree the principle of development should be allowed without full details when no development is envisaged within current planning envelopes.
- Unwanted, unsustainable development in an unsuitable location and should be rejected.
- Nature of development would change the village into a dormitory town, destroying its roots in the local farming community
- In favour of ongoing development that maintains the character and quality of life residents enjoy but Infrastructure should be build PRIOR to development.
- Proposal is on Grade 2 farm land currently used to supply food.
- Benefits Statement still does not address the fundamental concerns of the proposed development and the impacts on social/economic/environmental
- Benefits statement refers to lack of housing supply, ECDEC has sufficient housing supply

## 6.0 The Planning Policy Context

### 6.1 East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015

GROWTH 2	Locational strategy
GROWTH 3	Infrastructure requirements
GROWTH 5	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
HOU 1	Housing mix
HOU 2	Housing density
HOU 3	Affordable housing provision
ENV 1	Landscape and settlement character
ENV 2	Design
ENV 4	Energy efficiency and renewable energy in construction
ENV 7	Biodiversity and geology
ENV 8	Flood risk
ENV 9	Pollution
ENV 14	Sites of archaeological interest
COM 7	Transport impact

### 6.2 Supplementary Planning Documents

Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations

Design Guide

Contaminated Land - Guidance on submitted Planning Application on land that may be contaminated

Flood and Water

Natural Environment SPD

Climate Change SPD

### 6.3 National Planning Policy Framework 2019

- 2 Achieving sustainable development
- 4 Decision-making
- 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities
- 9 Promoting sustainable transport
- 11 Making effective use of land
- 12 Achieving well-designed places
- 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

### 6.4 Planning Practice Guidance

### 7.0 PLANNING COMMENTS

#### 7.1 **Principle of Development**

7.2 This application follows two previous schemes submitted in 2014, Ref: 14/00130/OUM, an outline application for up to 100 dwellings with access included, and in 2019, Ref: 19/00214/OUM, an outline application for up to 110 dwellings with access included. Both of these applications were recommended for refusal by Officers and refused by the Planning Committee for the reasons stated on the decision notices, appended to this report. This current application proposes residential development of up to 70 dwellings which would include the demolition of no.18 Wilburton Road, to facilitate the proposed access. The physical site remains largely the same as it was in 2014 and 2019. The two major differences between this and the previous application are the demolition of a dwelling and the reduction in the number of dwellings from up to 110 to up to 70 (reduction of 40 dwellings).

7.3 The application is assessed in accordance with the development plan which comprises East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. Also relevant are the associated Supplementary Planning Documents, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Planning Practice Guidance. On 26<sup>th</sup> March 2021 East Cambridgeshire District Council issued a Single-Issue Review of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. One area has been identified as being in need of update, namely Policy GROWTH1 which uses an out of date housing requirement figure. The need to review the Local Plan was triggered by a number of factors including the need to re-examine the appropriate level of housing growth, to ensure there is sufficient housing land supply and to ensure the Local Plan remains up to date. The review focusses on one aspect of the Local Plan only. For the avoidance of doubt, the vast majority of the Local Plan 2015 will not be amended. While the Emerging Plan is at an early stage and carries no weight in the determination of this application, it is worth noting the current policy position.

7.4 Policy GROWTH 2 of the Local Plan 2015 sets out the overall strategy for the distribution of growth across the district focussing on the Market Towns of Ely, Soham and Littleport. The policy is up-to date and aims to ensure that growth takes place in appropriate locations across the district. Within the defined development envelopes housing, employment and other development to meet local needs will

normally be permitted, provided there is no significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area and that all other material planning considerations are satisfied. It then states that outside of development envelopes, development will be strictly controlled, having regard to the need to protect the countryside and the setting of towns and villages.

- 7.5 The NPPF promotes sustainable development and the delivery of high quality homes, it specifically states at paragraph 12 that *“the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory starting point for decision making”*.
- 7.6 Since April 2020 the Council has been able to demonstrate an adequate 5 Year Housing Land Supply, as demonstrated first in its ‘Five Year Land Supply Report - 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2024’ (published April 2020) and later in its updated ‘Five Year Land Supply Report - 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2025’ (published December 2020). The latter report confirmed that from 1 January 2021 the Council had a 6.14-year supply of deliverable housing land. That calculation included a 20% buffer as required by paragraph 73 of the NPPF based on a 2019 Housing Delivery Test (HDT) result of 66%. The 2020 HDT result, published in January 2021, indicates that housing delivery in the district has improved to 87%. As a result of the HDT exceeding 85%, the appropriate paragraph 73 buffer falls to 5% which has the effect of increasing the Council’s housing land supply to 7.01 years.
- 7.7 This adequate housing land supply means that the Council considers its policies relating to housing delivery up-to-date and gives them full weight in the determination of this application.
- 7.8 The site is situated outside of the development envelope and does not constitute an exception as defined within Policy Growth 2 of the Local Plan. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy Growth 2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015, and is not acceptable.
- 7.9 **Visual Amenity and impact on the character of the countryside**
- 7.10 In relation to visual amenity, the plans submitted are indicative only and details of scale, appearance, layout, and landscaping are not being considered as part of this outline application.
- 7.11 The application site is located on the eastern edge of Haddenham on predominantly undeveloped land, which falls towards the south, as part of a ridge running east-west between Haddenham and Wilburton. Whilst the site is not covered by any landscape quality designations (there are no such designations in East Cambridgeshire), the site makes a significant positive contribution to the setting of the village and this transitional character between the villages.
- 7.12 Haddenham is one of the highest points in the Fens and the application site sits at a key vantage point in the district. From this part of Haddenham there are attractive and locally valued views from the ridge down across the Fens to Cambridge, and the site takes in part of this existing vista. This is a highly distinctive landscape in the local area and is an important part of the setting not only of Haddenham but also of the Isle of Ely. This open and attractive vista also forms an important gap

between Haddenham and Wilburton, with the highway between the two running along the top of the ridge (A1123).

- 7.13 Policy ENV1 of the Local Plan, 2015 recognises the importance of the edge of settlement locations and requires developments to demonstrate that their location, scale, form, design, materials, colour, edge treatments and structural landscaping will protect, conserve and where possible enhance the settlement edge, space between settlements, and their wider landscape setting. This is also echoed in Chapter 15 of the NPPF – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
- 7.14 A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) was submitted with the application (by Guarda Landscape). The Council requested the input of an external Landscape Consultant (Alison Farmer Associates) to review the document and to allow a more comprehensive analysis to be undertaken of the LVIA. Alison Farmer Associates also reviewed the LVIA submitted as part of the previous application and is therefore familiar with the site and its context. The consultant's comments are summarised in paragraph 5.25 of this report. However, it is clear from her comments that she considers that the *“proposed scheme will still result in a development which would not positively contribute to the character of Haddenham and would give rise to adverse landscape effects. The proposed development would create another cul-de-sac development on the edge of the village which is poorly connected, and given its indicative form and layout, would not create a distinctive addition to the village nor retain open rural views”*.
- 7.15 It is considered that based on the conclusion from the Landscape Consultant, the proposal would have a long-term negative impact on the character of the existing historic landscape. Furthermore, the applicant has failed to demonstrate (and in the absence of further information) that the visual landscape impact can be mitigated through this proposal. The LVIA in its conclusion recognises that, *“initially the effect of new planting will be limited. In the long term the scale of effect of the proposed development on the landscape receptors identified will reduce to Moderate or Minor Adverse with a Minor Beneficial effect on the level of vegetation within the site which will improve both the ecological and recreational value of the site”*. From this statement, it is considered that the proposed development would have a high adverse impact because any quantity or quality of landscaping would not be able to successfully integrate with the surrounding area, nor mitigate against the significant visual harm on the open countryside character of the area.
- 7.16 The proposed development, in the case of visual amenity and the character of the countryside, is considered to have an adverse impact on the character of the area and the setting of Haddenham. It is therefore considered to be contrary to the aims and objectives of Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015, and the principles of Paragraph 170 of the NPPF which seeks all new developments to enhance the natural and local environment through protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.
- 7.17 **Residential Amenity**
- 7.18 The application is outline only (includes access). Matters such as appearance and scale are both reserved for the future as part of a reserved matters application, if outline permission is granted.

- 7.19 There are a number of residential dwellings in close proximity to the site, namely no.40 Haddenham Road, to the east, and 16 Wilburton Road to the west. The site then wraps around the boundaries of the properties of Pear Tree Close and Orchard Way. No. 40 Haddenham Road sits on a relatively large plot and has been extended to the rear quite extensively. The change from an undeveloped piece of agricultural land to residential development would clearly have an impact on the outlook and setting of these properties and those towards the front of the development will be likely to experience an increase in activity from the occupants of that development using the main access point. The proposal includes an indicative housing layout showing how the site could be developed, which illustrates that there would be sufficient space to adequately mitigate for any adverse impact with the use of soft landscaping and sufficient set back distances, in accordance with the Council's Design Guide SPD.
- 7.20 Neighbours have raised concerns about noise and disturbance from the additional traffic movements to and from the site. It is considered that there would be an increase in traffic noise as a result of people entering and leaving the new development. However, the proposed access would be sufficiently distant from those properties in Orchard Way and Pear Tree Close, and from 16 Wilburton Road to ensure that there would not be a significant adverse effect on residential amenity.
- 7.21 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the application and is satisfied with the submitted odour assessment and has recommended conditions relating to construction hours and submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan as part of any permission. The Council's Scientific Officer has also reviewed the Contaminated Land report and is satisfied with the conclusions and has recommended conditions relating to the submission of a full land contamination report and a condition requiring the developer to make us aware of any future sources of contamination during construction. The proposal therefore complies with Policy ENV9 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 7.22 The size of the gardens on the adjacent existing housing estates (Orchard Way and Pear Tree Close), along with the scope for a sensitive layout within the site itself also indicates that it would be possible to achieve a design and layout that would enable sufficient separation distances to prevent any adverse effects on residential amenity in terms of overlooking, or buildings being overbearing, and to comply with the guidelines contained within the Design Guide SPD. It is therefore considered that the Local Planning Authority could not object to the proposal on the grounds of residential amenity as it would be possible to design a scheme that would comply with Policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015.
- 7.23 **Archaeology**
- 7.24 Policy ENV14 of the Local Plan is relevant and seeks all new development to have regard to their impacts upon the historic environment and protect, enhance and where appropriate, conserve nationally designated and undesignated archaeological remains, heritage assets and their settings. The policy also requires submission of an archaeological evaluation of significance to be submitted. These principles are also echoed in paragraph 189 of the NPPF.

- 7.25 The application is accompanied by a Archaeological Evaluation Report which identifies potential archaeology relating to prehistoric Roman settlement. The County Archaeology Team have assessed this document and raise no objection and state: *“This was established via a trench-based field evaluation in 2014. As the remains are not of national importance or so sensitive that they warrant management through a designed archaeological investigation programme, we recommend that the mitigation of construction impacts on the archaeological remains can be achieved through the implementation of an appropriate designed archaeological investigation programme secured by a suitable planning condition”*.
- 7.26 It is therefore considered that in terms of archaeology, the proposal is acceptable and complies with the aims and objectives of Policy ENV14 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015 and paragraph 189 of the NPPF.
- 7.27 **Highway Safety**
- 7.28 Means of access is included as part of this outline application. The proposed access would be created following the demolition of no.18 Wilburton Road. In the previous application, Ref: 19/00214/OUM, the access was proposed further to the east nearest the junction with Wilburton Road and New Road (A1123). The previous application included a reason for refusal in relation to this access and the subsequent impact on highway safety (See appendix 2, Reason 2). A Transport Assessment has been submitted as part of this application which has been reviewed by the County’s Transport Team. The proposed access details have also been considered by the Local Highway’s Authority. The new access would include 3 tactile crossing points, 2 along Wilburton Road, and 1 on New Road with an additional new 2m footway to be created along New Road. These crossings and footway would ensure a safe connection to the wider village for pedestrians. Further information was requested as per the comments, summarised in paragraph 5.15 in this report.
- 7.29 Policy COM7 of the Local Plan requires all new developments to be designed to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and should promote sustainable forms of transport appropriate to its particular location. Development proposals shall also provide safe and convenient access to the highway network and be capable of accommodating the level/type of traffic generated without detriment to the local highway network and the amenity, character or appearance of the locality. This is also reflected within paragraphs 108 and 109 of the NPPF.
- 7.30 The County Council Highways Team have advised, based on the additional information submitted, that the proposed access and the impacts of the proposed development on the wider highway network is acceptable and the previous reason for refusal on Ref: 19/00214/OUM, in relation to highway safety, has been overcome.
- 7.31 In relation to car and cycle parking provision, this is not a matter that is being considered as part of this outline application and would form part of a reserved matters application.



- 7.32 It is therefore considered that in terms of highway safety and accessibility, the proposed development complies with Policy COM7 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015 and is acceptable.
- 7.33 **Biodiversity**
- 7.34 Policy ENV7 of the Local Plan is relevant and requires all new development proposals to protect the biodiversity and geological value of land and buildings and minimise harm to or loss of environmental features, such as trees, hedgerows, woodland, wetland and ponds. Also, to provide appropriate mitigation measures, reinstatement or replacement of features and/or compensatory work that will enhance or recreate habitats on or off site where harm to environmental features and habitat is unavoidable, and maximise opportunities for creation, restoration, enhancement and connection of natural habitats as an integral part of development proposals. Further emphasis of these principles are stated within paragraph 174 of the NPPF. Paragraph 170(d) emphasises the need to minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. Furthermore, Policy NE6 of the Council's Natural Environment SPD states that "*all development proposals should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by firstly avoiding impacts where possible, where avoidance isn't possible, minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing measurable net gains for biodiversity*".
- 7.35 In terms of biodiversity the application is accompanied by a Biodiversity Net Gain report, Bat Survey Report, a Biodiversity and Ecological Management Plan (BEMP) and a Protected Species Mitigation Strategy which covers Great Crested Newts, Bats and Badgers. The previous application, Ref: 19/00214/OUM, included a reason for refusal based on insufficient evidence in relation to the presence of Great Crested Newts and biodiversity net gain (See appendix 2, Reason 3). The submitted documents now cover these elements.
- 7.36 The Wildlife Trust have reviewed the documents and have advised that they are satisfied with the details and that an overall biodiversity net gain could be achieved (Net gain of 1.71%). The Protected Species document submitted with the application covers Great Crested Newts (GCN), which was a reason for refusal on the previous application. It is acknowledged that GCN may be present in close proximity to the site, however the report covers mitigation and protection measures to ensure that these would not be harmed as a result of the proposal. The Wildlife Trust are satisfied with the recommendations within the report. The previous reason for refusal has therefore been overcome and the proposal is acceptable, in relation to biodiversity.
- 7.37 It is therefore considered that the proposed development, in relation to biodiversity, complies with Policy ENV7 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, paragraph 170(d) of the NPPF and Policy NE6 of the Natural Environment SPD, and is acceptable.
- 7.38 **Flood Risk and Drainage**
- 7.39 Policy ENV8 of the Local Plan requires all developments to contribute to an overall flood risk reduction. Paragraph 155 of the NPPF also emphasises the need to

divert development away from high flood risk areas. Cambridgeshire's Flood and Water SPD is also relevant which supports Policy ENV8.

- 7.40 The site lies within Flood Zone 1, which is an area of low flood risk and where development should be directed to. Due to the scale of the proposed development (over 1ha in size) a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required. A FRA accompanies the application and has been assessed by the Environment Agency (EA), the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and Anglian Water. A Foul Sewerage assessment has also been submitted as part of the application.
- 7.41 The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) raised concerns initially with the water discharge rates indicated within the Flood Risk Assessment. Further information was submitted to demonstrate that surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the use of permeable paving and a series of Swales and attenuation basins. Surface water will then either infiltrate into the ground or discharge into the Anglian Water surface water sewer at 3l/s during a 1 in 1 year storm event, and 5l/s during the 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year (plus 40% allowance for climate change) storm events.
- 7.42 In relation to foul water drainage, Anglian Water have confirmed that this site is in the catchment of Haddenham Waste Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.
- 7.43 It is therefore considered that the proposed development complies with Policy ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015, paragraph 155 of the NPPF, and the Flood and Water SPD.
- 7.44 **Impact on Primary Health Care**
- 7.45 The previous application, Ref: 19/00214/OUM, included a reason for refusal based on the impact of the proposed development on Primary Health Care. NHS England (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group), in their response, raised concerns that the existing GP Practices do not have capacity for the additional growth resulting from that development, and that the proposed development will likely to have an impact in the NHS funding programme for the delivery of primary healthcare provision within this area and specifically within the health catchment of the development.
- 7.46 The proposal, subject of this application, is proposing a smaller number of dwellings (from up to 110, to up to 70). NHS England were consulted but have not responded to this consultation, despite numerous correspondence with them. They have not returned messages or emails and can only assume that they have no comments to make on this application. However, if the Council were minded to approve the application, we could seek a contribution as part of the S106 to ensure that any impact could be mitigated, in accordance with Policy Growth 3 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015
- 7.47 In light of no response from NHS England on this proposal including several attempts made to encourage a response, the previous reason for refusal has not been overcome. However, on balance, this could be mitigated through a S106 legal agreement, if relevant, and therefore is acceptable.

- 7.48 It is considered that the proposed development complies with Policy Growth 3 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015.
- 7.49 **Other Material Matters**
- 7.50 Social, Economic and Environmental Benefits Statement – February 2021
- 7.51 A Benefits Statement was submitted in February 2021, which seeks to explain the social, economic, and environmental benefits of the proposed development. The Statement fails to acknowledge that the Council have a comfortable housing land supply, at 7.01 years. Paragraph 1.3 in the Statement refers to Paragraph 11(d) part ii of the NPPF which relates to the “*tilted balance*” and would otherwise be triggered if the Council had not had a 5-year housing land supply. This is therefore not relevant and the analysis against the Social, Economic and Environmental benefits of the proposal is not required as part of the determination of this application. I therefore give no weight to this Statement and do not agree that the application should be assessed against the tilted balance.
- 7.52 Self-Build Dwellings
- 7.53 The previous application, Ref 19/00214/OUM, included a reason for refusal relating to self-build properties (see appendix 2, reason 5). Policy HOU1 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015, states that housing developments of 100 or more dwellings will be expected to provide 5% self-build properties. The previous application failed to demonstrate this and was therefore contrary to this policy. The proposal subject of this application, proposes less than 100 dwellings and as such the requirement for self-build properties is not required, and the reason for refusal therefore is no longer relevant to this application, and could not be refused on these grounds.
- 7.54 Affordable Housing
- 7.55 The proposed development is required to deliver 30% affordable housing in accordance with Policy HOU3 of the Local Plan. The application is accompanied by an Affordable Housing Statement and confirms to deliver this as required by the Policy and would also provide a mix which reflects the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment, i.e. 77% rented and 23% intermediate housing. The Council’s Housing Strategy and Enabling Officer has supported this proposal, and this can be secured through a S106 legal agreement. It is considered that the proposed development therefore complies with Policy HOU3 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015, in relation to affordable housing.
- 7.56 Renewable Energy and Climate Change
- 7.57 Policy ENV4 of the Local Plan relates to energy and water efficiency and renewable energy in construction. The policy requires all proposals for new development should aim for reduced or zero carbon development in accordance with the zero-carbon hierarchy; first maximising energy efficiency and then incorporating renewable or low carbon energy sources on-site as far as practicable. Policy CC1 of the Council’s Climate Change SPD supports Policy ENV4 and encourages

developers to submit a Sustainability Statement with their proposals. There is mention of energy efficiency within the submitted Design and Access Statement, which states that “*Environmentally responsible methods of construction and a palette of sustainable, locally sourced materials will be chosen wherever possible, in pursuing a design that is energy efficient and environmentally conscious. Materials will be selected from local sources wherever possible to minimise transport energy use and help sustain the local economy. Low carbon lighting, triple glazing and improved insulation will be incorporated into the scheme. Where possible, the orientation of the plot will ensure the optimum plot orientation for solar gain*”.

7.58 A separate Sustainability Statement has not been submitted with the application elaborating on the above claims, however, this could be secured by condition if the application was approved. It is therefore considered that the proposed development complies with Policy ENV4 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015, and Policy CC1 of the Climate Change SPD.

#### 7.59 Developer S106 Contributions – Education

7.60 The County Council have requested contributions towards education, as shown in paragraph 5.20 and as required by Policy Growth 3 of the Local Plan and the Council’s Developer Contributions SPD. If Members were minded to approve the application, these contributions would be secured by a S106 legal agreement. The proposed development therefore would comply with Policy Growth 3 of the Local Plan, 2015, and the Developer Contributions SPD.

#### 7.61 **Planning Balance**

7.62 It is considered that the proposed development is unacceptable as the site is situated outside of the development envelope where development is normally restricted under Policy Growth 2 of the Local Plan. The proposed development does not fall under the definition of any of the identified exceptions to the policy and is therefore unacceptable. The Council can demonstrate a comfortable 5-year housing land supply, at 7.01 years. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development would give rise to significant adverse impacts in terms of visual amenity and the impact on the setting of Haddenham, which forms part of a locally valued landscape. As a result, the proposal would be contrary to Policies Growth 2 and ENV1 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and the principles of chapter 15 of the NPPF – ‘Conserving and enhancing the natural environment’.

7.63 The application is therefore recommended for REFUSAL.

### 8 COSTS

8.1 An appeal can be lodged against a refusal of planning permission or a condition imposed upon a planning permission. If a local planning authority is found to have acted unreasonably and this has incurred costs for the applicant (referred to as appellant through the appeal process) then a cost award can be made against the Council.

8.2 Unreasonable behaviour can be either procedural i.e. relating to the way a matter has been dealt with or substantive ie relating to the issues at appeal and whether a local

planning authority has been able to provide evidence to justify a refusal reason or a condition.

8.3 Members do not have to follow an officer recommendation indeed they can legitimately decide to give a different weight to a material consideration than officers. However, it is often these cases where an appellant submits a claim for costs. The Committee therefore needs to consider and document its reasons for going against an officer recommendation very carefully.

8.4 In this case members' attention is particularly drawn to the following points:

- Objection raised from the Landscape Architect in relation to the adverse visual landscape impact of the proposed development on the character of the locality and setting of Haddenham
- The site is situated outside of the development envelope of Haddenham and the proposed development does not fall under the definition of any of the identified exceptions to Policy Growth 2 of the Local Plan and is therefore unacceptable.
- The Council can currently demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, well in excess of 5 years, at 7.01 years.

## 9 APPENDICES

9.1 Appendix 1 – Decision Notice for Ref: 14/00130/OUM  
Appendix 2 – Decision Notice for Ref: 19/00214/OUM

---

<u>Background Documents</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Contact Officer(s)</u>
20/00996/OUM	Angela Briggs Room No. 011	Angela Briggs Planning Team Leader
14/00130/OUM 19/00214/OUM	The Grange Ely	01353 665555 angela.briggs@eastcambs.gov.uk

National Planning Policy Framework -

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 -

<http://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Local%20Plan%20April%202015%20-%20front%20cover%20and%20inside%20front%20cover.pdf>