

---

**MAIN CASE**

**Reference No:** 20/01156/RMM

**Proposal:** Reserved matters for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of previously approved 19/00910/OUM for residential development of up to 30 dwellings, including open space provision and associated works with all matters reserved except for access

**Site Address:** Land South Of 6 Hinton Way Wilburton Cambridgeshire

**Applicant:** Etopia Wilburton Limited

**Case Officer:** Toni Hylton Senior Planning Officer

**Parish:** Wilburton

**Ward:** Stretham  
 Ward Councillor/s: Bill Hunt  
 Lisa Stubbs

**Date Received:** 1 September 2020      **Expiry Date:** 5<sup>th</sup> February 2021

[V128]

---

1.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 Members are recommended to APPROVE this application subject to the recommended conditions below. The conditions can be read in full in Appendix 1.

- 1 Approved Plans
- 2 Time Limit - OUT/OUM/RMA/RMM
- 3 Parking, serving, etc
- 4 Visibility splays
- 5 Garages for parking
- 6 Details of cycle sheds
- 7 Details of benches
- 8 Boundary treatments
- 9 Landscaping as agreed
- 10 Landscape maintenance
- 11 Lighting scheme
- 12 PD rights Windows (some plots)
- 13 PD rights extensions, outbuildings (some plots)
- 14 Compliance with tree protection

- 15 Materials
- 16 Road construction

2.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

2.1 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.eastcamb.gov.uk/online-applications/>. **Alternatively a paper copy is available to view at the East Cambridgeshire District Council offices, in the application file.**

2.2 The Reserved Matters Planning permission is sought for the erection of 30 dwellings, to include appearance, layout, landscaping and scale. The table below illustrates the range of dwellings and their dimensions. A full table is shown in Appendix 2 for further information. The figures in closed brackets are the approximate measurement in the imperial measurement of Feet. The numbers not in brackets are in the metric measurement of metres. (XG) excluding garage.

Plot	Plot Size Sqm (Sqft)	Garden size Sqm (Sqft)	Width Metres (Feet)	Depth Metres (Feet)	Floor Area Sqm (sqft)	Height (Eaves) Metres (Feet)	Height (ridge) Metres (Feet)
1	440 (4736)	210 (2260)	9.2 (XG) (29)	7.6 (25)	70(XG) (725)	5.3 (17.3)	8.3 (27.2)
2	212.5 (2287)	115.5 (1237)	9 (29)	6.5 (21)	58.5 (609)		7.9 (25.9)
3	238 (2561)	141.5 (1523)	9 (29)	6.5 (21)	58.5 (609)		7.9 (25.9)
4	216 (2325)	103.9 (1108)	11.7 (39)	9.4 (30)	110 (1170)		9.1 (29.8)
5	189 (2034)	76.13 (819)					9.1 (29.8)
6	660 (7104)	353.40 (3803)					9.2 (XG) (29)
7	374 (4026)	157.4 (1694)	6.7 (22)	9.8 (32)	66 (704)		9.1 (29.8)
8	418 (4499)	231 (2486)	9.2 (XG) (29)	7.4 (24)	68 (XG) (696)		8.3 (27.2)
9	340 (3660)	184.2 (1982)	6.7 (22)	9.8 (32)	66 (704)		9.1 (29.8)
10	300 (3229)	183.6 (1976)	9 (29)	6.5 (21)	58.5 (609)		7.9 (25.9)
11	154 (1658)	71.3 (767)	9.2 (29)	9.8 (32)	90 (928)		9.1 (29.8)
12	132 (1421)	70.45 (757)					

Plot	Plot Size Sqm (Sqft)	Garden size Sqm (Sqft)	Width Metres (Feet)	Depth Metres (Feet)	Floor Area Sqm (sqft)	Height (Eaves) Metres (Feet)	Height (ridge) Metres (Feet)			
13	154 (1658)	87.60 (943)	11.7 (38)	9.2 (29)	108 (1102)					
14	154 (1658)	83.40 (897)								
15	120 (1292)	56 (602)	10.6 (35)	9.8 (32)	104 (1120)					
16	130 (1399)	65 (699)								
17	120 (1292)	65 (699)	10 (33)	9.8 (32)	98 (1056)					
18	120 (1292)	65 (699)								
19	120 (1292)	57.3 (616)								
20	120 (1292)	58.2 (626)								
21	140 (1507)	71 (764)	15.3 (50)	9.8 (32)	150 (1600)					
22	110 (1184)	55.9 (601)								
23	112.5 (1211)	61.6 (663)								
24	138 (1485)	77.4 (833)								
25	138 (1485)	79.8 (858)						10.2 (33)	9 (29)	92 (957)
26	141 (1517)	82.6 (889)								
27	144 (1550)	85 (914)						10.2 (33)	9 (29)	92 (957)
28	144 (1550)	87.5 (941)								
29	171.5 (1846)	92 (990)	11.7 (38)	9.2 (29)	108 (1102)			9.1 (29.8)		
30	171.5 (1846)	92 (990)						9.1 (29.8)		

- 2.3 The application has been amended twice, in order to address external consultee comments and the concerns raised by the planning case officer. Firstly to address the layout of the site, improved amenities for the dwellings to the north of the site and to accommodate more public open space. Secondly to address drainage issues and highway concerns.
- 2.4 The application is a reserved matters application, the site was granted outline planning permission on 16th April 2020 with a S106 agreement attached. The decision notice is attached as appendix 3. The S106 agreement required the provision of affordable

housing; transfer of public open space and SUDS; contribution towards the provision of bins; biodiversity contribution off site provision; payment towards education.

- 2.5 To the boundary of the site it is planned for 1.8 metre close board fencing, with an element of 1 metre high and trellis above in the north eastern corner. Each plot has at least 2 parking spaces, garden in excess of 50 square metres, cycle shed and planting.
- 2.6 The application has been called into Planning Committee at the request of Cllr Hunt, on the basis that the proposal has raised a number of concerns locally and in the public interest should be discussed in an open forum.

### 3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

19/00910/OUM Proposed outline planning permission for residential development of up to 30 dwellings, including open space provision and associated works with all matters reserved except for access. Approved 16.04.2020

19/00910/DISA – Discharge condition 4 parts A and B (Archaeology) Accepted

19/00910/DISB – Discharge conditions 4C (Archaeology) 5 (CEMP) 9 (Fire hydrants) 11 (Arboricultural Method Statement) 20 (Contamination) 23 (Foul Water) - out to consultation

19/00910/DISC – Discharge condition 19 (Broadband Strategy) – out to consultation

20/01614/ADV Erection of a sign – remains undetermined

### 4.0 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

- 4.1 The site is situated to the western edge of Wilburton, to the west of Clarke's Lane and is situated outside of, but adjacent to, the development envelope of Wilburton. The site is a rectangular shape and covers a total area of approximately 1.21 hectares. The site also includes the occupation of a single storey bungalow (no.13) located directly to the west of Clarke's Lane, which is to be demolished as part of this proposal. The existing dwelling is not listed and is not a highly architectural example within the area.
- 4.2 To the south of the site you have the more traditional development along the High Street (A1123), the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings. There are some local amenities within the village including a Post Office/convenience store, 2 garages, garden centre, village hall, primary school, church and recreation ground.
- 4.3 The land has previously been used for agricultural purposes, though it has been left to fallow, with an overgrown unkempt appearance. There are several dilapidated former agricultural buildings within the site, along with a number of unused agricultural machinery, related to the farm to the south. The site is interspersed to the north, south and western boundaries by existing trees and hedges, with an existing close boarded fence bounding the eastern edge of the site, which also defines the boundaries of the dwellings along this side of Clarke's Lane.

- 4.4 The surrounding development is primarily focused to the east and south of the site. The site is outside of the development but is bound to it on the east, south and adjacent to it to the northern boundary. The built form along Clarke's Lane consists mainly of detached and semi-detached two-storey dwellings, with some flat development. Similarly, residential development consisting of both single storey and two storey dwellings can be found to the south. Directly adjacent to the site, to the north is Hinton Way, which is an unmetalled track, leading to a few detached dwellings set back from the road frontage. Directly to the west of the site is an enclosed field used for grazing horses and is occupied by a field shelter with open countryside beyond to the west.
- 4.5 The south-west corner of the site is positioned adjacent to the Conservation Area. The nearest listed building is 2 Church Lane (Grade II) which is approximately 76 metres to the south of the site.
- 4.6 The site in October 2020 was secured by the applicant with Heras fencing, this surrounds the site and is predominantly for site security.

## 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.

**Cllr Bill Hunt** – Requests the application is presented to Planning Committee to be discussed in open forum, due to the public interest.

### **Wilburton Parish Council- 21 December 2020**

States "Cllrs object: all previous objections still stand.

1. 4 visitor parking spaces for 17 of the houses (all the 2 bed houses) The road leading to the site, Clarks Lane, has considerable existing issues with parking which will only be exacerbated by this lack of provision.
2. There are three dead ends from this development to adjoining land - this is showing that the developers are putting in access for further development at the cost of not enough visitor parking or any open space on the development.
3. Density of the houses on this development remains a major concern with public area at a minimum
4. Drainage of site is not good enough. There has always been considerable surface water on the site even with some drainage and putting 30 houses on the site will only cause more water to flood the area."

### **Wilburton Parish Council - 26 October 2020**

States "Councillors are very concerned about

1. No visitor parking for 17 of the houses (all the 2 bed houses) the road leading to the site: Clarks Lane, has considerable existing issues with parking which will only be exacerbated by this lack of provision.
2. Footpath behind number 22 - unusual position of the footpath poses security issues for plot 22, 23 and the house facing Clarks Lane

3. There are three dead ends from this development to adjoining land - this is showing that the developers are putting in access for further development at the cost of not enough visitor parking or any open space on the development.
4. Density of the houses on this development remains a major concern”

**Lead Local Flood Authority - 19 January 2021**

Following a discussion with the LLFA their objection would be removed if the applicant could provide confirmation that the swales were within their ownership.

**Lead Local Flood Authority – 19 January 2021**

The swales are not within the full ownership of the applicant and neighbours have Riparian rights.

**Lead Local Flood Authority - 15 December 2020**

States “At present we maintain our objection to the grant of planning permission for the following reasons:

**1. Water Quality**

The inclusion of permeable paving across the private drives and access is supported by the LLFA. However, surface water runoff draining from the adoptable highway will not be receiving adequate treatment in line with the pollution hazard indices as outline in the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753). The LLFA does not consider the conventional trapped gully as a form of treatment. This is due to the fact that if the gullies are silted up and a storm occurs, this can flush the built up pollutants through the system. All runoff leaving the site must be cleansed suitably to ensure there is minimised risk of pollutants leaving the site and entering the wider surface water networks. This should be through a wider use of SuDS, such as conveyance swales, or other online treatment features. Until all surface water leaving the development is being appropriately cleansed of pollutants, we are unable to support this application.

**2. Discharge Rate (depending on orifice in calcs)**

The proposed discharge rate from the site is 3.3 l/s to an Anglian Water surface water sewer. The calculated QBar runoff rate is 1.9 l/s. As stated in our previous response, the proposed discharge rate from the site approved under the outline planning approval 19/00910/OUM is at 2.0 l/s. The reasoning for this increase in rate is due to the potentially small orifice flow control required, which could increase risk of blockage. The submitted calculations indicate that the flow control from the system is proposed to be 83mm. However, the information submitted with the outline report demonstrates that the 2.0 l/s flow control can be attained with a 76mm diameter flow control, which is an acceptable size. Therefore the rate should be reduced to ensure the rate is as close to the greenfield rate as possible. Until the rate is reduced, we are unable to support this application.”

**Lead Local Flood Authority - 23 September 2020**

States “At present we object to the reserved matters application for the following reasons:

**1. Discharge Rate**

The proposed discharge rate from the site approved under the outline planning approval 19/00910/OUM is at 2.0 l/s. The proposals are to now discharge at 5.0 l/s to the Anglian Water surface water sewer. Whilst it is noted that Anglian Water will accept this rate, as stated in Anglian Water's response in Appendix 3 of the

submitted report, it is a rate up to 5.0 l/s. The reasoning for this increase in rate is due to the potentially small orifice flow control required, which could increase risk of blockage. However, the information submitted with the outline report demonstrates that the 2.0 l/s flow control can be attained with a 76mm diameter flow control, which is an acceptable size. Therefore the rate should be reduced to ensure the rate is as close to the greenfield rate as possible. Until the rate is reduced, we are unable to support this application.”

**Cambs Wildlife Trust - 14 December 2020**

States “We have no comments to make on this aspect of the application.”

**Environmental Health - 8 January 2021**

States “I have nothing to add to my previous comments”

**Environmental Health - 8 December 2020**

States “I have nothing to add to my previous comments”

**Environmental Health – Scientific Officer - 7 October 2020**

States “I have read the Phase 2 Contaminated Land Assessment report dated 30th July 2020 prepared by Nott Group and accept the findings. The report finds that there are slightly elevated levels of arsenic in the topsoil and made ground and recommends further investigation. Depending on the results further sampling or remediation may be required. It will not be possible to fully discharge the condition until this work has been completed and any necessary remediation has been completed and verified.

**Environmental Health - 15 September 2020**

States “I have no comments that I wish to make at this time.”

**Technical Officer Access - 29 September 2020**

States “1) If the tactile paving towards the beginning of the cul-de-sac could be nearer the junction with Clarke's Lane, that might be a bit safer for visually impaired pedestrians. This is because you will not be crossing on a corner and will not have to walk across the private drive on the south side of the road.

2) There is a moratorium on shared space. Shared space is not accessible for blind and partially sighted pedestrians because we can't see cars.”

**Local Highways Authority - 14 January 2021**

States “The revised proposal is acceptable, and I therefore have no further observations.

In addition to the above, and provided the LPA are content to apply these, I would suggest the following Conditions are appropriate to secure satisfactory implementation:

HW2A - standard estate road construction

HW3A - estate road specification - unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA

HW16A - parking for each respective dwelling - PL-1-02 Rev E

HW20A - pedestrian visibility - at access crossovers as shown on drawing PL-1-02 Rev E”

**Local Highways Authority - 15 October 2020**

States “Subject to the following comments and recommendations:

The development principle and access arrangements are acceptable having been established at Outline planning application stage.

In relation to the internal layout which has been the subject of pre-application discussions with the applicant's engineering consultant, I would make the following comments which require attention:

1. Turning head kerb radii need clarifying (I note that the junction layout is covered by Outline consent Condition 15);
2. Turning head extension west - CCC will only adopt 20m extension from the approach road CL, but sufficient length is needed for a refuse vehicle to turn. Thus the potential adoptable extent needs to be looked at (see overarching drainage comments below);
3. I would suggest remote path in front of plots 13 - 19 is offered for adoption, but would need to consider drainage of highway to private parking spaces (see overarching drainage comments below);
4. CCC would prefer not to adopt the tree adjacent plot 22; I would suggest that a 0.5m maintenance strip is shown to the inside of the kerb and that the remainder of the grass area and the tree is maintained by private management company along with the wider open spaces and paths across the site (see comments below).

Points for further consideration:

- o The FRA and drainage proposal includes crate storage system beneath the adoptable highway; such features beneath the structure of the road are not acceptable to CCC, and the roads will not be considered adoption unless the storage feature can be relocated from the carriageway.
- o Notwithstanding the above, the Surface Water Sewer includes private and highway surface water and thus would require adoption by AWS. AWS would need to be satisfied with any drainage solution and the future maintenance thereof, if CCC were to adopt the roads in the fullness of time.
- o The development includes significant areas of open space/ shared private paths - future maintenance thereof needs to be properly considered and secured, noting that Condition 18 of the Outline consent covers the interim maintenance of the streets.”

**ECDC Trees Team - 13 January 2021**

States "I'm concerned that the blocks of planting adjacent the entrance under the upright ornamental Pear trees is unnecessary and offers little benefit. If these areas were smaller, circular and either contained small scale shade tolerant shrub species shrubs or wild flowers and bulbs this would help soften the entrance and be better than the proposed blocks of grass, it could also reduce ongoing maintenance costs for the site. The short lengths of Prunus lusitanica hedging at right angles to the entrance boundary hedging are superfluous and offer little benefit to the sites aesthetics. It would also be better if there was less none native evergreen hedging used consideration should be given to the use of Holly or Yew as alternatives or the use of non-evergreen species such as Hornbeam that will still provide a suitable boundary. The hedging by parking spaces 12, 13 and 14 would be better combined in to one larger area allowing planting space to avoid future conflict between car doors and the hedges. The hedge between spaces 17 should be added to the planting are adjacent parking space 18 as this would give the proposed new tree more space to develop increasing its chance of long tern retention and avoiding the previously mentioned conflict between car doors and hedges. There are other hedge lined parking spaces (15, 19, 21, 22, Vx3, 29, 30) which should be reconsidered as they are unlikely to be sustainable, nobody likes getting out of a car into/close to a hedge especially on damp days or when loading children into cars when more space is required and this is a likely scenario due to the proposed property sizes.

No tree related objections to the current design"

**ECDC Trees Team - 18 December 2020**

States "The revised tree protection details are acceptable in respect of T9 Oak.

The lack of public open space is dissapointing and lack of providing trees within the area they have now identified for parking to break up the area visually and to contribute to the water management of the site through interception of rain."

**ECDC Trees Team - 8 October 2020**

States "One tree (T9 Oak) which on the previous layout ref PL-1-01 19/00910/OUM which previously would have been lost to the development is now retained. However it is compromised by the proposed path through the RPA and there is no real detail in how this decing and path would be installed.

The layout is poor in relation to the lack of open space and retaining the Oak tree T9, as an open grown tree it is not acceptable to place pedestrian paths through the RPA creating post development pressure through creating a risk in respect of deliberately placing people under the canopy of the tree.

The layout is poor and does not provide the appropriate provision for the longevity of T9 or for public open space the layout should be revised."

**Conservation Officer - 27 October 2020**

States "In line with NPPF requirements, the application is supported by a heritage assessment which builds on the one submitted for the 2019 outline application. This follows Historic England's format set out in 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets.' Given the separation

distances involved, lack of intervisibility and the screening effects of intervening development around the site, its conclusions on the limited impact of the scheme on any designated heritage assets in the vicinity are considered reasonable.  
Recommendation: no objection”

**Housing Section - 22 December 2020**

States “The Strategic Housing Team notes the amendments made to the affordable housing plot numbers and the location and has no further comments to make, as the mix and number of affordable housing dwellings remain unchanged.”

**Housing Section - 21 September 2020**

States “The Strategic Housing Team supports the above application as it will deliver 30% affordable housing on site and will meet the required tenure of 77% rented and 23% shared ownership in accordance with the approved s106 agreement.

The affordable housing mix proposed will meet the housing needs of those households in East Cambridgeshire as well as helping meet the Councils overall Objectively Assessed Need for affordable housing.”

**Waste Strategy (ECDC) - 30 September 2020**

Details of refuse collection points.

**The Ely Group Of Internal Drainage Board - 8 October 2020**

States “The application states that surface water will be disposed of via soakaways. Provided that soakaways form an effective means of surface water disposal in this area, the Board will not object to this application. It is essential that any proposed soakaway does not cause flooding to neighbouring land. If soakaways are found not to be an effective means of surface water disposal, the Board must be re-consulted in this matter, as the applicant would need the consent of the Board to discharge into any watercourse within the District.”

**The Ely Group Of Internal Drainage Board - 15 September 2020**

States “This application for development is outside of the Littleport and Downham Internal Drainage District but within an area that drains into it.  
The Board has no comment to make on the aspects raised in this application.”

**Environment Agency - 23 September 2020**

States “We are returning this planning application consultation without comment because it is not clear why we have been consulted.”

**Design Out Crime Officers - 18 December 2020**

States “I can confirm this office has reviewed the amendments to the above reserved matters application and are supportive of proposed changes and consider that community safety and vulnerability to crime should be addressed. No further comments at this time”

**Design Out Crime Officers - 14 September 2020**

States “I have reviewed documents and drawings in relation to the above Reserved Matters Application - it would appear that this proposed design and layout including landscaping promotes community safety and should reduce vulnerability to crime,

the proposed pedestrian link to Hinton Way is straight and within sight of homes. I would like to see a lighting proposal when ready to consider it, I am happy that adopted roads should be lit to BS5489-2013 or 2020 but I would like to see what lighting is proposed for the private and shared drives.”

**Cambridgeshire Archaeology - 18 January 2021**

States “An archaeological evaluation of the development area was undertaken in October 2020, carried out against the condition included on permission granted to associated outline application ref 19/00910/OUM (Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record reference ECB6308). No further archaeological works are required in mitigation of the development impacts and we have no further objections or requirements for this development as proposed.”

**The Ely Group Of Internal Drainage Board - No Comments Received**

**Parks And Open Space - No Comments Received**

**Cambridge Ramblers Association - No Comments Received**

**Asset Information Definitive Map Team - No Comments Received**

**Cambridgeshire Fire And Rescue Service - No Comments Received**

**Enforcement Section - No Comments Received**

**Building Control - East Cambridgeshire District Council - No Comments Received**

**CCC Growth & Development - No Comments Received**

**Minerals And Waste Development Control Team - No Comments Received**

5.2 Neighbours – 42 neighbouring properties were notified and the responses received are summarised below. A full copy of the responses are available on the Council’s website.

5.3 At the time of writing the report 64 responses had been received from local residents from 16 different addresses. 42 local residents have been notified of the application. The responses received are shown in the table below and are an overview. The full responses are available to be seen on the Planning Website.

Letter	Date	Address	Objections
1	01/10	21 Clarkes Lane	More suited to urban development settings Density of development is too high The filling in of the ditch will lead to flooding Lack of parking The creation of additional traffic
2	02/10	23 Clarkes Lane	Fails to represent the local character Inappropriate development in the Green Belt

Letter	Date	Address	Objections
			Increase in surface water Overlooking Noise from the development of dwellings and vehicle movements Highway safety from having 2 junctions opposite (Seppings Close) Loss of trees
3	21/12		Does not accord with the development plan Does not accord with the NPPF Scale of development Loss of privacy Inappropriate use Impact on highway safety Impact on conservation, biodiversity and trees
4	06/10	1 Toates Close	Overdevelopment Surface water issues Foul water and blockages having to be cleared by Anglian Water Highway safety at junction with Clarkes Lane Is it for 30 or 60 houses MTC report says 60?
5	01/10	22 Broadway	Highway safety from the junction and the A1123 Emergency vehicles access Surface water run off
6	22/09	19 Clarkes Lane	Overlooking, loss of privacy Density of development Loss of light Loss of trees Loss of wildlife Traffic congestion and lack of parking Drainage surface and foul water
7	08/10		Could the planning officer visit the site and come to the house
8	17/12		Loss of privacy Overbearing Lack of parking Refuse collection points Drainage How is this eco? Why not another developer?
9	11/12	9 Clarkes Lane	Too much traffic Pollution from additional traffic Too much development Loss of privacy/overlooking Dated statistics
10	14/12	27 Clarkes Lane	Too many dwellings
11	14/12		The developer has not addressed any of the concerns raised originally
12	09/11		Further samples were taken from the site. Can information be provided to show where and

Letter	Date	Address	Objections
			what the samples were?
13	02/10		<p>Density</p> <p>Anything over single storey will be invasive to neighbours amenities</p> <p>Overlooking due to the layout</p> <p>Loss of light</p> <p>The amenities in the village cannot support a development of 30 dwellings</p> <p>Additional traffic</p> <p>Noise from the GSHP</p> <p>Evidence that suggests there is wildlife on the site</p> <p>Development outside of the development framework</p> <p>The online consultation was not satisfactory</p> <p>Not organic growth</p>
14	04/10		<p>Impact of view</p> <p>Development dominates rear garden</p> <p>Noise pollution of GSHP</p> <p>Back to back distance is not far enough</p> <p>Site is higher than adjoining neighbours</p> <p>Layout plans shown neighbouring properties in correctly</p> <p>The heights of the dwellings has not been clarified</p> <p>Infilling of the ditch</p> <p>Existing footpath in Clarkes Lane is not suitable and cannot accommodate more development</p> <p>Additional traffic</p> <p>Removal of roofs has been undertaken by the landowner not the applicant</p> <p>Impact on the wildlife</p> <p>Local amenities cannot support the development of 30 dwellings</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure</p>
15	06/10		<p>Do not support the proposal or accept this work</p> <p>Who will be installing the fence and the details of height, material, working hours</p> <p>Removal of vegetation should not be burnt on the site</p> <p>What risks assessments have been undertaken to determine the impact of the development on the properties on Clarkes Lane.</p>
16	07/10		<p>Who are the contractors for the site as this is important for site safety</p>
17	14/10		<p>The drainage of the site is of concern and potential run off into the garden</p> <p>There are springs on the site</p> <p>High water table</p>

Letter	Date	Address	Objections
			Potential for newts
18	24/11		Have amended plans been submitted?
19	25/11		Why has the Local Planning Authority asked for an extension of time? Will any revised plans be the final application
20	27/11		Objection to the temporary fencing Restricts wildlife Objects to signs that state it is a construction site
21	08/12		New documents have been appearing on the portal are these to be consulted upon?
22	10/12 (15.02)		The time period is not acceptable to provide comments To see the information discussed with the developers
23	10/12 (17.30)		E mail uploaded incorrectly dated Request a call to discuss the application on process
24	10/12 (19.10)		The red line is so thick it is incorrect
25	11/12 (09.47)		The information is not easy to understand
26	11/12 (16.44)		Objection to the waste strategy too many will have to drag their bins in excess of 20 metres Bin storage too close to rear boundary The measurements are incorrect
27	13/12 (20.44)		Overlooking from the changed layout View will be affected by a car park
28	13/12 (21.24)		Infilling of the ditch will lead to flooding issues, this was always maintained by the previous land owner
29	18/12 (10.13)		Support the comments of the LLFA
30	16/12 (10.19)		Unable to scale the drawings from the website Concerns with the disclaimer and not drawn to scale
31	21/12		Impact on the loss of the swales and flood issues The tree would flourish with no development The measurements for bins to be dragged by occupants is incorrect The contamination report has not had the follow up reports and the information provided by the agent did not address concerns Where archaeology research has taken place this will have disturbed any further contamination Lack of parking/overspill parking Proposal is not innovative

Letter	Date	Address	Objections
			<p>Density  Provision of a car park area  Impact on junction with Clarkes Lane and A1123  The fencing that has been erected has not considered ecology  Lack of noise data with regard to GSHP  The drainage issues should be considered with this application.</p>
32	28/12 (17.10)		<p>Have the comments from 13/12/20 been uploaded  Case officer confirmed 30/12.20 the 13<sup>th</sup> was a non working day so was received on 14/12/20</p>
33	24/12 (10.06)		<p>Drainage strategy does not address the issues and provides photographs of recent flood issues at the site. Swales cannot cope with the discharge.  A door has been placed over a spring to create a bridge, which shows a lack of understanding of the site.</p>
34	30/12		<p>In correct addresses given in the report by MTC  The drainage strategy does not address the issues  Drag distances of refuse bins are incorrect  Sustainability and Energy Strategy is a statement and does not meet the s106  The mapping shown is incorrect  The swales are not depressions  Lack of understanding of ditch ownership  'Riparian owner'</p>
35	28/12		<p>Loss of light  Overshadowing  Loss of privacy  Visual amenity  Insufficient parking spaces  Highway safety  Noise and disturbance from vehicles  Density  Out of keeping with the character of the area  Outside of the planning envelope  Drainage  Errors in the submitted documents</p>
36	06/01		<p>Incorrect dimensions and bin drag distances are in excess of 25 metres</p>
37	11/01		<p>Lack of an explanation  How many amendments  The strategy is intentions not a strategy  10 days to comment is not long enough</p>
38	18/01		<p>Too close to the dwelling  Lack of privacy</p>

Letter	Date	Address	Objections
			No sunlight to affordable housing gardens Pollution from the car parking/turning area Lack of street lighting proposal
39	18/01 (17.44) and again (17.45)		Planning officer to call to discuss the process of the application. When does the planning officer examine the responses? Lack of explanation from the developer on changes to plans? How can they make their responses more constructive?
40	04/10	18 Clarkes Lane	Access opposite will lead to lights into the dwelling Staggered crossroads Outside the development envelope Density Lack of parking Highway data outdated Ecological damage Loss of a dwelling
41	09/12		Concerns over the erection of the sign ruin the outlook The erection of the sign assumes planning permission has been granted Why is this not part of the reserved matters application The fence that has been erected is unsightly
42	14/10		Site clearance has been undertaken (landowner) Burning on site should not be permitted as per condition 8 (landowner) Impact on wildlife from the burning Removal of an asbestos roof (landowner)
43	11/11		Erection of the sign
44	23/12		An outside light has been erected at number 13 Clarkes Lane
45	21/12		Re iterates objections 04/10/20
46	03/10	25 Clarkes Lane	Outside of the development envelope Drainage Loss of light Loss of privacy Noise and disturbance Light pollution Highway safety Lack of parking Use is inappropriate Capacity at waste water treatment works Lack of local services Impact landscape features

Letter	Date	Address	Objections
47	16/10		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infilling of ditches</li> <li>Impact of surface run off</li> <li>Lack of waste collection points</li> <li>Who will manage the open space</li> <li>Contamination impacts</li> </ul>
48	13/11		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Archaeology does not respond to the application</li> <li>Ground works are being undertaken</li> </ul>
49	16/11		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Density</li> <li>Risk of flooding</li> <li>Adequate drainage</li> <li>Contaminated land</li> <li>Out of character</li> <li>Inadequate parking</li> <li>Highway safety</li> <li>Loss of light</li> <li>Loss of privacy</li> </ul>
50	05/12		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The erection of the sign assumes planning permission has been granted</li> <li>The size of the sign does not meet regulations</li> <li>Clarkes Lane has been blighted by the fencing</li> </ul>
51	21/12		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not address the objections raised with regard to the original submission.</li> <li>The rainfall recently has seen drainage issues</li> <li>Request the application is presented to the planning committee</li> <li>Density</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Garden sizes are too small</li> <li>No natural light to some bathrooms</li> <li>The development will be 20 metres from their conservatory</li> <li>Invasion of privacy</li> <li>Creation of a car park</li> <li>Pathway to plot 23 is not secure and affects their own security</li> </ul>
52	29/12		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supporting information about how important the ditches and swales are to the site</li> <li>MTC report does not address the issues</li> </ul>
53	05/10	11a Clarkes Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Out of character</li> <li>Design and layout</li> <li>Overlooking</li> <li>Overbearing</li> <li>Loss of privacy</li> <li>Loss of light</li> <li>Loss of view</li> <li>Outside of the development envelope</li> <li>Poorly located</li> <li>Over development</li> <li>Increased traffic</li> </ul>

Letter	Date	Address	Objections
54	16/11		Concern that the developer is proceeding when no planning permission has been granted.
55	24/11	6 Hinton Way	Damage to Hinton Way during construction as this is maintained by the residents of Hinton Way
56	30/12		Loss of the swales are critical to the drainage of the site
57	18/12		The swales are not depressions Flooding in the future
58	05/10	26 Clarkes Lane	Volume of traffic Parked cars on Clarkes Lane Traffic impact during construction
59	04/10	Bellgables Church Lane	Poor design Use of materials Materials unsuitable for a vernacular building
60	29/12	29 Clarkes Lane	Loss of light Loss of privacy Poor drainage and infilling of ditch
61	29/12		Overlooking from plots 19, 20 and 21
62	19/12	4 Hinton Way	Drainage Concerns over using Hinton Way as access to the site
63	04/01		Provided photos of flooding issues at the site
64	08/01	15 Clarkes Lane	Density Flooding Potential for future housing Impact on the wider village

## 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 and Water efficiency and renewable energy in construction
ENV 7	Biodiversity and geology
ENV 8	Flood risk
ENV 9	Pollution
ENV 11	Conservation Areas
ENV 12	Listed Buildings

- ENV 14 Sites of archaeological interest
- COM 7 Transport impact
- COM 8 Parking provision

- 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

- 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 & enhancing the historic environment

*National Design Guide*

*Cambridgeshire County Council*  
 RECAP Waste Management Design Kit

7.0 PLANNING COMMENTS

7.1 The vast response from neighbours has raised a number of issues, some of which are not within the scope of planning. The table below identifies these issues and the Local Planning Authority response.

Non planning issues	Reason why they are not planning issues
Why this developer	This is not determined by the Local Planning Authority.
Applicants consultation not acceptable	The Local Planning Authority was not part of this consultation on the scheme.
Impact on view	It is long established that the impact on a 'view' is not a reason to refuse an application.
Site clearance by previous landowner	The Local Planning Authority were made aware of the original landowner carrying out site clearance. However, it was not related to the development proposal. The Local Planning Authority did investigate through the Planning Enforcement Team.

Non planning issues	Reason why they are not planning issues
Risk assessment of the contractors on site	All sites have to undergo health and safety regulations and this will be carried out by the contractor and not something the Local Planning Authority would be involved in. Although the submission of a CEMP in accordance with condition 5 of 19/00910/OUM may address some of these issues.
Why did the Planning Officer ask for an extension of time	To give the agent the opportunity to address the concerns raised by the planning officer, neighbours and other external consultees.
Time period to make representations is not long enough	This is set in legislation. As a Local Planning Authority we accept comments up until the point of determination. For items being presented to planning committee these need to be submitted by noon on the Monday before the meeting.
Red line is incorrect	This was due to the thickness of the line and not infringement on any neighbours boundary.
Incorrectly dated e mails	Many e mails were received over the weekend, however as a non working day they were dated on the date received.
Disclaimer on the plans	This is a standard disclaimer that all architects use. These are planning application plans, not those for the physical development and they are scaled down for the purposes of planning from the large plans for construction. This is the architects method to ensure this is known at the planning stage. Any approved plans would need to be complied with.
Incorrect information submitted by applicant	There is some degree of honesty and acceptance that the information is correct. Any errors are have been brought to the applicants attention.
Can the applicant continue to submit amendments	This is at the discretion of the planning officer.
Erection of a sign should be as part of this application	This can only be submitted as an Advert application, as per the planning regulations.
Erection of the sign pre determines the application for approval	Consent does exist for up to 30 dwellings (19/00910/OUM) and therefore this is standard practice by site owners to undertake these types of works.

7.1.1The main issues to consider in the determination of the application are;

- Principle of development
- Character of the area
- Neighbours amenities
- Highway safety and parking
- Ecology and trees
- Heritage assets
- Flood risk
- Contamination
- Waste

## **7.2 Principle of development**

7.2.1 In 2019 outline planning permission was granted for the erection of up to 30 dwellings on this site, with only vehicular access agreed from Clarkes Lane (application 19/00910/OUM, decision notice is attached in Appendix 3). At that time the Local Planning Authority could not state that they had a 5 year housing land supply and therefore the tilted balance was applied. The justification for allowing this development is copied from the Officer Report for information.

*“The site is situated outside of the settlement framework of Wilburton. The proposal would provide up to 30 dwellings, including up to 9 affordable dwellings (30%). Means of access is the only detailed matter for consideration as part of this outline application. An indicative site layout plan has also been submitted showing how the site could be developed but this is for illustrative purposes only and does not dictate the final layout. Layout, scale, appearance and landscaping are all matters which are reserved and not part of this application.*

*Paragraph 78 of the NPPF (2019) states that to promote development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The Council is not currently able to demonstrate that it has an adequate five year supply of land for housing. Therefore, all local planning authority policies relating to the supply of housing must be considered out of date and housing applications assessed in terms of the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF. This means that development proposals should be approved unless any adverse effects of the development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This is also echoed in Policy GROWTH 5 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015 which highlights the NPPFs thrust of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.*

*It is therefore necessary to consider the benefits of the proposed development and weigh against any adverse impacts in order to determine whether or not the development comprises sustainable development.*

*Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states that achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways; these are Economic, Social, and Environmental.*

*In terms of the economic role the proposal would provide short term local employment during the construction phases of development. In terms of the social role, the development is well connected to the village and local services can be easily and safely accessed and the scheme would provide up to 9no. affordable dwellings to meet local housing needs. In terms of the environmental benefits, the proposal would contribute towards a scheme which would provide a biodiversity net gain, off-site, by way of a financial contribution secured by the S106 legal agreement.*

*It is considered that the principle of development is acceptable and complies with Policies Growth 2, Growth 5 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015, Paragraphs 8, 11 and 78 of the NPPF, and subject to the following material planning considerations”*

7.2.2 On this basis the site does have the benefit of planning permission for up to 30 dwellings and this reserved matter application is the detailed application to enable the site to be brought forward for development. The site as part of the outline permission considered that the site was in an acceptable location, sustainable location and makes for an efficient use of land.

### **7.3 Character of the area**

7.3.1 The site is adjacent to the development envelope for Wilburton and is in a location of transition from the village setting of Wilburton into the rural open countryside. Clarkes Lane has a mix of housing types and has a variety of styles and age of properties. At the entrance to Clarkes Lane are traditional dwellings, which then progresses onward to 1960's development, with Seppings Close being built in the late 1990's and 10,12 and 12a in early 2000. Further development leads onto The Broadway. The Broadway is almost a continuation of Clarkes Lane, having seen relatively recent residential development of small cul-de-sacs of single and two storey dwellings. This part of Wilburton has seen the character change over the years and seen development occur using a range of styles.

#### Density

7.3.2 The density of the proposed development is 25 dwellings per hectare (gross) or net of 30 dwellings per hectare, which is what you would expect to find in a village location. In comparison with the dwellings on Clarkes Lane, the proposed development does have a higher density which is suited to their period of construction. Planning has evolved since the development of Clarkes Lane and the NPPF seeks that development makes an efficient use of land, which does mean that densities compared with earlier developments are higher. In comparison with other developments, Berristead Close has 20 dwellings per hectare and Warren Close has 19 dwellings per hectare (gross). The density proposed on this site is more akin to 21<sup>st</sup> density standards and makes for the efficient use of land, in accordance with the NPPF.

7.3.3 Whilst the density of the development is higher than its immediate surroundings, it is still what you would expect to find in a village location. In more urban areas these densities can be over 30 dwellings per hectare. The proposed density is not considered to be of urban development, and in keeping with a village setting.

#### Design

7.3.4 The design of the dwellings has been kept simple and this also reflected in its construction. The construction of the dwellings is primarily off site and brought to site to be assembled, this reduces build times by weeks and is seen to be a better building method with less costs to the environment. This is also leads to a lesser impact on the neighbours amenities during construction.

7.3.5 The dwellings have a mix of finishes including brick and render, as well as slate and red roof tiles, with different colours to the doors and windows to add interest. The dwellings are not distinguished between affordable and market housing, although the affordable housing is grouped together at the northern part of the site. This is more to do with the management of the properties by the housing provider. The dwellings incorporate solar panels on south facing roofs and GSHP (Ground Source Heat Pumps) as part of the need use renewable energies within new developments. The development is simple with some interest from coloured windows and doors. Whilst some issues from the neighbours have been raised with regard to design, they are not stark or urban style dwellings and something similar can be seen across the district. They are contemporary in their style with renewable and sustainable features within the build. The dwellings do not recreate something from the past, or features of other architectural styles but a development of a simple, contemporary and comprehensive development.

7.3.6 Some of the plots have internal bathrooms with no natural lighting and was raised as a concern by a resident. It is not unusual for dwellings to have internal bathrooms, and ventilation is provided by way of an internal extractor fan. This would be an issue dealt with as part of the building regulations. It is not however seen to be an issue that would seek refusal of the application and would be unreasonable to require when a bathroom is not a habitable room.

7.3.7 The heights of the dwellings range from 7.8 to 9.1 metres in height with all of the dwellings having the same eaves height of 5.3 metres. This is a typical height for residential developments and not disproportionately high for 2 storey dwellings. The variation in heights and materials add for interest to the overall development of the site and prevents a monotonous roofscape.

#### Layout

7.3.8 Plot 23 has a rear access and concern was raised that this is not secure. There is a gate to this rear access, however a condition can be attached to confirm the location of the gate and its appearance. The use of such accesses is not considered unacceptable for the purposes of serving rear gardens.

- 7.3.9 The layout of the site has changed since its original submission. The original submission was a linear form of development, with less public open space and a very car dominated environment. The revised proposal gives more depth to the proposal. The accesses to the south and western boundaries, which provide access to neighbouring land and a requirement of the purchase. These are now serving not just the requirement for the adjoining land owners but also become part of the overall scheme.
- 7.3.10 The change in layout has allowed for the affordable housing to be split across the northern part of the site, provide larger gardens and to reduce the number of the affordable gardens with north facing gardens. The south western part of the site is spacious to limit any impact on the nearby Conservation Area and Listed Buildings.
- 7.3.11 On entering the site, there is an impression of space with retained oak tree as a focal point. Whilst the open space is not for sports pitches it is a pleasant environment with benches and features, which will positively add to the public domain. It encourages people to walk through the site and link with the public right of way to the rear on Hinton Way.
- 7.3.12 The proposal provides blocks of housing, rather than continual terraces to enable breaks in the roof scape, views through the site and to advocate a sense of space. The parking arrangement has been spread across the site, rather than a continual line of parking, which again break up the parking layout and allows for planting.

#### Plot size

- 7.3.13 Each plot provides at the minimum 2 parking spaces, 2 spaces for cycles within a shed and a garden size in excess of 50 square metres. There were some concerns with the original scheme that the garden sizes did not meet the Design Guide standard of a minimum of 50 square metres and that the lack of public open space was not acceptable. However, the layout was reassessed and the scheme was amended to ensure all gardens were in excess of 50 square metres and increase the public open space provision.

#### Lighting

- 7.3.14 The final development will need to provide some kind of street lighting this will need to ensure that it provides levels of lighting to ensure public safety without causing a detrimental impact to lightspill. This is a balance to be met and can be dealt with by way of condition. In consultation with the Design Crime Officer, no objections were received to the proposal although the final details of a lighting scheme would be required via a condition on this application.

#### Conclusion Character of the Area

- 7.3.15 On balance the proposal is considered to meet the criteria of policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2015. Policy ENV1 of the Local Plan states all new developments should be informed by, be sympathetic to, and respect the capacity of the distinctive character areas. Development proposals should demonstrate that their location, scale, form, design, materials, colour, edge treatment

and structural landscaping will create positive, complementary relationships with existing development. This will protect, conserve, and where possible enhance the settlement edge, space between settlements, and their wider landscape setting. It is considered that whilst the approach taken is modern in terms of its construction the external features are simple and little details such as door details and windows give each dwelling its own identity. The immediate surroundings of the site are mixed with a range in development types of 1960s, 1970, 1990's and early 21<sup>st</sup> century, a variety of brick types, render, roofing styles and overall appearance including single and 2 storey dwellings. It is considered that the simple style will sit next to the established development without competing or detracting from the overall character of the area.

7.3.16 Each plot can provide adequate garden space, parking provision and renewable energy features in accordance with policy ENV4 of the East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2015. The proposal would make for an efficient use of land in accordance with the NPPF and local plan policy.

7.3.17 The design and layout are contemporary in keeping with the period in which it would be built. It does not recreate the past but is true to its generation. It is considered the proposal is in keeping with the spirit of policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2015.

#### **7.4 Neighbours amenities**

7.4.1 Policy ENV2 of the Local Plan is relevant and requires all new development to ensure there is no significantly detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers, and that occupiers and users of new buildings, especially dwellings, enjoy high standards of amenity. A number of concerns have been raised from neighbours highlighting issues of overlooking; noise; dwellings too close to their properties; creation of a car park and plot 23 is not secure. The Design Guide provides guidelines for distances between dwellings and boundaries. The back to back distance should be a minimum of 20 metres (65 feet) and a boundary distance of 10 metres (32 feet). Elevations that sit side on to development should have a minimum distance of 10 metres (32 feet).

7.4.2 The main neighbours to be affected by the proposal are 18, 15, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27 and 29 Clarkes Lane, 2, 4 and 6 Hinton Way.

##### 18 Clarkes Lane

7.4.3 18 Clarkes Lane is set opposite to the access road to be created for the proposed development. Whilst the neighbour would not be subject to overlooking, the development being overbearing or loss of light, they will have sight of the proposal. The ruining of a view is not reason to refuse an application. There will be some disturbance with the access road being almost opposite the dwelling, however this was assessed as part of the outline application 19/00910/OUT. It is considered that the amenities of this neighbour will not be demonstrably harmed by this proposal.

##### 15 Clarkes Lane

7.4.4 15 Clarkes Lane is a 2 storey detached dwelling and sits close to the entrance with the proposed development. Plot 1 of the proposed development is nearest dwelling to the neighbour and sits 15 metres (49.2 feet) side on to the neighbour's western boundary, although the main dwelling sits at 23 metres (75.4 feet). It is considered that whilst the neighbour will have sight of the dwelling it will not be to detriment of the neighbour's amenities by way of overlooking, being overbearing or loss of light. To ensure the amenities of the neighbour are maintained in the future any additional windows on the east facing elevation should be restricted, to ensure there is no perception of overlooking in the future between the neighbour and the proposed plot 1.

#### 19 Clarkes Lane

7.4.5 19 Clarkes Lane is also a detached 2 storey dwelling and would have plots 29, 30 and in part 28 to its western boundary. These plots are 2 storey dwellings and set 10 (32 feet) metres away from the boundary of this neighbour. The distance from the rear elevation of 19 Clarkes Lane and these plots is 28 metres (91.8 feet). It is considered that this distance would not lead to detrimental overlooking, being overbearing or loss of light.

#### 21 Clarkes Lane

7.4.6 21 Clarkes Lane has plots 28, 27 and 26 to its western boundary and these dwellings sit 13 metres (42.6 feet) from the boundary and 29 metres (95.1 feet) from the rear elevation of the dwelling. It is considered at this distance would not lead to detrimental overlooking, being overbearing or loss of light.

#### 23 Clarkes Lane

7.4.7 23 Clarkes Lane has plots 25 and 24 to its western boundary. These plots are set between 12 and 14 metres (39.3 – 45.9 feet) from the boundary and 24 metres (78.7 feet) at the closest point from the rear elevation. It is considered at this distance would not lead to detrimental overlooking, being overbearing or loss of light.

#### 25 Clarkes Lane

7.4.8 25 Clarkes Lane has plots 22 and 23 to its western boundary. These plots sit 15 metres (49.2 feet) from this boundary with a distance of 21 metres (68.8 feet) from the rear conservatory. It is considered at this distance would not lead to detrimental overlooking, being overbearing or loss of light.

#### 27 Clarkes Lane

7.4.9 27 Clarkes Lane is a detached 2 storey dwelling which shares the parking area to the western boundary and in part plot 21 side elevation. The distance between the side elevation of plot 21 and number 25 Clarkes Lane is 15 metres (49.2 feet). It is considered that this will not lead to the proposal being significantly overbearing or lead to overlooking. To ensure future amenities are maintained a restriction on windows on the east facing elevation is recommended to ensure the perception of overlooking is not an issue in the future.

7.4.10 To the rear of the neighbour is parking for 3 dwellings and this boundary is enhanced by the provision of a 1.8 close board fencing, a beech hedge and Acer trees. The

parking area site between 5 and 3 metres (16.4 and 9.8 feet) from the boundary and the neighbour is concerned with the noise from this area and its impact on their amenities. It is considered that this would not cause demonstrable harm to the neighbour's amenities. It is the rear part of the garden and in excess of 15 metres (49.2 feet) from the main dwelling.

#### 29 Clarkes Lane

7.4.11 29 Clarkes Lane is a detached 2 storey dwelling with Plot 21 to its western boundary. The distance between the dwellings is 14 metres (45.9 feet) and the majority of the rear garden will share its boundary with Plot 21 rear garden. To ensure the neighbours amenities are not harmed in the future a condition restricting windows in the eastern elevation is recommended.

#### 2 Hinton Way

7.4.12 2 Hinton Way sits to the north of the development site in excess of 25 metres from the boundary of the site. The nearest dwelling is plot 21 in excess of 35 metres (114.8 feet) from the neighbour. The distance between the dwellings is considered to not lead to overlooking, being overbearing or loss of light.

#### 4 Hinton Way

7.4.13 4 Hinton Way sits to the north of the development site in excess of 25 metres (82.0 feet) from the boundary of the site. The nearest plots are 19 and 20 approximately 35 metres (114.8 feet) from the dwelling at 4 Hinton Way. The distance between the dwellings is considered will not to lead to overlooking, being overbearing or loss of light.

#### 6 Hinton Way

7.4.14 6 Hinton Way sits to the north of the development site in excess of 40 metres (131 feet) from the boundary. The nearest plot is number 18 which is side onto the boundary. It is considered that the distance would not lead to overlooking, being overbearing or loss of light.

#### Residential Amenity Conclusion

7.4.15 Using the Design Guide SPD the distances between the dwellings and boundaries is in accordance with the distances set out within guide. It is appreciated that the view of these neighbours will change significantly and they will no longer view open fields but a development of 30 dwellings. However, these will not lead to direct overlooking and conditions can be attached to ensure these are protected in the future. The principle of dwellings in this location has already been established through the granting of planning permission 19/00910/OUM.

### **7.5 Highway Safety and parking**

7.5.1 There are a number of highway issues to consider, although the access from Clarkes Lane has already been established through application 19/00910/OUM and this cannot be altered. However, the accesses and road layout within the site and parking arrangements form part of the discussion of this application.

- 7.5.2 The access into the site has been established through application 19/00910/OUM and has been accepted by the Local Planning Authority and Local Highway Authority. It is considered that traffic will increase but the existing road network is able to cope with the additional traffic as assessed and determined within the outline application.
- 7.5.3 In consultation with the Local Highway Authority the internal highway arrangement has been considered acceptable, following some amendments and conditions have been requested to address the final construction of the internal road layout. These would be attached to any planning permission issued.
- 7.5.4 The site provides 70 parking spaces. Five plots, specifically the larger plots 1, 6,7,8 and 9 provide 4 parking spaces per dwelling and the remaining plots have 2 parking spaces each and a total of 4 visitor parking spaces. Whilst policy COM 8 would require 8 visitor parking spaces, there is an over provision of 2 spaces, as the site as a whole would require 68 spaces and it provides 70 spaces. In addition the site provides 2 cycle spaces per dwelling which is in excess of the policy which requires 1 per dwelling.
- 7.5.5 It is considered that parking on the site has been addressed and provides adequate parking in accordance with policy COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2015. The garages are able to accommodate a vehicle and are in excess of the standard 3 metres by 6 metres. (9.84 by 19.6 feet). A condition to restrict the conversion of the garages to habitable accommodation at a later date would be recommended, in order to preserve the parking provision within the site.
- 7.5.6 The proposal is considered to meet the requirements of policies COM7 by achieving highway safety and adequate parking in relation to policy COM8 of East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2015.

## **7.6 Ecology, trees, landscape and public open space**

- 7.6.1 The original application was subject to an Extended Phase I Habitat Survey and a Reptile Survey, which in consultation with the Wildlife Trust was considered acceptable. As part of that application, and the S106 agreement the application was to provide some biodiversity measures within the site and an off-site contribution to ensure a net gain in biodiversity. This is still applicable and forms part of the permission.
- 7.6.2 A number of residents have raised issues with regard to wildlife and the lack of biodiversity provision, however this has been covered by the Outline application 19/00910/OUT (condition 14) and the corresponding S106 Agreement. On this basis the proposal is considered to meet the requirements of policy ENV7 of the East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2015.

- 7.6.3 The application is supported by a comprehensive landscaping plan and has also been updated throughout the application. It ensures the retention of the oak tree which becomes a focal point for the overall development.
- 7.6.4 In consultation with Tree Officer the scheme did raise concerns initially with regard to the oak tree, which have subsequently been addressed. On the final submission the Tree Officer has found some areas of contention mainly relating to hedges being in close proximity to car parking areas, some planting seems to be superfluous to requirements and to include other tree species such as yew, holly for example. It is considered that these are merely suggestions, however the overall scheme will not only provide ecological benefits it will have a selection of trees, hedges and planting that will provide a positive environment.
- 7.6.5 The proposal has been amended and this included increasing the amount of Public Open Space from 1574 square metres to 2055 square metres, enhanced planting plan and responding to issues relating to the oak tree to be retained. An application of this scale would need to provide a minimum of 1725 square metres of public open space and delivers in excess of this by 305 square metres. It is considered that the proposal delivers an adequate amount of public open space, with a comprehensive landscaping plan.
- 7.6.6 The proposal is considered to comply with policies ENV1 and ENV7 of the East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2015, Natural Environment SPD and the NPPF.

## **7.7 Heritage assets**

- 7.7.1 The site is not within the Conservation Area, host to a Listed Building, nor Building Local Interest (BLINT). The Conservation Area is in excess of 40 metres (131.2 feet) from the boundary of the site. The nearest Listed Building, 2 Church Lane is the closest Listed Building at 75 metres, (246 feet). The Gables, Church Lane, 85 metres (278.8 feet) and the church is 112 metres. (367.4 feet) There are no BLINT's in close proximity to the proposal. On this basis policies ENV11(Conservation Area) and ENV12 (Listed Buildings) of the East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2015 should be applied.
- 7.7.2 In consultation with the Conservation Officer no objections have been raised. It was considered that the distances between the heritage assets and the development site it would have a limited impact. In assessing the harm in accordance with NPPF, it is considered the proposal would lead to negligible harm, it would not affect the setting of the Listed Buildings or the Conservation Area, and there would be limited inter-visibility between the site and the buildings. The benefit of the proposal is that it brings housing to the village to support a growing population, support local services and employment. On this basis the proposal accords with policies ENV11, ENV12 of the East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2015 and the NPPF.
- 7.7.3 The site has been subject to an Archaeological investigation and as part of discharge of condition application 19/00910/DISB this is being assessed by the Historic

Environment Team (HET) at the time of writing the report. The archaeological information is required to be submitted in stages, and it's the final stage that is awaiting approval from HET.

- 7.7.4 On balance the proposal is considered acceptable and complies with policies ENV11, ENV12 and ENV14 of the East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2015 and the NPPF.

## **7.8 Flood Risk**

- 7.8.1 The site is within flood zone 1, where you would expect vulnerable development, such as residential development to be located. This was discussed within the outline application and the LLFA (Lead Local Flood Authority) considered the information submitted within the application was for the most part acceptable and a condition was attached to the permission granted. Condition 10 of 19/00910/OUM required a surface water drainage scheme, which would be agreed via a discharge of condition application. Whilst the applicant has submitted this information as part of the application, it can be dealt with under condition 10 of 19/00910/OUM.
- 7.8.2 The site was a field and to the eastern boundary are swales. These are part of the surface water drainage for the area. As part of the application, it is proposed these areas are infilled and piping is introduced with swales included within the site as part of the public open space. These swales will become part of the landscaping of the site and in time provide additional habitats.
- 7.8.3 In consultation with the LLFA there were originally objections to the proposals, due to calculations from green field run off and a question of the ownership of the swale. Following a discussion and e mails with the LLFA, following confirmation from the application that they do own the swales the LLFA would not raise any objections or require further information.
- 7.8.4 Local residents have stated that they have 'Riparian right' over the swale. In brief this means that the swale is partly owned by the residents and the developer. However, the developer has been able to prove that they do own the swale, and therefore the 'Riparian rights' do not apply. This is further supported by statements from neighbours stating that the previous landowner had undertaken regular maintenance of the swales. On this basis it is considered the 'Riparian rights' do not apply in this instance and the swales are within the ownership of the applicant.
- 7.8.5 Following the conformation of the ownership of the swale, the LLFA have removed their objection. The infilling of the swales will require consent under the Land Drainage Act 1991. On this basis the proposal is considered to comply with policy ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2015.

## **7.9 Contamination**

- 7.9.1 The site has been subject to a Phase II Contamination Report and has been submitted in conjunction with application 19/00910/DISB, to discharge condition 20. A number of residents have raised issues with regard to the potential of contamination from arsenic and asbestos. The contamination report has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and is being assessed by the Council's Scientific Officer and forms part of

the approved outline application (19/00910/OUM). This report provides mitigation measures and remediation where appropriate and will be assessed as part of the discharge of condition application.

- 7.9.2 Should any further contamination be found during construction the developers are required by condition 21 of 19/00910/OUT to report this to the Local Planning Authority and cease works until further investigations are carried out. It is considered that the proposal complies with policy ENV9 of the East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2015.

## **7.10 Waste**

- 7.10.1 In consultation with the East Cambs Waste Teams no objections to the proposal were raised, other than a plan to show refuse collection points. This was supplied by the applicant and shows all of the collection points at the kerbside. The RECAP Waste Design Kit does state bins should not be dragged in excess of 30 metres (98.4 feet) to a refuse collection point, however does state that these collection points can be from private driveways.
- 7.10.2 A concern has been raised that some of the distance's residents are required to drag their bins is in excess of 25 metres (82 feet). Whilst this is a recommendation it is not something a proposal could be seen to be refused upon. There is 1 dwelling, Plot 7 which has a drag distance of 32 metres, (104.9 feet) to a collection point. However, the remaining plots are within the recommendation of 30 metres (98.4 feet). It is considered that on balance the distances and the collection points are acceptable and in compliance with the RECAP Waste Design Kit. There is also the option that refuse could be collected from private driveways.

## **7.11 Conclusion**

- 7.11.1 The principle of development has already been secured through the previous approval 19/00910/OUM and therefore it's the finer details that need to be agreed appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Access formed part of the outline approval. The scheme is considered to have met all of the criteria set within the Design Guide SPD by ensuring at the very least minimum distances between dwellings and neighbours are met. On this basis its impact in terms of overlooking, overbearing, loss of light are considered as being acceptable. This does not alter the fact that there will be an impact on the existing neighbours' views, however this would occur with any development proposed on this site.
- 7.11.2 The site has secured in excess of the required Public Open Space provision by some 300 square metres and creates what is an attractive environment. This includes the retention of the oak tree, additional planting, swales and benches as well as linking with the Public Right of Way. All of the dwellings proposed have a garden size which is in accordance with the Design Guide or in excess of it. This ensures the environment for the new dwellings is pleasant and place where people want to live.
- 7.11.3 All of the plots have a minimum of 2 parking spaces, some even having 4 parking spaces with 4 visitor spaces in accordance with the parking standards set out within

the local plan. Highway safety standards can also be met and the internal measurements of the garages are in accordance with the requirements.

- 7.11.4 The biodiversity of the site is achieved through an off site provision via the S106, however this will be further enhanced by the comprehensive landscaping scheme proposed which is proposed. There are other ecological features of the scheme including the construction methods, for which most is off site and a reduction in the build out time by weeks.
- 7.11.5 The layout has been addressed through concerns raised by Local Highways Authority and the case officer, which aided in the increase in garden sizes, amenity space and to meet the guidelines set within the Design SPD.
- 7.11.6 Issues relating to flooding have been addressed and the LLFA have accepted the proposals and the infilling of the swales with a condition to ensure this is implemented. Whilst the Land Drainage Act 1991 will need to be addressed this is not in relation to the planning merits of the scheme.
- 7.11.7 On balance the proposal is considered to be acceptable and meets the criteria set out within the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015, NPPF and supplementary planning documents and is recommend for approval subject to the recommended conditions.

## 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 ie 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:
- The principle of development has been established with 19/00910/OUM
  - No external consultees have raised objections

## 9 APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 – Suggested Conditions  
Appendix 2 – Full list of details for the development  
Appendix 3 – Decision Notice 19/00910/OUM

<b><u>Background Documents</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>	<b><u>Contact Officer(s)</u></b>
20/01156/RMM	Toni Hylton Room No. 011	Toni Hylton Senior Planning Officer
19/00910/OUM	The Grange Ely	01353 665555 toni.hylton@eastca mbs.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>

APPENDIX 1 - 20/01156/RMM Conditions

1 Development shall be carried out in accordance with the drawings and documents listed below

Plan Reference	Version No	Date Received
100-14-LA-01	P3	
10014-PP-01	P3	
2016-PL-1-03	C	
PL-1-02	E	
Location Plan		1st September 2020
18985-TOPO 2 of 2	A	1st September 2020
18985-TOPO 1 of 2	A	1st September 2020
Arboricultural Method Statement		1st September 2020
(2B08)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B07/4)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B08)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B08-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B08-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B08-2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B08-2)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B03)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B08-3)2-01	A	3rd December 2020
(3B05-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B08-3)3-01	A	3rd December 2020
(3B03)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B05-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B05-2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B05-2)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B06-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B06-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B06-2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B06-2)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B01-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B01-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B01-2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B01-2)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
Greenwillows Cover Letter		3rd December 2020
10086-MP-01		3rd December 2020
10086-SP-01		3rd December 2020
Garden Sizes Schedule		3rd December 2020
Services Report	B	3rd December 2020
Tree Protection Plan		3rd December 2020
(3B06-3)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B06-3)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy	D	7th December 2020
(2B01-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
PL-1-03	B	3rd December 2020
3-01	B	3rd December 2020

(2B01-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B01-2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B01-2)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B03-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B03-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B07/4)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B03-2)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B03-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B03-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B03-2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B03-3)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B03-3)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(GA1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(GA2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(GA3)2-01	A	3rd December 2020
10014-DT-CD-01	T1	3rd December 2020

- 1 Reason: To define the scope and extent of this permission.
  
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within 2 years of the date of the approval of the last of the reserved matters.
  
- 2 Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.
  
- 3 Prior to first occupation or commencement of use the proposed on-site parking area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan PL-1-02-Rev E and thereafter retained for that specific use.
  
- 3 Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policies COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
  
- 4 Prior to the first occupation of the dwellings the visibility splays shown on PL-1-02-Rev E shall be provided each side of the vehicular accesses. Such splays shall thereafter be maintained free from obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the footway.
  
- 4 Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policies COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
  
- 5 The garages space shall be made available for the parking vehicles. This space shall remain available for parking and not used for any other purpose in perpetuity.
  
- 5 Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policies COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
  
- 6 No above ground works shall take place until details of the cycle sheds have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle sheds shall be erected prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved and maintained in perpetuity.

- 6 Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 7 No above ground works shall take place until details of the benches have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The benches shall be installed prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved and maintained in perpetuity.
- 7 Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 8 The boundary treatments hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the details specified on 10014-LA-01 Revision P3 and 10014-PP- revision P3. The boundary treatments shall be in situ and completed prior to the first occupation on the site. All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter
- 8 Reason: To assimilate the development into its surroundings, in accordance with policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 9 All of the landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details shown on Plans 10014-LA-01 Revision P3 and 10014-PP-01-Revision P3 . The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of 20 years from the date of the planting, or replacement planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.
- 9 Reason: To assimilate the development into its surroundings, in accordance with policies ENV1, ENV2 and ENV 7 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and the Natural Environment SPD.
- 10 Prior to any occupation of the development, a scheme for the maintenance of the landscaping scheme shown on plans 10014-LA-01 Revision P3 and 10014-PP-01 Revision P3; for a minimum period of 20 years from last occupation, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall be maintained in accordance with the agreed scheme. The scheme shall include the following:
- i) methods for the proposed maintenance regime;
  - ii) detailed schedule;
  - iii) details of who will be responsible for the continuing implementation
  - iv) details of any phasing arrangements
- 10 Reason: To assimilate the development into its surroundings, in accordance with policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 11 No above ground works shall take place until a scheme of lighting has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting scheme shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved and maintained in perpetuity.

- 11 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 12 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order), no windows, dormer windows, rooflights or openings of any other kind, other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed at first floor level or above on the following plot numbers and elevations.

Plot 1 - east facing elevation  
 Plot 21 - east facing elevation

without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

- 12 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 13 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order), no development permitted by Class A, B, C, D or E of Part 1 or Class A of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the 2015 Order (as amended) shall be carried out or made to the following plots 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 or within its curtilage without the grant of a further planning permission by the local planning authority.
- 13 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 14 The tree protection measures as shown on Tree Protection Plan shall be implemented prior to the commencement of development, site works or clearance in accordance with the approved details, and shall be maintained and retained until the development is completed. Within the root protection areas the existing ground level shall be neither raised nor lowered and no materials, temporary buildings, plant, machinery or surplus soil shall be placed or stored thereon. If any trenches for services are required within the fenced areas they shall be excavated and backfilled by hand and any tree roots encountered with a diameter of 25mm or more shall be left unsevered
- 14 Reason: To ensure that the trees on site are adequately protected, to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.

- 15 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces, including walls, roofing materials, windows, and doors, shall be as specified on the submitted plans detailed below:

(2B01-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B01-2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B01-2)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B03-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B03-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020

(2B07/4)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B03-2)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B03-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B03-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B03-2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B03-3)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B03-3)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(GA1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(GA2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(GA3)2-01	A	3rd December 2020
(2B08)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B07/4)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(2B08)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B08-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B08-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B08-2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B08-2)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B03)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B08-3)2-01	A	3rd December 2020
(3B05-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B08-3)3-01	A	3rd December 2020
(3B03)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B05-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B05-2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B05-2)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B06-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B06-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B06-2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(3B06-2)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B01-1)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B01-1)3-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B01-2)2-01	B	3rd December 2020
(4B01-2)3-01	B	3rd December 2020

All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 15 Reason To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 16 The highway shall be built to adoptable standards as defined by Cambridgeshire County Council Housing Estate Road Construction Specification (current at time of commencement of build) before the last dwelling is occupied.
- 16 Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policies COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.

Appendix 2 – Full details of each plot

Plot	Plot Size	Garden size	Height (Eaves)	Height (ridge)	Width	Depth	Floor Area	Materials/Notes
1 (4B03-1) 3-01B	440 (4736)	210 (2260)	5.3 (17.3)	8.3 (27.2)	9.2 (XG) (29)	7.6 (25)	70(XG) (725)	(B) Buff /Soft grey CB RAL7038 (R) slate plain tiles (WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012 (SP)
2 (3B06-1) 3-01B	212.5 (2287)	115.5 (1237)		7.9 (25.9)	9 (29)	6.5 (21)	58.5 (609)	(B) Buff /Soft grey CB RAL7038 (R) slate plain tiles (WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012and Beige RAL1015 (SP)
3 (3B06-2)3-01B	238 (2561)	141.5 (1523)		7.9 (25.9)	9 (29)	6.5 (21)	58.5 (609)	(B) Buff /Soft grey CB RAL7038 (R) slate plain tiles (WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012 and blue RAL 5014 (SP)
4 (3B05-1) 2-01B	216 (2325)	103.9 (1108)		9.1 (29.8)	11.7 (39)	9.4 (30)	110 (1170)	B) red multi/ Soft grey CB RAL7038 (R) Clay plain tile light red (WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012 and beige RAL 1015 (SP)
5 (3B05-1) 2-01B	189 (2034)	76.13 (819)		9.1 (29.8)				
6 (4B03-2) 2-01B	660 (7104)	353.40 (3803)		8.3 (27.2)	9.2 (XG) (29)	7.4 (24)	68 (XG) (696)	(B)Red multi/(CB) Black anthracite RAL9005 (R) slate plain tiles (WD) pure white/Beige RAL1015 (SP)
7 (4B01-1)3-	374 (4026)	157.4 (1694)		9.1 (29.8)	6.7 (22)	9.8 (32)	66 (704)	(B) Red multi/(CB) Black anthracite

Plot	Plot Size	Garden size	Height (Eaves)	Height (ridge)	Width	Depth	Floor Area	Materials/Notes
01B								RAL9005 (R) Clay plain tile light red (WD) white 9016 (SP) Garage materials to match
8 (4B03-3)-01B	418 (4499)	231 (2486)		8.3 (27.2)	9.2 (XG) (29)	7.4 (24)	68 (XG) (696)	(B) Buff /Soft grey CB RAL7038 (R) slate plain tiles (WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012 (SP)
9 (4B01-2)3-01B	340 (3660)	184.2 (1982)		9.1 (29.8)	6.7 (22)	9.8 (32)	66 (704)	(B) Buff /Soft grey CB RAL7038 (R) slate plain tiles (WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012 (SP) Garage materials to match- garage door blue RAL5012
10 (3B06-3)3-01B	300 (3229)	183.6 (1976)		7.9 (25.9)	9 (29)	6.5 (21)	58.5 (609)	(B) Red multi/(CB) Black anthracite RAL9005 (R) Clay plain tile light red (WD) white 9016 /basalt grey RAL7012 (SP) Garage materials to match
11 (2B01-1)2-01B	154 (1658)	71.3 (767)		9.1 (29.8)	9.2 (29)	9.8 (32)	90 (928)	(B) render white (R) slate plain tiles (WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012, Green RAL6005, Blue RAL5014 (SP)
12 (2B01-1)2-01B	132 (1421)	70.45 (757)						
13 (3B05-2)3-01B	154 (1658)	87.60 (943)			11.7 (38)	9.2 (29)	108 (1102)	(B) Buff /Soft grey CB RAL7038 (R) slate plain tiles (WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012 (SP)
14 (3B05-2)3-01B	154 (1658)	83.40 (897)						
15 (3B08-1)2-01B	120 (1292)	56 (602)			10.6 (35)	9.8 (32)	104 (1120)	(B) render white (CB) Black anthracite RAL 9005
16	130	65						(R) clay plain tile red

Plot	Plot Size	Garden size	Height (Eaves)	Height (ridge)	Width	Depth	Floor Area	Materials/Notes
(3B08-1)2-01B	(1399)	(699)						(WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012, Beige RAL1015, blue RAL5014 (SP)
17 (3B08-2)3-01B	120 (1292)	65 (699)			10 (33)	9.8 (32)	98 (1056)	(B) Render white (R) slate plain tiles (WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012, red RAL3013 (SP)
18 (3B08-2)3-01B	120 (1292)	65 (699)						
19 (2B01-2)2-01B	120 (1292)	57.3 (616)			15.3 (50)	9.8 (32)	150 (1600)	(B)render white (CB) Black anthracite RAL 9005 (R) slate plain tiles (WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012, red RAL 3013. Blue RAL5014 (SP)
20 (3B08-3)3-01A	120 (1292)	58.2 (626)						
21 (2B01-2)2-01B	140 (1507)	71 (764)						
22 (2B03-1)2-01B	110 (1184)	55.9 (601)		8.8 (28.8)	15.2 (50)	8.7 (28)	132 (1400)	(B) red multi (CB) Black anthracite RAL9005 (R) Light red clay plain tile (WD) white 9016/ red RAL 3013. Blue RAL5014 (SP)
23 (2B03-1)2-01B	112.5 (1211)	61.6 (663)						
24 (2B03-1)2-01B	138 (1485)	77.4 (833)						
25 (2B07/4)2-01B	138 (1485)	79.8 (858)			10.2 (33)	9 (29)	92 (957)	(B) render white (R) slate plain tiles (WD)Grey RAL7015, green RAL6005 (SP)
26 (2B07/4)2-01B	141 (1517)	82.6 (889)						
27 (2B08)2-01B	144 (1550)	85 (914)			10.2 (33)	9 (29)	92 (957)	(B) render white (CB) Black anthracite RAL9005 (R) light red clay plain tiles (WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012, beige RAL1015 (SP)
28 (2B08)2-01B	144 (1550)	87.5 (941)						
29 (3B03)3-01B	171.5 (1846)	92 (990)		9.1 (29.8)	11.7 (38)	9.2 (29)	108 (1102)	(B) Buff /Soft grey CB RAL7038 (R) slate plain tiles (WD) Basalt Grey RAL7012

Plot	Plot Size	Garden size	Height (Eaves)	Height (ridge)	Width	Depth	Floor Area	Materials/Notes
								(SP)

Appendix 3 – Decision Notice 19/00910/OUM