

---

**MAIN CASE**

**Reference No:** 17/00757/ESO

**Proposal:** Residential development of up to 680 dwellings (including retirement/sheltered dwellings) and neighbourhood centre including associated infrastructure, public open space and landscaping

**Site Address:** Land Parcel North Of Grange Lane Littleport  
Cambridgeshire

**Applicant:** Manor Oak Homes Ltd

**Case Officer:** Andrew Phillips, Senior Planning Officer

**Parish:** Littleport

**Ward:** Littleport West

Ward Councillor/s: Councillor Christine Ambrose-Smith  
Councillor Paul Cox

**Date Received:** 27 April 2017 **Expiry Date:** 29 December 2017

**[S184]**

---

1.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 Members are recommended to grant delegated approval to the Planning Manager, subject to the final conditions and the completion of a S106 Agreement. The conditions might need to be altered as the S106 progresses, in order to make both the decision notice and S106 both precise, relevant and reasonable. The recommended conditions at this stage are (which can be read in full in Appendix 1) are:

1. Approved Plans
2. Reserved Matters
3. Time Limit
4. Fire Hydrants
5. Adoptable Roads
6. Design Code
7. Foul water
8. Tree Protection
9. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
10. Unidentified Contaminated Land
11. Construction Times
12. Detailed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan
13. Retail Limit
14. Annexes

- 15.Noise mitigation/protection
- 16.Tree Protection
- 17. Ecological protection
- 18.Ecological enhancement
- 19. Sustainability
- 20.Strategic Surface Water
- 21.Phased surface water
- 22.Dwelling limit
- 23.Grange Lane access
- 24.Grange Lane speed limits
- 25. Broadband

## 2.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

- 2.1 The proposal is for outline consent for up to 680 dwellings; which is broken down to 616 houses (originally for 30% affordable housing but since the Proposed Local Plan gained Council approval will now be 20%), 14 retirement bungalows and 50 retirement flats. It also includes public open space, retail units and a community centre.
- 2.2 The application will provide approximately 4 hectares of usable public open space and 2.8 hectares of buffer open space between the development and the A10. With the developable area being approximately 20 hectares, the net density is 34 dwelling per hectare.
- 2.3 The application is supported by an Environmental Statement (screened prior to submission), due to the potential significant impacts on archaeology and visual impact. The requirement of an Environmental Statement does not weigh against a planning application, but should highlight that the impacts of the development go beyond the immediate area and careful consideration is required. The application has been duly advertised to reflect that an Environmental Statement has been submitted.
- 2.4 The developer undertook significant pre-application advice with both the local community and the Local Planning Authority in order to help guide the submission of the application and to overcome concerns at the earliest opportunity.
- 2.5 The full planning application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online via East Cambridgeshire District Council's Public Access online service, via the following link <http://pa.eastcambs.gov.uk/online-applications/>. **Alternatively a paper copy is available to view at the East Cambridgeshire District Council offices, in the application file.**
- 2.6 The proposal has been referred to Planning Committee, due to its size and the Council's constitution.

### 3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

#### 3.1

16/01590/SCREEN SCREENING OPINION:  
Housing development

30.11.2016

### 4.0 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

#### 4.1

The site is located adjacent and to the west of the Highfield Farm development and Woodfen Road (a narrow lane that no longer connects to the A10 along the western boundary). The northern boundary is defined by the playing fields of the Primary School on Parsons Lane. The southern boundary is defined by Grange Lane, which is the location of the main access onto the public highway.

#### 4.2

The site is currently a group of fields divided by a T shaped mature hedge and ditch. The southern boundary is relatively open, while the northern boundary has a line of semi-mature tree line.

#### 4.3

The A10 is approximately 1 metre lower than the site in the southwest corner of the site.

### 5.0 RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES

#### 5.1

The full responses are available on the Council's web site.

Littleport Parish Council – (7 June 2017) Has concerns over the proposal and seeks to keep a watching brief.

(19 September 2017) Stated that it is interested in taking on the community centre and preference is the developer to build it, rather than a financial contribution.

(30 October 2017) Meeting was cancelled as due to being inquorate.

Ward Councillors – (1 September 2017) Cllr Paul Cox states that without prejudice his initial thoughts is that the community facility is a good idea and should be under the control of the Parish Council.

Transport Assessment Team – (12 June 2017) The proposed secondary accesses, through the adjacent development, appear outside of the developers control.

A detailed footpath along Grange Lane doesn't appear to have been provided, this needs to be submitted as part of this application.

A detailed plan needs to be provided for the pedestrian link onto Woodfen Road. Discussions should also be had with the Primary School to the north in regards to connections to and from the site.

Have discussions taken place with the local bus operator regarding public transport strategy for the site, this could affect road widths?

The two bus stops on Ely Road should be upgraded, these are the closest stops to the site. The upgrades should include but not be limited to bus shelters, bus cages on the carriageway, flags, time tables and real time passenger information. Could this bus service be improved?

The routes between the site and the railway station should be assessed and any deficiencies highlighted and improvements included.

Requires more information on accident data, which can be provided by Cambridgeshire County Council.

Requires more information on trip rates and vehicle distribution.

The application as submitted does not include sufficient information to properly determine the highway impact of the proposed development.

(13 September 2017) States that the proposal has not overcome the concerns raised in regards:

- Walking/cycling strategy.
- Have discussions taken place with the bus company in regards to diversions or bus times?
- Connection to railway station.
- Footpath connection to Woodfen Road.
- Trip Rates based on 4-491 dwellings been selected on TRICS.

Asks for clarification on some of the data provided.

A previous concern has been updated to say now it is the developer's responsibility to prove a bus stop(s) could be accommodated on Ely Road Littleport.

(22 August 2017) The applicant has not yet addressed all of their concerns.

In regards to the A10 improvements wants to wait until all the outstanding issues with the Transport Assessment Methodology are sorted before coming to a view on roundabout mitigation.

(27 October 2017) it states that:

#### *Footway along Grange Lane*

A plan has been submitted showing the proposed footway which is acceptable. However, seeks a walking and cycling strategy should be produced and submitted as part of the planning application. This should not be conditioned, as it should demonstrate that the site is in a sustainable location.

#### *Public Transport*

No new information has been submitted regarding public transport.

Asks, have discussions taken place with the local bus operator regarding public transport on site. If buses are to enter the site this will need to inform road widths.

There appears to have been no attempt to make this site sustainable and reduce the reliance on the private motor vehicle, which is contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

The existing bus stops on Ely Road are 750 metres away from the proposed site access, which makes the northern end of the development 1.3km away from the nearest bus stops. This is not acceptable, a new development of 680 dwellings which is not service by buses and contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Local Plan.

#### *Pedestrian Link onto Woodfen Road*

It is understood this link is to be constructed by ECDC for the developer. It does not want to encourage pedestrians onto Woodfen Road, which does not have any pedestrian facilities. It would not adopt this pedestrian link as public highway once constructed.

#### *Bus*

The applicant has agreed to provide bus stop improvements but a plan showing these improvements has still not been provided.

#### *Rail*

An assessment has still not taken place of the route between the site and the railway station. Questions what is the route to the station, what are the widths of the footways on route and are there any missing sections?

#### *Accident Data*

No clusters have been identified and considers this element to now be acceptable.

#### *Walking*

No connection has been shown to the school just to the north of the school. With the site being adjacent the developer should have discussions with the school.

#### *Trip Rates, Distribution, Growth Rates and Flow Diagrams*

Considers these to be acceptable.

#### *Junction Assessment*

County Council has undertaken a large piece of work to try and determine how best to deal with the traffic issues at the A10/A142 roundabouts. The ARCADY assessment undertaken by JPP suggests there are only a couple of cars in the queue, the assessment is not correct and is not representative of what is happening on the ground at the moment.

County Council have recently undertaken a PM site visit and observed significant queuing (hundreds of metres) during the peak.

It is also noted that the OD varies over time box has been ticked but this one hour profile has been selected. This is bringing up a warning in PICADY, correcting this is unlikely to alter the results.

### *Conclusion*

They conclude that as submitted it does not include sufficient information to properly determine the highway impact of the proposed development.

Local Highways Authority – (13 July 2017) It requests a holding objection for the following reason:

“The application is not supported by sufficient highways and transport information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be prejudicial to the satisfactory function and safety of the highway.

This is an all matters reserved application accept access. As such the details of the proposed access and all mitigation measures must be determined at this stage and therefore all and any detail matters must be submitted for review.”

The proposed access requires the road fronting the development (Grange Road) to be altered and the existing road layout changed.

A Grampian condition will be required to change the speed limits along Grange Road.

If there is a bus route through the site, the access should be widened to 6.5m to allow busses to pass.

The proposed vehicular access on Grange Road is the only connection with the adopted highway.

Woodfen Road is a 60mph road and is unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists.”

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service – (22 May 2017) Seeks a condition or S106 in regards to the provision of fire hydrants.

Designing Out Crime Officer (Police) – (19 May 2017) States that this area is at medium risk of crime.

While this is at an early stage it appears to have an acceptable layout and is happy to discuss Secured by Design as the application progresses, suggests this could be by way of condition.

(7 September 2017) No further comments to those provided in May 2017.

Waste Strategy (ECDC) – (11 May 2017) Provides the standard advice on waste/recycling collection and provides details how the developer can pay for bin provision.

Growth and Economy Service (County) – (19 September 2017)

Seeks a pre-commencement condition requiring a detailed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

Housing Services – (26 May 2017) In accordance with Policy HOU3 expects that 30% affordable housing, with a split of 70% rented/30% shared ownership.

An appropriate mix of property types is 15% 1 bedroom, 60% 2 bedroom, 23% 4 bedroom and 2% 4 bedroom. It is also expected that a proportion of these will be or easily adaptable for occupation by the elderly or people with disabilities.

(18 September 2017) Previous comments still relevant.

Environment Agency – (30 May 2017) It has no objection in principle to the proposed development but provides guidance. This guidance includes consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority, Sustainable Drainage Systems, foul water, pollution prevention, contamination and wildlife conservation. It makes recommendations that water efficiency measures should be adopted by the developer.

(11 September 2017) No comment to make on this application.

Littleport and Downham Internal Drainage Board – (12 June 2017) The development is outside their area but drains into the Board's Wood Fen Catchwater Drain.

The surface water attenuation calculations in the Flood Risk Assessment are based on the Board's run off rate of 1.1 litres per second per hectare. Therefore it has no objection.

It is vital that there is a robust long term plan for the maintenance of the on site surface water features to ensure they will continue to function as designed.

The discharge into the Board's Catchwater will require the consent of this Board in the form of a legal agreement and must be obtained prior to works starting on site.

Anglian Water – (31 May 2017) It requests an informative to ensure the developer incorporates them into the proposal.

The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Littleport Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for this proposal.

It requests a condition in regards to the foul sewerage network.

The surface water drainage does not appear to relate to Anglian Water operated assets.

Lead Local Flood Authority – (26 May 2017) States:

“Whilst as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) we have no objection in principle to the proposed development, we believe the SuDS could be greatly improved upon. In accordance with the Cambridgeshire Flood & Water SPD adopted by East Cambridgeshire District Council in November 2016, the design and layout of a site should seek to manage and convey surface water above ground. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment references the presence of existing drainage ditches that link to a watercourse adjacent to Woodfen Road. These ditches should be retained to assist in defining appropriate and efficient flow routes through the developed site without relying on additional infrastructure. Allowing surface water to follow the natural physical geography requires less soil movement and can eliminate the need for additional underground piping. The retention of these ditches would also provide an additional level of water quality treatment, and if used appropriately could reduce the size of the proposed attenuation basins.

In conjunction with retaining the ditches we request the applicant also looks to utilise bioretention/wetland areas to manage surface water.”

Requests several conditions in regards to surface water management.

(19 July 2017) States that all of phase 1 and part of phase 2 drain to the basin within Phase 2 (western end) and therefore this basin would need to be in place prior to the construction of hard standing areas with either phase 1 or 2.

Part of phase 2 all of phases 3 and 4 drain into the basin within phase 3, therefore this basin would need to be in place prior to the construction of hard standing areas within any of these areas.

If a private management team was to maintain these, they would want to see a bond taken by ECDC in the interim.

(21 September 2017) Confirms that the LLFA has no further comments beyond those set down in our response of 26 May 2017.

Open Spaces & Facilities Manager – (20 July 2017) States:

“would be happy to adopt public open space, SuDS if approved by Lead Flood Authority. We need to take the line that County should be adopting street trees, therefore we will not adopt. We do not wish to adopt any community building.”

(4 September 2017) Agreed that the contribution of £21,000 for footpath improvements to Woodfen Road seems about right, as does the price of land.

Sport England – (31 May 2017) It objects to this proposal as it fails to provide outdoor or indoor sports facilities, contrary to Sport England’s Planning Policy Objectives and NPPF.

It requires 2.61 hectares of outdoor sport facilities and seeks an off site contribution for indoor space.



Natural England – (31 May 2017) It states that based on the plans submitted the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on the Ouse Washes designated site and has no objection.

It recommends that at least 40% of the development be high quality Green Infrastructure. The proposal does not appear to meet this requirement nor deliver significant biodiversity improvements.

It recommends that the Local Planning Authority should ensure that the development provides the high quality Green Infrastructure that is well connected to the wider network. It also expects that in addition to ecological mitigation the development provides biodiversity improvements.

(13 September 2017) Proposed amendments are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal.

Historic England – (7 June 2017) Does not wish to offer any comments but suggests that specialist conservation and archaeological advice is sought.

(13 September 2017) Suggest that the views of specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

Historic Environment Team – (19 May 2017) States:

“An archaeological evaluation was undertaken at the beginning of the year and the report of results, downloaded from the submission documents, approved, is a fair depiction of the archaeological character of this large land parcel. Though a large Anglo-Saxon cemetery was found to the east of the land parcel, its corresponding settlement continues to elude discovery – it was not found in this 30 hectare area.

Owing to the low significance of archaeological evidence present, we do not recommend any further work and have no objection and no requirement for archaeological work at this site.

We thank Manor Oak Homes for their co-operation in this matter.”

(7 September 2017) It states no objection to the amendments and no further archaeological requirements for this development.

Conservation Officer – (18 May 2017) States:

“I've read the Heritage Assessment and would agree with the assessment of the heritage given and the likely impact of the development on the designated heritage assets.

Trees Officer – (6 May 2017) In regards to existing vegetation the site currently consists of substantial boundary trees to the north. There is significant boundary hedge to the south of the site also. Internally there is a significant hedge running east to west and a minor hedgerow from the southern boundary heading north. The current plan seeks to maximise the retention of these features with sections of hedging removed to facilitate access routes.

Does not object to the proposal as the proposed tree impact will be minimal. However, raises concerns that it will have a negative impact upon the landscape character of the area, which would conflict with ENV1. Although it should be emphasised this is to be expected from a development of this magnitude.

Advises that the layout is revised to incorporate the existing internal hedge running east to west into an open space. This could be done by locating the current proposed open space further south. This will facilitate the retention of this feature in the long term as part of a comprehensive landscape design.

Seeks a tree protection condition.

(14 September 2017) Supports the current proposal as the indicative layout may affectively support the retention of the major landscape features within the development.

Recommends conditions to seek the protection of trees/hedges on site.

Concludes that affective landscaping will be essential to the success of these proposals, with the full evaluation of landscaping provision best considered at the reserved matters stage.

Environmental Health – (22 June 2017) States they have read the Noise Report dated 8 November 2016.

The report indicates that where windows are kept closed, internal noise levels will be acceptable. With the use of barriers external noise levels can be kept at an acceptable limit.

From an Environmental Health point of view it has been demonstrated that Government guidance has been met and for this reason raised no issues. However, it understood that the Local Planning Authority have to consider the fact of keeping windows closed and ventilation requirements against residential amenity standards.

Discussions were had with the case officer in regards to bunding adjacent the road, which is always supported as it creates additional screening near the noise source.

Considers the principle of development to be acceptable but the number of properties will need to be dependant on the constraint of the site.

Seeks conditions in regards to Construction Environmental Management Plan, construction hours, noise assessment, details of external plant/extraction units for neighbourhood centre, plant noise limit (might be at reserved matters stage), commercial delivery times (might be at reserved matter stage) and details of external lighting.

(20 September 2017) Environmental Health Officer states:

“Thank you for reconsulting me on the above regarding the updated noise report. I can confirm I have read the Noise Impact Assessment entitled ‘Land North of the

Grange and East of the A10 (including allocated site LIT 2), Littleport, reference AC100327-1R3, dated 24<sup>th</sup> August 2017.

It appears that the only difference is the inclusion of the 2m bund near the road within the noise modelling. The result of this bunding reduces the potential noise impact in external areas on the proposed development and therefore reduces the height of the required fencing to some gardens. From the information received the internal noise levels are unaffected and the same mitigation is proposed as previously. My previous comments (forwarded below) are therefore still relevant.

It is difficult to compare the new and previous sets of modelling maps as different colours and noise levels have been utilised. However I note from the report the external amenity areas are now indicated to experience noise levels up to 58dB, whereas previously this was up to 60dB. Whilst both reports state that this is without mitigation I believe that the August 2017 report includes the attenuation afforded by the 2m bund.

Pg 19 confirms that with a 1.8m high barrier around certain garden areas, all gardens would fall below the 55dB guideline value, with the vast majority below 50dB. As this is outline permission and the final layout is unknown I would advise the submission of a noise report for each phase of development prior to the commencement of that phase to demonstrate how government & WHO guidelines will be met. It is important that the design is fully considered as the layout and orientation, as well as additional fenestration on quieter facades, can be beneficial to reduce the amount of mitigation required and potentially negate the need for mechanical ventilation.

It is still important for clarification if the current commercial areas operate 24/7 as this has not been assessed. (This could be covered in the phase noise reports).

As this is an outline planning application and on reading the additional noise report, I consider the previous recommendations for conditions are still relevant (see e-mail below) and I am happy to discuss appropriate wording, including guideline noise limits."

Environmental Health (Scientific) – (7 June 2017) States they have read the Site Check report dated 7 October 2015 and Air Quality Assessment dated 20 May 2016 and accepts the findings. Recommends that conditions in regards to air quality are not required and the only condition in regards to contaminated land is to deal with unexpected contamination.

Ely Cycle Campaign – The proposed development should:

- include plans for cycle parking for every dwelling.
- Provide segregated main routes for cyclists.
- Direct motor free cycle routes to the two primary schools.
- Adequate cycle links to Littleport centre.
- Adequate cycle link to Sustrans.
- Developer should contribute to cycle route between Littleport and Ely.

Senior Public Health Manager Environment and Planning - No Comments Received

## Planning Casework Unit - No Comments Received

- 5.2 Neighbours – 184 neighbouring properties were notified and the responses received are summarised below. A notice was put in the press on the 25 May 2017 and site notices put up on the 30 May 2017. A full copy of the responses are available on the Council's website.

40 The Barns, Littleport – The occupant is strongly opposed to this additional development. Considers that Littleport is slowly losing its character, as developments increase. There are numerous surrounding villages that have seen little or no development such as Wicken, Upware, Welney etc. Finds the additional 600 dwellings an unreasonable extension to Littleport.

The dentist has a long waiting list and the road networks are already busy at peak times.

(updated comments) Provides similar comments to those previously provided.

37 Rye Close, Littleport – Does not have an objection with the notion of more houses but raises concern how the proposal could impact on local infrastructure and transport links. Makes the point that Littleport is a commuter settlement with house prices in Ely and Littleport pushing people northwards.

Seeks that transport network is vastly improved ranging from A10 improvements, to railway improves and cycle links.

34 Barley Way, Littleport – The occupants consider that the increase from 600 to 680 dwelling is acceptable, given that there are now sheltered bungalows and accommodation for retirement bungalows. However, wants to ensure that the density remains low and below that of Highfields.

Is pleased to note that the general scale of the community centre and shops proposed is in keeping with a village feel.

Supports the amount of public open space, but would like to see as many trees planted as possible.

Would like to be kept up to date with any changes and decisions on this application.

## 6.0 The Planning Policy Context

### 6.1 East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015

GROWTH 1	Levels of housing, employment and retail growth
GROWTH 2	Locational strategy
GROWTH 3	Infrastructure requirements
GROWTH 4	Delivery of growth
GROWTH 5	Presumption in favour of sustainable development

HOU 1	Housing mix
HOU 2	Housing density
HOU 3	Affordable housing provision
ENV 1	Landscape and settlement character
ENV 2	Design
ENV 4	Energy efficiency and renewable energy in construction
ENV 7	Biodiversity and geology
ENV 8	Flood risk
ENV 9	Pollution
ENV 12	Listed Buildings
ENV 14	Sites of archaeological interest
COM 1	Location of retail and town centre uses
COM 2	Retail uses in town centres
COM 4	New community facilities
COM 5	Strategic green infrastructure
COM 7	Transport impact
COM 8	Parking provision
LIT 2	Housing allocation, land west of Highfields

## 6.2 Supplementary Planning Documents

Developer Contributions  
Cambridgeshire Flood and Water  
Contamination  
Design Guide

## 6.3 National Planning Policy Framework 2012

### Para 14

- 1 Building a strong, competitive economy
- 2 Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- 3 Supporting a prosperous rural economy
- 4 Promoting sustainable transport
- 6 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- 7 Requiring good design
- 8 Promoting healthy communities
- 10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 11 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- 12 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

## 6.4 Proposed Local Plan 2017

- |      |   |
|------|---|
| LP1  | A presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development                |
| LP2  | Level and Distribution of Growth                                  |
| LP3  | The Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside                      |
| LP6  | Meeting Local Housing Needs                                       |
| LP14 | Retail and Other Main Town Centre Uses                            |
| LP15 | Retail Uses in Town Centres                                       |
| LP16 | Infrastructure to Support Growth                                  |
| LP17 | Creating a Sustainable, Efficient and Resilient Transport Network |
| LP18 | Improving Cycle Provision   |
| LP19 | Maintaining and Improving Community Facilities                    |
| LP20 | Delivering Green Infrastructure, Trees and Woodland               |
| LP21 | Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities                     |
| LP22 | Achieving Design Excellence                                       |

LP23	Water Efficiency
LP24	Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Development
LP25	Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk
LP26	Pollution and Land Contamination
LP27	Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets
LP28	Landscape, Treescape and Built Environment Character, including Cathedral Views
LP30	Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity
LP33	Residential Annexes
Littleport 1	Littleport's Local Character and Facilities
Littleport 2	Infrastructure and Community Facilities
Littleport 3	Allocation Sites
Littleport 4	Site LIT.H5 - Land West of Highfields

## 6.5 Planning Practice Guidance

## 7.0 PLANNING COMMENTS

### 7.1 Principle of Development

7.2 The Council currently able to demonstrate that it has an adequate five year supply of land for housing. However, this is based on the site allocations in the Proposed Local Plan 2017 coming forward.

7.3 The application was screened under Regulation 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 where it was concluded that an Environmental Statement is needed to cover the significant urbanisation of the local area and the high potential for archaeological finds. This application is, therefore, supported by an Environmental Statement. The significant issues of impact on the landscape and archaeology are covered below in detail.

7.4 Policy LIT2 covers approximately half of the development site and seeks approximately 300 dwellings. The Littleport Key Diagram on page 33 of East Cambridgeshire Local Plan Adopted April 2015 shows that the remainder of the site comes under the broad area of housing. It is expected that the site in its entirety was always planned to be built on under the Local Plan period. The proposal for the entire site has the benefit of being planned in one go, rather than two (or more) different developers trying to link up with potential consents (including conditions/S106 Agreements). The site is now allocated for approximately 600 dwellings under the Proposed Local Plan 2017.

7.5 Policy LIT 2 states:

#### **Policy LIT 2: Housing allocation, land west of Highfields**

13.25 hectares of land is allocated for residential development for up to approximately 300 dwellings.

A Masterplan for the whole area will need to be prepared and submitted as part of an outline planning application, and approved by the District Council.

Development proposals will be expected to:

- Provide an element of affordable housing (currently 30%) as required under Policy HOU 3.
- Provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes to reflect current evidence of need within Littleport, including provision for at least 5% self-build properties.
- Provide a minimum of 2 hectares of public open space on-site, including land for provision of a play area. This provision should have regard to the need to provide links into the countryside and should form part of the wider green network in Littleport.
- Have particular regard to the layout and scale, height, design and massing of buildings, and landscaping, in order to minimise visual impact from Woodfen Road, Grange Lane and the surrounding countryside.
- Undertake a project level Habitats Regulation Assessment screening. Where this identifies a likely significant effect, applicants will be required to submit sufficient information for a project level Appropriate Assessment to be undertaken by the District Council under the Habitats Regulation Assessment process to ensure there will be no adverse impacts on European sites.
- Provide pedestrian and cycle links from the site to the town centre via the adjoining Highfields development (Tilling Way/Cornfield Lane) and Upton Place.
- Provide a pedestrian and cycle link across the site from Woodfen Road as part of a circular walking route around Littleport.
- Contribute towards the provision of a pedestrian and cycle route on Grange Lane, between the A10 roundabout and Highfields mini roundabout.
- Relate well to the established design character of the Highfields development and allow for future housing development to the south of the site.
- Provide safe vehicular access from Highfields Road (vehicular route which currently has benefit of planning permission).
- Provide necessary highway improvements and traffic calming measures on nearby roads, as demonstrated in a Transport Assessment.
- Demonstrate that potential noise impacts from the A10 can be adequately mitigated.
- Demonstrate there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewerage network and that adequate surface water drainage and flood storage capacity is provided.
- Provide appropriate evidence of the archaeological potential and significance of the site prior to the submission of a planning application; and
- Comply with the other policies of the Local Plan.

#### **Littleport4: Site LIT.H5 - Land West of Highfields**

- The following special considerations/requirements apply to proposals for site LIT.H5:
- A housing-led development for approximately 600 dwellings, supported by the provision of appropriate infrastructure;
- Other supporting uses, such as local retail, services and small-scale employment, will be accepted where these enhance the quality of the development and do not undermine Littleport's town centre;
- Pedestrian and cycle routes should provide clear, legible connections to neighbouring developments and the town centre;

- A landscape and noise buffer should be provided between development and the A10;
- Distant views of Ely Cathedral should be retained, enhanced if opportunities arise, and new public views created if possible.

- 7.6 The developer was providing 30% affordable housing, but this will need to be reduced to 20% as the Council has determined 30% would make developments in Littleport unviable. It will provide a wide mix of housing (including 5% self build), provide 4 hectares of open space, have little impact on ecology, will provide several pedestrian links in all directions, shows footpath/cycle links along Grange Lane, incorporates land to the south as part of the proposal, considers noise impact from the A10, can deal with sewage treatment/network and has shown there is no significant archaeological potential on the site. The highway safety/transport movements are covered in great detail below, but are deemed to be acceptable to the officers of the Local Planning Authority.
- 7.7 The amount of retail proposed is approximately 222 square metres, which falls below the requirements of the need for a viability or Retail Impact Assessment as required by Policy COM1. The provision of small retail units should add to the sustainability of the development, without unduly affecting the retail units found within the centre of Littleport.
- 7.8 Littleport is one of the more sustainable settlements within the district with a good range of services/facilities (including a new educational campus) and has access to railway station (with permission granted for a car park extension). With the size of the development it is expected that renewable energy and clever design will be incorporated to minimise the long term impact on the environment and to ensure running costs for future residents are minimised; this can be conditioned and also deal with at the reserved matters stage. The proposal, therefore, will comply with Policy ENV4 and LP24.
- 7.9 It is considered that the principle of up to 680 dwellings is acceptable in Littleport based on the allocation, the remainder of the site being shown as a broad area of housing under adopted policy and allocated for approximately 600 dwellings under proposed policy. With the site being for approximately 600 dwellings, which gives a range from 540 – 660 dwellings (based on a 10% allowance). The proposal is considered to be 20 dwellings over this but a condition will be added stating 680 is the maximum and that it is the developer's responsibility to demonstrate that the design is acceptable through a design led approach. All other material considerations are covered below.
- 7.10 Highway Safety and Transport
- 7.11 The proposal for 680 dwellings needs to be considered as only accessing onto Grange Lane. While the developer has secured two access points into the High Field development, there is no guarantee when these access points will come forward or if they will be adopted by the Local Highways Authority. The proposed junction into the site is via a ghost right arrangement and this needs to be built to a standard capable of supporting all vehicle movements to and from the site.



- 7.12 The developer has agreed traffic generation with the County Council Transport Team and that the distribution, growth rates and flow diagrams are all acceptable. The ghost right into the site is, therefore, now considered to be acceptable.
- 7.13 The areas of objection relate to a bus route through the development, a pedestrian link to Woodfen Road, lack of a plan for agreed bus stop improvements, no route shown to detail problems linking the site to the train station by foot and no link to the adjacent primary school on Woodfen Road/Parson's Lane.
- 7.14 The lack of a bus route through the development weighs against the proposal, as this reduces the number of easily accessible methods of transport that people are likely to take. However, from the case officer's previous experience it is very hard to provide long term viable bus routes into a new development (for instance Lancaster Way). In addition to this the Local Highways Authority have stated that the road connections into Highfields cannot be relied on, which means that any bus route into LIT2 will have to enter and leave by the same route. This is likely to be impractical to a bus company in the long term as it will create an unnecessary diversion. The potential future addition of LIT.M2 (1,200 dwellings) might alter preferred bus routes through Littleport. With any S106 money only creating a short term gain it is not considered reasonable in this case to hold up an approval for this proposal on this ground alone. The Local Highways Authority has mentioned in discussion with the case officer that the site entrance is 0.1m too narrow at 6m to allow two buses to pass each other (preferably it should be 6.5m wide in order to allow two buses to easily pass), but as most roads are a standard of 5.5m wide this is not deemed to be a significant issue.
- 7.15 A pedestrian access route to Woodfen Road would potentially be over third party land (considered to be owned by Anglian Water). The developer has offered £41,000 to East Cambridgeshire District Council in order to purchase land and undertake appropriate work, the sum and work has been considered to be acceptable by the Open Spaces & Facilities Manager. The Local Highways Authority raises concern as Woodfen Road has no pedestrian facilities, has a national speed limit and is used by a business park. However, Woodfen Road is considered to be a popular informal pedestrian route and if LIT1 (LIT.M1 in Proposed Local Plan) comes forward will connect onto a wider pedestrian route. It is considered that the risk to pedestrians would not be significantly increased in the short time and in the long term will form greater pedestrian connectivity throughout the parish.
- 7.16 The developer is willing to pay approximately £30,000 towards bus stop improvements on Ely Road, Littleport. This meets with the requirements (though additional negotiation will have to be undertaken during S106 discussions) of the Transport Team comments dated 12 June 2017 where they requested "The two bus stops on Ely Road should be upgraded, these are the closest stops to the site". The Transport Team on the 27 October 2017 amended their comments to require a plan from the developer showing the bus stop improvements. The proposed improvements might be difficult to achieve as the southbound bus stop on Ely Road has very little space (approx 0.5m verge) to expand into. The developer's offer meets the earlier requirements of the Transport Team, but in the S106 negotiation it is advised that there is no claw back period as it will likely take time to upgrade the bus stops and/or bus stop locations moved to new locations. The

discussion over upgrade of bus stops should involve Littleport Parish Council in order that the money is used where most needed.

- 7.17 In regards to access to Littleport Train Station it is considered that the greatest existing issue is the lack of a safe crossing in front of the Train Station across Station Road. This is the current situation for all current Littleport residents and a developer should not be used to fund improvements to an existing problem. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) that goes to the Parish Council could be used to overcome this existing issue or/and work could be undertaken by the Local Highways Authority. This is not a reason to refuse the application.
- 7.18 The developer is in discussion with Littleport Community Primary School on Parson's Lane in order to provide a footpath connection to and through the school. The S106 will need to include a requirement on the developer to provide a pedestrian link to the boundary of the school; it is considered that CIL that includes Littleport Schools can fund any on school site improvements. The developer is, therefore, considered to meet this requirement of the Transport Team.
- 7.19 The roundabout where the A10 and A142 meet is currently undergoing a transport study. This study is required as it has been discovered that County Council did not calculate the combined effect of the North Ely developments and Lancaster Way Expansion site. The current S106s for these two developments currently work against each other and will either lead to this roundabout not being able to cope with rush hour traffic or will cause a substantial burden to the public purse. Officers of East Cambridgeshire District Council are currently working with Lancaster Way Business Park and the County Council in order to overcome this problem. It is not considered reasonable to hold off a judgement on this proposal until the revised study is completed (likely Summer 2018); the case officer has calculated that the developer should contribute approximately £194,820 (based on North Ely contributions) towards the off site highway improvements.
- 7.20 In relation to this proposal it can only be expected at this stage for the developer to mitigate against its own harm, which is likely to be a contribution in order to prevent further abortive works.
- 7.21 It is considered that subject to suitable conditions and the completion of a S106 the proposal will have no detrimental harm on the highway users or affect on the highway network. The proposal by providing a mix of uses on site and by providing connections to two Primary Schools in close proximity is considered to meet the requirements of paragraphs 32 and 38 of the NPPF that states:
- “Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe...For larger scale residential developments in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties.”
- 7.22 Landscape and Visual Impact

- 7.23 The application is supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment dated April 2017 (LVIA).
- 7.24 The proposal by virtue of its size and location will have a significant impact on this settlement edge site, as it will continue the built form along Grange Lane as started by the adjacent large housing scheme (Highfield Farm) to the east.
- 7.25 To the west of the site is a balancing pond managed by Anglian Water and to the northwest is the Saxon Way Business Park.
- 7.26 The LVIA has taken a study area of 5km but has focused on a 1.5km radius and only public viewpoints have been considered by the report. It states that the site is on relatively high ground, which is up to 18m AOD (above ordnance datum) that is significantly higher than the majority of fen landscape (1m AOD).
- 7.27 Development on land that is above the low lying fen landscape is typical of the built form in the northern part of the district where all the historic settlements are on the 'islands'.
- 7.28 The greatest effect on the landscape will be to the west of the site, as the Highfield Farm development will minimise the impact eastwards. The developer is proposing to keep a buffer zone (approx 30 – 100m wide) along the western boundary, which will maintain a rural edge and allow for a 2m bund that will help obscure the new built form. It should also be noted that a 2m barrier is permitted development under the General Permitted Development Order.
- 7.29 While this change is significant it would have always been expected when the Local Plan was adopted, for this reason it is not considered to be significantly detrimental and to refuse the application on these grounds would be unreasonable. Policy LIT2 (LIT.H5) combined with the direction of growth is considered to define the settlement edge and the blend between urban to rural; proposal for this reason accords with Policy ENV1 and Policy LP28. The Proposed Local Plan 2017 allocates this site for 600 dwellings, again demonstrating that this site is in principle acceptable for a major residential expansion on this side of Littleport.
- 7.30 With the landscape buffer it is considered those looking towards the site from the fen landscape to the west and long term impact will be minimal, as the site will be viewed as a gentle slope and trees.
- 7.31 The Heritage Assessment, agreed with by the Conservation Officer, makes no reference to any impact on the Ely Cathedral. The Landscape Visual Impact Assessment makes reference towards long distance views towards Ely Cathedral and this has helped define the location of the entrance. However, the long distance views towards Ely Cathedral are likely to be blocked in the future by LIT.M2 due to the raise in land height of approximately 5m. The proposal is not considered to have any detrimental impact upon the views of Ely Cathedral, again complying with Policy LP28.
- 7.32 The conclusion of the submitted Environmental Statement is, therefore, agreed with that states:

“The proposed mitigation planting around the perimeter of site will be effective in screening and softening views of and into the development.

The use of tree and shrub species from the locality and incorporation of the local vernacular fenland village characteristics into the built form the development will mean that the development is in keeping with its surroundings and should be assimilated into the surrounding landscape and townscape.”

7.33 Archaeology and Historic Environment

7.34 An archaeological investigation was required as part of the Environmental Statement, as Cambridgeshire County Council believed the potential for archaeological finds was extremely high on this site, due to the discovery of Anglo-Saxon cemetery on the adjacent land. However, in the end the archaeological finds on this site were very low and County Council are not seeking the developer to undertake any additional works.

7.35 The proposal will, therefore, have no detrimental impact upon archaeological finds and complies with Policy ENV14 of the adopted Local Plan and Policy LP27 of the Proposed Submitted Local Plan. In addition the developer has met with the archaeological requirements of the Environmental Statement.

7.36 Housing Mix

7.37 The proposal is suggesting that the housing mix will be (makes an assumption on self build plots and affordable units):

- 50 retirement apartments
- 14 retirement bungalows
- 68 one bedroom dwellings (approx 11%)
- 110 two bedroom dwellings (approx 17.8%)
- 243 three bedroom dwellings (approx 39.4%)
- 154 four bedroom dwellings (approx 25%)
- 41 five bedroom dwellings (approx 6.7%)

7.38 The market mix of housing while not fully complying with the indicative housing mix of HOU 1; is close to it and the significant difference is provision of single bedroom properties that usually developers do not want to provide and lack of larger properties. While not in full compliance the housing mix is considered to be appropriate, as it provides a wide range of housing that will cater for a wide section of society.

7.39 The developer was offering to provide 30% affordable housing (204 dwellings if 680 dwellings built) that would consist of 1 - 4 bedroom properties. However, the Councils change in policy to 20% under the Proposed Local Plan (Policy LP6) means it will no longer be reasonable to require 30% affordable housing. The developer is also stating that there will be no more than 8 affordable units in one group, which will help create a sense of tenure blind and ensuring a good social mix throughout the development. With the provision of 20% affordable housing mix it is considered that the proposal will meet with Policy LP6. It is the view of officers that half of the affordable units should be given to those that need it most within the

district and the other half given as priority to Littleport residents. While this is not the norm it is based on the local community working with the developer to bring forward this site.

- 7.40 The developer is offering 5% self build plots (34 dwellings); these would be sold at market prices as serviced plots and the purchasers would have to individually apply for reserved matters consent. This will provide flexibility in the housing market on the site, which is to the benefit of the proposal. This will be secured through a S106 Agreement and its provision fully complies with policy.
- 7.41 The developer is also stating that 5% of units will be live/work units. If this application is approved the reserved matters stages will need to show that there is potential dedicated space for a work area (this could potentially be either an office with w.c above a garage, garden office or an additional ground floor habitable room with a ceiling height of at least 3m). These units at reserved matters will need to demonstrate that there is additional independent parking in order to allow for the occasional potential customer visiting the site and could be secured by way of a condition.
- 7.42 It is expected that any property that has five bedrooms (approx 6.7% of dwellings) or higher shall include space for (a non-self contained) annexe and shall be built to Lifetime Homes standard or equivalent. This will allow several generations to live in the same house for a long period of time and is to the benefit of the proposal; as it caters for both young adults who still live with parents and the elderly who want to live with their direct family
- 7.43 The proposal includes space for retirement bungalows and flats, which will ensure that the development will cater for the elderly population. The affordable housing will be expected to meet lifetime homes standards. The development has, therefore, provided a proportion of houses that are suitable/easily adaptable for occupation for the elderly/people with disabilities that fully complies with the requirements of HOU1.
- 7.44 It is considered that the development will comply with Policy HOU1 and LP6 of the adopted Local Plan, as it will be able to cater for a wide variety of people.
- 7.45 The proposal housing mix will be very socially sustainable, as it provides great flexibility.
- 7.46 Impact of the Phasing
- 7.47 With the size of the development it will need to be phased, either to allow several house builders to be on site at one go or to give time for one builder to build out the entire proposal.
- 7.48 The first phase will provide up to 165 units and is located around the entrance to the site from Grange Lane; the open spaces within this phase will be small and designed to only serve the immediate residents.
- 7.49 The second phase will provide up to 300 units, the community centre and space for the retail units, will provide larger public open spaces and a balancing pond.

- 7.50 The third phase will provide up to 151 units, the buffer land (including a 2m high bund) to the A10, the main public open space and a balancing pond.
- 7.51 Phase 4 is the 'retirement village' only.
- 7.52 With a development of this size being phased it will be fundamental that a comprehensive design for the entire site is brought forward. While this does not mean that all dwellings have to be built in the exact same style it will need to ensure that there is a suitable design flow throughout the development and to ensure that a complementary materials pallet is used. This can be achieved by requiring a developer to submit a Design Code prior to any reserved matters being submitted; this can be dealt with by condition.
- 7.53 The phasing plan suggests that the community centre will be delivered early in the development but the main open space is likely to be in the end stages of the proposal.
- 7.54 While this phasing provides a useful breakdown of a large site, the S106 is unlikely to be specifically limited to the phasing breakdown; for instance it is likely one balancing pond will need to be completed prior to first occupation on phase 1.
- 7.55 With careful wording of the S106 Agreement and a condition in order to ensure the development has a comprehensive final appearance the phasing plan is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.56 Flood Risk and Drainage
- 7.57 The developer has amended its indicative master layout that will allow for the existing ditches on the site to be maintained (or suitably upgraded). There are no concerns that have been raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in regards to the overall drainage scheme and there is plenty of space to accommodate the proposed balancing ponds. The exact details of the balancing pond can be conditioned and will need to be phased to correspond with the build out of the development, as highlighted by the LLFA. The long term maintenance of these balancing ponds and connecting drainage systems is very likely to be adopted by East Cambridgeshire District Council; this will require the developer to provide a maintenance contribution that will need to be agreed through S106 discussions.
- 7.58 The proposal is not considered to have any detrimental impact upon surface water drainage, if suitable conditions and S106 provisions are secured.
- 7.59 The requested foul water condition as requested by Anglian Water is considered reasonable and can be added if the application is approved.
- 7.60 Residential Amenity
- 7.61 Policy ENV2 requires development proposals to ensure that there is no significantly detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers and that future occupiers enjoy high standards of amenity.

- 7.62 The proposal is a major development and will be being built over a long period of time that will have an ongoing impact to both existing and future residents in the area. It is for this reason that conditions, as informed by Environmental Health, will be required to deal with unexpected contamination, noise mitigation measures and the requirement of a Construction Environmental Management Plan. If these conditions are added the harm to residential amenity will be minimised both in the construction phase and the long term life of the development.
- 7.63 The Environmental Health Team has confirmed there are no air quality issues affecting this site.
- 7.64 The Local Planning Authority does not seek development to be pushed up against main roads in order to maximise development. The developer here is seeking to leave at least 40m gap that widens to approximately 100m between the A10 and the edge of the built development, this will leave plenty of room for a gentle sloped bund to be included. The 2m high bund will mean that boundary treatment of individual houses does not need to be over engineered and will be of a typical height. The proportion of dwellings that might need mechanical ventilation is minimal in comparison to the overall development site and it is expected that the developer at any reserved matters will demonstrate how they have sought to provide a design that avoids the need for mechanical ventilation, with relevant noise assessments submitted.
- 7.65 With the proposal having a net density of 34 dwelling per hectare it should be relatively easy to design dwellings that will not cause detrimental loss of privacy, loss of light or undue overbearing to both existing residents and each other. The relatively low density will mean that any reserved matters application should have no difficulty complying with the requirements of the Design Guide SPD.
- 7.66 The proposed indicative main open space is considered to be wide enough to fit equipped areas of play without the noise of children playing causing undue disturbance to the surrounding residents.
- 7.67 The design of the proposed retail units will need to consider potential disturbance to nearby residents, the main source of disturbance is likely to be during early morning deliveries and external plant. This could be controlled at the reserved matters stage either through design or conditions.
- 7.68 The application, if suitable conditions are added, will not have any detrimental impact upon residential amenity and will meet the requirement of ENV2, LP22 and the Design Guide.
- 7.69 Ecology
- 7.70 The application is supported by an ecological report (Preliminary Ecological Appraisal February 2017). This report concludes that the majority of the site is of poor habitat wildlife potential. The likelihood of protected species on or adjacent to the site remains low.

- 7.71 Natural England states that “proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on the Ouse Washes designated site and has no objection”, this is reflected in the ecological report that has considered the impact upon migrating birds to and from the Ouse Washes.
- 7.72 The developer submitted a Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Consideration dated October 2017 which concluded:
- “This assessment has concluded (in line with consideration provided by Natural England in regard to the planning application) that, on the basis of the information submitted in regard to the proposed development, no likely significant effects as a result of the proposed development are anticipated either alone or in combination with other development proposals in the area.
- Accordingly it is considered (in line with comments previously received from Natural England in relation to the proposals) that on the basis of the information set out, the potential for any likely significant effects on European Nature Conservation Designations (including in particular Ouse Washes SAC/SPA/RAMSAR) as a result of the proposed development can be ruled out, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.”
- 7.73 The main mitigation measures relate to vegetation removal in order to protect nesting birds and reptiles. The mitigation measures can be conditioned. The development will also need to enhance biodiversity in order to ensure a net gain in biodiversity, but again this can be conditioned.
- 7.74 Contributions (S106 Agreement)
- 7.75 The developer is providing contributions to cover both on and off site works. The details of these are covered below.
- 7.76 The developer is offering to provide a community centre (approximately 376 square metres, plus land for car parking); if they don't construct it themselves they will offer Littleport Parish Council £0.9 million. The Parish Council's preference is for the developer to build it with input from itself, with the Parish Council then taking on ownership/management responsibilities. The Parish Council's preference is also supported by the Case Officer and the developer. This is a significant benefit to the parish as a whole, as the Parish Council states that there are already groups looking to rent out space.
- 7.77 It should be noted that the community centre has a D1 use class and could be used in the future (if approved) as a library, health centre, public hall or an art gallery for instance without needing any additional planning consent. This provides great long term flexibility for this building.
- 7.78 The development is liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), which covers off site contributions to indoor and outdoor sport provision. The CIL 123 List covers Littleport Schools (that includes a leisure facility) and District Leisure Centre on the outskirts of Ely. The requirements of the developer to pay CIL is considered to overcome the objections raised by Sport England, who sought formal play space



(both internal and external). The CIL 123 List also includes improvements to Health Facilities and Littleport Station Car Park.

- 7.79 On site provision of informal open space, including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and equipped play spaces is shown on the submitted masterplan. East Cambridgeshire District Council has stated it is willing to adopt all public open spaces (including SuDS), but the exact maintenance figure has not yet been agreed. Policy LIT2 required 2 hectares of open space for 300 dwelling and for this reason 4 hectares is considered acceptable for this development, as additional buffer land has been included to raise the total public open space to almost 7 hectares.
- 7.80 While the red line connects to the southern most tip of Woodfen Road, the developer is also offering £41,000 to allow for an additional off site connection into Woodfen Road. It is believed the land is owned by Anglian Water, but used as an informal footpath currently. The Case Officer is awaiting comments from Anglian Water if they would in principle be willing to sell the land, though informal discussion has already begun. The Open Spaces & Facilities Manager has confirmed this is a reasonable price for the work (including land purchase).
- 7.81 The developer is offering 20% affordable housing, which meets policy LP6. While the exact tenure has not been agreed it is expected that a 70/30 split between rented and shared ownership is possible now that the emerging policy is seeking 10% less affordable units. The exact split would have to be part of continued discussions between the Local Planning Authority and the developer and secured by a S106 Agreement.
- 7.82 Planning Balance
- 7.83 There is no in principle issue with the proposed development of 680 dwellings on this site. The proposal will provide significant public benefits that include the range of dwelling types, public open space and the provision of a community centre.
- 7.84 In regards to social sustainability the developer is providing a wide range of housing (including fully policy compliant affordable housing), dwellings adaptable for both work and/or extended family, a community centre and providing a significant increase to the overall housing stock in the district.
- 7.85 The proposal meets with environmental sustainability by large provisions of open space, clear buffer against the A10, ecological improvements, sustainable urban drainage systems, renewable energy and the addition of landscaping.
- 7.86 Finally in regards to economic sustainability the proposal provides a limited amount of retail space (mimics the corner shop idea) but is small enough not to have any noticeable impact on the retail hub of Littleport. The construction works will likely improve the economy in the area but this is short term and little weight is given to this. The provision of this significant amount of housing will provide homes for the workforce and having some dwellings capable of small businesses will allow people to work from home.

- 7.87 The proposal is lacking in some sustainable transport criteria but these are not considered to undermine the high sustainability criteria the developer is providing on site by other means.
- 7.88 The proposal is considered to be overall acceptable as the benefits significantly outweigh the potential harm. With the S106 still being drafted it is recommended that members grant the Planning Manager delegated powers to determine the application following completion of the S106.
- 7.89 With the size of the site members might want to consider having the S106 final contributions confirmed at a Planning Committee.
- 8.0 **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:
- No air quality issues
  - Road noise can be mitigated against
  - The comprehensive bringing forward of development
  - The entire site is allocated for development in the proposed submission local plan
- 9.0 **APPENDICES**
- 10.0 Appendix 1 – Recommended Conditions

<u><b>Background Documents</b></u>	<u><b>Location</b></u>	<u><b>Contact Officer(s)</b></u>
17/00757/ESO	Andrew Phillips Room No. 011 The Grange	Andrew Phillips Senior Planning Officer
16/01590/SCREEN	Ely	01353 665555 andrew.phillips@ea

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>