

MAIN CASE

Reference No: 19/00376/OUM

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of up to 110 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access points from Station Road and Fordham Road. All matters reserved except for means of main vehicular access.

Site Address: Land Off Station Road Isleham Cambridgeshire

Applicant: Gladman & Christopher Ian Harvey

Case Officer: Andrew Phillips, Planning Team Leader

Parish: Isleham

Ward: Fordham And Isleham

Ward Councillor/s: Julia Huffer
Joshua Schumann

Date Received: 12 March 2019 **Expiry Date:** 20 April 2020

[U206]

1.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 Members are recommended to approve the application subject to the signing of the s106 agreement and conditions covering the following matters with authority delegated to the Planning Manager and Legal Services Manager to complete the s106 and to issue the planning permission. The recommended planning conditions can be read in full within Appendix 1.

1.2 Conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. Reserved Matters
3. Commencement of Development Timeframe
4. Contamination
5. Unexpected Contamination
6. Surface Water
7. Foul Water
8. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
9. Construction Times and Deliveries
10. Potential Piling
11. Detailed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (DWMMP)
12. Fire Hydrants
13. Highway Built to Adoptable Standards

- 14. Road Management
- 15. Site Entrances
- 16. Visibility Splays
- 17. Road Drainage
- 18. Travel Plan
- 19. Bus Stops
- 20. Footpaths
- 21. Broadband
- 22. Energy and Sustainability Strategy
- 23. Biodiversity
- 24. Noise Protection

2.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

- 2.1 The application has come before Planning Committee, due to the Council's Constitution and that the application is an outline of over 50 dwellings.
- 2.2 The proposal seeks outline permission with only access being determined at this stage. The original permission was for up to 215 dwellings, during the application this has been reduced to up to 127 dwellings in order to overcome primarily the landscape impacts of the proposal. The developer then reduced the number of dwellings to up to 110 on the 17 March 2020.
- 2.3 During the application process the developer has also sought to overcome concerns raised in regards to archaeology, transport and education contributions.
- 2.4 The proposal also includes 6m wide access roads (with 2m footpaths) on both Station and Fordham Road, public open space, associated infrastructure and to the south of the site additional field planting.
- 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.**

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 No relevant planning history

4.0 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

- 4.1 The site is an agricultural field between Fordham Road (to the northwest) and Station Road (to the east). To the north of the site is existing farm buildings and existing dwellings. The character of Station Road is dwellings on either side of the road with gaps to the wider countryside to the west. The site forms an important transition between the built form of Isleham to the wider countryside to the south along Fordham Road.

4.2 There are rows and copses of trees (including hedgerows) to the south of the remainder of the agricultural field.

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.

Isleham Parish Council – 3 April 2019

Objects to this proposal on the grounds of:

- Roads within the village are not fit for purpose and there is speeding issues along Station and Fordham Road.
- Adopted Local Plan 2015 required 86 dwellings within the village. In the 4 years since adoption just under 200 dwellings have been provided within the village.
- Site is agricultural land and the proposal would lead to the loss of far reaching views to the south and east from Fordham Road and west from Station Road.
- Proposal will have a significant impact on the entering and leaving of the village.
- There are only 7 busses that leave the village per week; this does not constitute good public transport.
- A new bus stop does not improve the village's extremely limited public transport.
- There needs to be improvements to services, facilities and connectivity within the village.

4 June 2019

Amendment does not overcome previous objections. Questions if the SuDS will work as the pond is on chalk soil. Also questions if there will still be space for the 215 dwellings.

18 February 2020

States:

"It is particularly important to note that the proposed development would be sited on prime agricultural farm land, which could never be returned and which would compound the universal environmental problems that already exists with the supply and movement of food in our country

Any development of this site would clearly result in the loss of open and historic views across neighbouring farm land, destroy the associated wildlife, flora and fauna and be a yet further erosion of our rural village character. This site is on a major gateway into our village and in contradiction to the developers masterplan would neither:

- Complement the character of our village (there is no similar development within our village)
- Reduce, rather than enhance the local distinctiveness not least because of the further erosion of the 'separation' between Isleham and Fordham)

We therefore feel that the erection of dwellings within this location, which comprises a predominantly open and rural setting, would create an intrusive urbanising impact upon the surrounding rural landscape, eroding the predominantly rural character of the countryside setting and detrimentally impacting views into and out of the village. The proposed development would create significant and demonstrable harm to the character and appearance to the area and is contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV2 and paragraphs 14,17 and 55-68 of the national planning framework.

We do appreciate that East Cambs District Council have a target to find 18,000 new houses, across the district but we do believe that this should be achieved in a proportionate manner and where there is an identified need and not just because land owners are willing to sell! ECDCs own 2015 estimation identified the need for 260 houses to be built in the village by the year 2031. As you can see from the summary below we have already achieved this target with over ten years to spare!

In November 2019 we undertook our own Housing Needs Survey and given that there are already a substantial number of similar properties for sale in Isleham we do not feel there is the need to lose yet another rural part of our village to development. The website www.rightmove.co.uk identifies 41 houses already for sale in the village and this at the start of January, when the market is typically low. The vast majority of these houses are being sold for a price extremely similar to this particular application. We would suggest once again that such a development would be completely out of proportion to both the neighbouring properties as well as the needs of the village and would undoubtedly have a detrimental impact on the value of other properties within the village

The infrastructure of our village is already at breaking point. Isleham already experiences significant drops in water pressure and challenges with other utilities including regular power cuts.

The connectivity between Isleham and other towns and villages can be described as limited at best. The village is served by just one bus a day, there is just one shop (which already causes major problems with parking) and the school is running at capacity with some families already having to transport their children to schools in neighbouring towns and villages. There are VERY limited employment opportunities within the village with the vast majority of adults having to travel to neighbouring towns and cities further adding to congestion and pollution.

At the very initial IPC / Gladmans consultation meeting, Gladmans repeatedly stated that they regarded Isleham as a semi-rural village and that they would not propose an urban development, yet this is exactly what they are proposing

We remain particularly concerned about the lack of clarity in this application. Before any consideration by the planning committee we would expect:

- clarification of the total number of houses application is being sought for. The cover sheet indicates that the application is for 215 homes, where-as the masterplan states up to 150 new houses !?
- an opportunity to respond to details of the housing types including numbers of each type, height levels, exact numbers of affordable housing

- clearer site plans. Gladmans plans for example do not include or reference the impact of the current construction of 9 houses at 4 Fordham Rd (18/01482) or the 9 already approved for the adjacent plot (18/00467)
- clarification of the reasons why CCC highways have removed the idea of a 3m cycle lane to be part of this development (this was perhaps the one redeeming feature of the proposal)
- clarification of transport data including
 - why 9 year old data is referenced i.e. 1.7% of trips were via railways? This particular figure is highly unlikely as although the village is within the vicinity of three railway stations, the assessment fails to reference that the nearest is 5.5 miles away and that there is no public transport to this (or any other rail station)
 - why it is deemed necessary to include a new bus stop (all-be-it welcome) when there is just ONE bus per day
 - the Fordham Rd recorded vehicle speeds when the 60mph zone only comes into effect at the approx. point of entry into the site. (to the immediate north of this proposed junction is a 30mph zone – yet the recorded speeds are identified as being 43mph)

Should the Planning Committee ultimately decide to approve this (or subsequent) applications then the Parish Council would wish there to be a number of conditions including

- a removal of ‘permitted rights of development’ which would otherwise leave us at even further risk of houses which are neither needed or out of keeping with the character of our village
- the establishment of a new 30mph zone on Station Rd
- traffic calming methods with the development to reduce the risk of other residents using the estate as a *rat-run* between Fordham and Station Roads”

17 March 2020

Restates its previous comments from February 2020.

Chippenham Parish Council – 9 April 2019

It objects to this proposal due to the impact it will have on traffic coming through Chippenham.

Points out that Chippenham High Street is already a rat run for traffic between Isleham and A14/A11 and all developments in surrounding villages are significantly adding to traffic in Chippenham.

Middle Fen and Mere Internal Drainage Board – 26 March 2019

States they have no comment to make, though comments must be maintained by Lead Local Flood Authority.

Environment Agency – 15 April 2019

The site is designated as Principle Aquifer that provide a high level of water storage and is designated for public water supply.

The site is highly sensitive in regards to groundwater receptors.

Agrees with the developer's specialists that a phase 2 ground investigation is required to assess the risks posed by the development. It believes that it would be unreasonable burden to require more detailed information prior to granting permission.

It seeks a planning condition to ensure remediation strategy. It also seeks a separate condition to ensure the verification that the remediation strategy has been successful.

It also seeks conditions in regards to SuDS, piling and waste management.

Lead Local Flood Authority – 9 April 2019

It objects to this application as the site is located within a Source Protection Zone 1. With any activity in this area posing a risk to groundwater contamination permission is first required.

It then provides alternative drainage strategies if the Environment Agency deny permission.

16 March 2020

States:

“ We have reviewed the following documents:

- Flood Risk Assessment, Enzygo Limited, SHF.1132.188.HY.R.001.A. Dated: February 2019.
- Environment Agency Response, Environment Agency, AC/2019/128233/01-L01. Dated: 15 April 2019.

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

In line with the Environment Agency's advice, it is recommended that an extension SuDS treatment train is provided to manage risk of pollution to the receiving groundwater. Surface water treatment measures are particularly important at this site, given that it is located in Source Protection Zone 1 and above a principle aquifer. Groundwater has been recorded at a depth of 8.8 metres below ground level, which will enable a sufficient clearance/ unsaturated zone between the base of infiltration features and the water table.”

Seeks conditions in regards to surface water drainage and long term maintenance.

Anglian Water – 24 April 2019

States that its assets are close to and/or crossing the site.

The site is within 15 metres of a pumping station that could put at risk future occupiers from odour, noise or general disruption.

The site layout will need to take into account these constraints.

Isleham Water Recycling Centre will have capacity for foul water.

It seeks a condition in regards to a phasing and/or on site drainage strategy. With surface water being disposed of via a sustainable drainage system.

It also seeks a condition requiring foul water drainage works.

Housing Section – 1 April 2019

Seeks 30% affordable housing and a split between 77% rented and 23% shared ownership.

Provides additional advice on ensuring a proportion are built to Lifetimes Homes Standard, designed to at least meet minimum floor space standards, that no cluster of affordable units should exceed 15 and provides advice on S106 drafting.

Environmental Health – 21 March 2019

Additional comments will be provided by the Scientific Officer in regards to contamination and air quality.

Seeks conditions in regards to construction times and the requirement of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

Does not believe the proposed development will be detrimentally impacted from the neighbouring farm (Wayside Farm).

States:

"I have read the Noise Assessment produced by Noise Consultants Ltd referenced J1053A/1/F5. It is a thorough report and I do not fault the methodology used. The report demonstrates that at measurement locations 3,4 and 5 acceptable internal levels can be met with a partially open window.

These locations run along the centre of the proposed site from north to south. Measurement position 1 (on the western edge of the site) and 2 (to the eastern edge of the site) are not able to meet acceptable internal levels with a partially open window. I am aware that the LPA would not look to support an application which cannot meet internal levels with a partially open window and therefore there will need to be some form of mitigation/alteration to the site. The report suggests that it is possible for internal levels to be achieved at positions 1 and 2 if consideration is given to sensitive room placement, i.e. if bedrooms are positioned to the rear of dwellings so as not to face the road. Alternatively/additionally, the dwellings closest

to the road could also be repositioned further back in order to bring internal levels down. The report also mentions acoustic fencing but I would not expect this to have an effect on internal levels unless the fence is particularly tall or the dwellings along the western and eastern extremes of the site are bungalows.

With regard to external levels there are similar results where locations 3, 4 and 5 are able to achieve levels under 50dB but locations 1 and 2 exceed this. The report suggests orientating the site so as amenity areas are shielded from the road by the dwelling they serve. I would expect this to be sufficient to bring external levels down to acceptable levels. Alternatively/additionally, the report suggests an acoustic fence at the Eastern and Western site boundaries and/or close to the boundary lines of the external amenity spaces.

In summary, whichever mitigation is utilised I would want to see an updated noise impact assessment to demonstrate that the chosen method will be effective in bringing both internal and external noise levels down to acceptable levels.”

Environmental Health (Scientific Officer) – 17 April 2019

Confirms they have read the submitted Phase 1 investigation report and accepts its findings. A Phase 2 ground investigation is required and therefore recommends the standard contamination conditions.

Has also read the Air Quality Assessment and accepts there will be no significant impacts on air quality. On this basis no air quality related conditions are required.

County Planning, Minerals and Waste – 9 April 2019

Requests a pre-commencement or reserved matters submission condition to provide a Detailed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

Waste Strategy (ECDC) – 21 March 2019

Standard advice in collection of waste, RECAP guidance and provision of bins.

Cambridgeshire Archaeology - 26 March 2019

Highlights the high archaeological potential and on this basis seeks an archaeological investigation prior to the granting of planning permission.

21 January 2020

States:

“Please be advised that the archaeological evaluation undertaken at this site late last year has been completed. A report of results has been received and reviewed.

While sufficient evidence indicating that part of this development area had been used for clunch extraction (for stone and lime making) in the Medieval period, consistent with numerous sites on the chalk in the parish, no further work is required in advance of construction at this site.

The archaeological contractor will prepare the archive for deposition in the county archaeological archives facility and arrange the Transfer of Title of the artefacts that are to be retained accordingly.

Meanwhile, the archaeological condition can be discharged upon application to you by the developer/agent to do so.”

Local Highways Authority (Transport Assessment) – 26 April 2019

Provides detailed advice and concludes that the application has not submitted sufficient information to properly determine the highway impact from the proposed development.

28 January 2020

States:

“Site Access Strategy

It is noted the site will be served by two vehicular access points; a new priority control junction off Station Road, and a new priority control junction off Fordham Road. It is noted 3m wide shared footway/cycleways will be provided on both sides of each access road and along both the eastern and western site frontages.

Pedestrian and cycle access will be provided at both site accesses. An additional pedestrian/cycle access will also be delivered to the south of the Station Road site access junction to provide a convenient link through to Fordham Road for existing residents situated in the dwellings south of the site.

It is noted car and cycle parking provision at the site will accord to the parking standards set out in the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

Capacity Assessments

The assessment year scenarios used within this assessment are agreed.

Junction capacity assessments were undertaken for the following junctions using Junctions 9 software. This is agreed:

Mill Street/Fordham Road

- Station Road/Proposed Access
- Station Road/B1102 Fordham Road
- Isleham Road/B1102 Mildenhall Road/Collins Hill
- Fordham Road/Proposed Access

All junctions are anticipated to operate within capacity under all assessment scenarios.

Conclusion

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

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

31 January 2020

It does not object to the proposal subject to the impact of the site being mitigated via:

- Prior to first occupation a Residential Travel Plan being agreed.
- Prior to first occupation four new bus stops (two on Station Road and two on Fordham Road).
- Prior to first occupation 2m wide footpaths provided between Fordham Road access and 19 Fordham Road and between 6 and 8 Station Road.

2 March 2020

Provided confirmation that the bus service would be willing to stop at the new bus stops, the bus stop works could be accommodated entirely within the highway and that with no shelters proposed the maintenance of this work is covered by the County Council.

Local Highways Authority – 14 May 2019

Places a holding objection on this site on the grounds of:

1. The developer has not demonstrated sufficient information to demonstrate it will not have detrimental impact on the functioning of the highway or the safety of its users.
2. No suitably scaled plans have been submitted.

7 April 2020

States:

“ The Highways Authority has no further objections to this application subject to the following comments, conditions and Informatives being attached to any permissions the planning authority is minded to grant.

The new junctions have the correct visibility splays and are laid out to CCC standards.

Whist this is an outline application with access only I would note that the indicative estate road layout would not be to an adoptable standard. I would further note there is a significant amount of internal carriageway which is over and above what would be considered reasonable and required. Internal roads should be designed to 20mph not 30mph and above.

Recommended Conditions

HW2A – Prior to first occupation the internal estate roads and footways will be constructed to at least binder course level

HW22A – no private surface water shall be permitted to be discharged on to the adopted highway

HW23A – no development shall take place until the future maintenance and management of the internal estate roads have been submitted and approved”

Growth and Development Team (County Council) – 17 April 2019

Confirms that the demand for early years and primary school spaces is beyond the capacity that Isleham can provide and is seeking contributions towards a new school in the southwest of Soham.

In addition without capacity in Soham Village College to accommodate the additional school children, it seeks a contribution to provide a 1 form entry expansion to Soham Village College.

With Soham Library not having capacity for the additional proposed people a contribution is requested to reorganise space and provide more shelving/resources within the library.

10 March 2020

Is seeking an estimated contribution of £2,127,992 which breaks down to:

- £308, 880 towards early years (new school in Isleham).
- £1,050,192 towards primary (new school in Isleham).
- £764,000 towards Soham Village College.
- £4,770 towards the mobile library service.
- £150 monitoring fee.

Explains currently that:

- Current capacity for early year years is 32.5, whereas future capacity requires 46.5 spaces.
- Primary school spaces is already in deficit of 85 spaces and the proposal will make the deficit 136 spaces. A new primary school is being sought in Isleham, though if this is not achievable there is a contingency project in Soham.
- There is currently a deficit of 312 Secondary school places and the proposal would increase this deficit to 344 spaces.
- The libraries and lifetime learning is based on a base rate of £15 per head to help mitigate the existing under capacity in the library and lifelong learning service within the village.

12 March 2020

Following a question from the Case Officer County confirmed that while this site had been considered for providing a new primary school, this site has not been taken forward and on this basis only a financial contribution is sought.

25 March 2020

States, following the reduction of dwellings from 127 to 110:

“The requirement has not changed, just updating the figures.”

ECDC Trees Team – 11 April 2019

Raises concerns in regards to the scale and density of the proposal, as will be out of keeping with the surrounding landscape.

The use of hedging will not make the development acceptable, as a more open development with sightlines will be beneficial.

20 February 2020

Previous comments 11/04/2019 raised no concerns for arboricultural reasons, more related to landscaping and assimilation of the development into the surrounding area.

The concerns raised in terms of the boundary hedging appear to have been addressed with the various proposals indicating new tree planting through the site - this detail needs to be clarified in a robust landscaping scheme.

No Objections - robust landscaping scheme to be conditioned.

20 February 2020

Concludes that they have no objection but seeks a robust landscaping scheme is required.

19 March 2020

States:

“The site is under agricultural management and therefore devoid of any trees of significance within the main body of the site with any treed vegetation being within the boundaries.

There is no arboricultural reasons to object to this application however a robust and diverse landscaping scheme will be required which incorporates feature trees achieving up to 10 – 12m and trees with all round interest within the urban realm.”

Landscape Consultant (Alison Farmer Associates) - May 2019

Reviewed the LVIA and concludes that:

“Summarised as follows:

- Views and visibility of the proposed scheme have been underestimated. The introduction of properties which are 2.5 storeys in height will increase visibility from the wider landscape and alter perceptions of a small compact village.
- The susceptibility of the site to development has not been adequately assessed – greater understanding of the role of the site in providing a setting, transition approach routes and gateways is needed.
- The CLG have not been followed sufficiently to create an appropriate new edge to the settlement – the principles of CLG could be used to create and distinguish between different parts of the site and avoid straight edges to new development which are not characteristic.”

The northern and eastern parts of the site have greater capacity to accommodate well designed development. The southern and western areas continuing to reflect the character of rural/agricultural.

Continues to state if housing is considered appropriate it is strongly recommended:

“

- Creation of new gateways and distinctive sense of arrival/gateway in keeping with character of the village – distinguishing between the character of approaches between Fordham and Station Roads.
- Creation of a new transitional and filtered edge to the settlement. This may incorporate smaller pastures, areas of parkland character and informal open space and rural farm complexes at the fringes of the village.
- Views to the church on approach and within the scheme in terms of site layout/road layout in order to reinforce sense of place.
- Integration of any development with current allocations and permissions ensuring a more strategic look at physical and perceptual connections to ensure development reads, and is experienced, as part of the village and not an add on self-contained extension.”

10 March 2020

States:

“I note the following changes:

- Introduction of paddocks to the southern boundary of the site. This takes onboard the comments made previously about the smaller scale pastures on the fringes of settlements to create an appropriate edge. This is an improvement although it is noted that the geometry of the paddocks is very regular and that the paddocks lie beyond the red line application site which may present difficulties in terms of control and long term permanence of this type of landscape buffer.
- The removal of the central pedestrian route between the houses. The problem with this central route was in part due to the current layout and masterplan of the site. Whilst its removal solves the problem of creating a route between the backs of houses it does not solve the wider masterplan problems such as road geometry, housing layout and the streetscape which is likely to be weakly defined.
- The pulling back of houses towards Fordham Road which is an improvement and retains a more rural/agricultural character to this side of the settlement, approach route and gateway. However, you have mentioned that a primary school may be located to the south of the site – certainly any development occurring to the south of the site, such as a primary school, is likely to substantially undermine the benefit of pulling development back away from the Fordham Road. If a primary school is to be put forward in this part of the village then a detailed masterplan for the housing scheme and school should be developed together to ensure landscape sensitivities are considered in the round.
- Creation of less formal open spaces with wild flower grassland rather than mown amenity grassland - this will be more appropriate for a village/edge location and biodiversity although a clear specification and management plan will be needed.

The effects of the proposed scheme should be considered in relation to landscape/townscape effects in terms of a) the surrounding area and edge of the village and b) positive place making. The effects on the former have been mitigated to some degree due to the integration of repetitive 'gaps' or 'breaks' in built form along Station Road and the pulling back of development along Fordham Road as well as the addition of smaller scale paddocks on the southern fringes.

Nevertheless the effects of a gateway building close to Fordham Road, three houses in the 'gap' on Station Road between numbers 8 and 27 and the access arrangements into the site, are still likely to have localised adverse effect on landscape/townscape character. In relation to the latter, I have reviewed the access drawings and note that the road and footpath arrangements do not correspond with the masterplan and appear formal. These arrangements are likely to have an urbanising effect on the character of the approach routes into the village. As I mentioned before the general pattern of road junctions within the village are oblique rather than at 90 degrees although I appreciate there may be highway requirements which are dictating this. In terms of footpath arrangements the proposals appear very standard with little thought given to reducing road width, need for two footpaths or just one, or locating footways set back from the road with grass margins/street trees/hedgerow. There appears to be little attempt to create a strong street scene or one which reflects the rural village.

It is noted that the maximum housing numbers for the site have been reduced to 127 and that the application is only outline. It is also assumed that the proposed housing layout and design is regarded by the applicant to be the best that can be achieved for this site. Although there has been some improvement to the scheme I still have concerns regarding the road geometry and housing layout and the streetscape which is likely to be weakly defined (the mix and layout of housing and garages continue to appear jumbled), and pedestrian routes/desire lines, vistas and landmark buildings which appear poorly conceived. On this basis it is my view that the proposed scheme would not result in a well-designed extension to the village, it would not contribute to local character and sense of place (despite the proposed embedded mitigation) and is likely to give rise to adverse effect overall."

Fire Service – 24 May 2019

Seeks fire hydrants to be provided either via a condition or as part of the S106 Agreement.

Cadent Gas Ltd - 22 January 2020

States:

"An assessment has been carried out with respect to Cadent Gas Limited, National Grid Electricity Transmission plc's and National Grid Gas Transmission plc's apparatus. Please note it does not cover the items listed in the section "Your Responsibilities and Obligations", including gas service pipes and related apparatus.

For details of Network areas please see the Cadent website (<http://cadentgas.com/Digging-safely/Dial-beforeyou-dig>) or the enclosed documentation.

Are My Works Affected?

Searches based on your enquiry have identified that there is apparatus in the vicinity of your enquiry which may be affected by the activities specified.

Can you please inform Plant Protection, as soon as possible, the decision your authority is likely to make regarding this application.

If the application is refused for any other reason than the presence of apparatus, we will not take any further action.”

Ward Councillors - No Comments Received

Parks and Open Space - No Comments Received

Infrastructure & Strategy Manager - ECDC - No Comments Received

C P R E - No Comments Received

Design Out Crime Officers - No Comments Received

NHS England - No Comments Received

5.2 Neighbours – A site notice was put up on the 3 April 2019 and a notice published in the press on the 28 March 2019. 51 neighbouring properties were notified and the responses received are summarised below. A full copy of the responses are available on the Council’s website.

36 Station Road - 10 April 2019

Has written in with an extensive letter outlining their concerns.

The concerns raised cover:

- New dwellings should be built near to where people work (Cambridge, Bury St Edmunds and Ely).
- Growth in Isleham is too large for services/infrastructure to cope.
- Brownfield within the UK should be used first before the further loss of the countryside.
- The loss of agricultural land and the impact on the economic output of the area.
- Outside development envelope
- Will lead to a significant amount of additional vehicles. Traffic calming is needed already on Fordham and Station Road.
- Raises highway safety concerns and seeks a traffic count to be undertaken at peak times.
- School in Isleham is at capacity and there is no way to expand it. Also raises traffic concerns in regards to dropping off and picking up children.

- Development has a too high density.
- Proposed design is unattractive and not in keeping with the area.
- Lack of affordable dwellings.
- Proposed play area and green spaces are not needed, as the Beeches Centre is nearby. New play areas will lead to noise pollution to both existing and future residents.
- The south of the site should be woodlands to screen the development from view.
- Detrimental harm to existing properties residential amenity.
- Harm to biodiversity.
- No police presence within the village.
- Lack of medical provision in the village and local area.
- Does not agree about the potential economic benefits to the village that the developer states.
- Lack of public transport.
- Village character should be protected and settlements should not just become

28 Station Road – 26 March 2020

Objects on the grounds of:

- Existing traffic issues.
- Highway safety.
- Lack of infrastructure or services to cope with new dwellings.

32 Station Road – 10 April 2019

Objects to the proposal on the grounds of:

- Not part of adopted Local Plan
- Dwelling increase greater than that set in the adopted 2015 plan.
- On agricultural land and is outside the local building guidelines.
- Block their views of countryside.
- Roads not designed to accommodate this level of traffic.
- Local infrastructure and services could not be able to accommodate this level of growth, specifically school.
- Limited bus service.
- Loss of biodiversity.
- Harm to their residential amenity.
- Detrimental harm to character of the area and visual appearance of those entering the village.

11A Station Road – 10 April 2019

Objects on the grounds of:

- Does not comply with local plan.
- Will local infrastructure cope?
- Land is green belt and not wasteland.
- Lack of retail space within the village.
- GP and education services will not cope with additional demand.
- Loss of village character for Isleham.

51 Waterside – 9 April 2019

Objects on the grounds of too many dwellings in Isleham with no decent access road.

13A Station Road – 9 April 2019

Objects on the grounds of:

- Not allocated in the Local Plan.
- Loss of countryside view.
- Highway capacity/safety issues.

1 Fordham Road – 2 April 2019

Objects on the grounds of:

- Highway safety and capacity.
- Lack of GP and school space.
- Too many dwellings within the village.
- No safe path or cycle route between Isleham and Fordham.
- Loss of agricultural land.
- Loss of biodiversity.
- Harm to fen character.

5A Fordham Road – 3 March 2020

Objects on the grounds of:

- Traffic (including noise and speeding).
- Transport network will not cope with additional large amounts of traffic.
- Services/facilities will be stretched to the limit.
- Harm to biodiversity.
- Drainage.
- Loss of views and tranquillity.

33 Silver Street Burwell (owner of 6 Station Road, Isleham) – 18 November 2020

Raises concerns in regards to:

- The size of the development
- Loss of residential amenity
- Loss of property value
- Loss of farm land and site is outside village framework
- Increase in traffic
- Damage to biodiversity

16 February 2020

Objects to the proposal as this house was bought adjacent to fields that were outside of the village framework and not allocated for housing in the local plan.

Isleham has already provided its requirement for new dwellings.

Also raises concerns in regards to property value, loss of view, change in local character, impact on biodiversity and increase in traffic.

30 March 2020

Still objects in regards to:

- Lack of infrastructure
- Harm to biodiversity and character of the area.
- Green spaces will attract noise, light pollution and rubbish.
- Loss of property value.

6a Station Road – 1 April 2020

Objects on the grounds of:

- Harm to residential amenity.
- Road system will not cope with development.
- Lack of village amenities.
- Their property is not accurately plotted.

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

6.2 Supplementary Planning Documents Design Guide Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations Cambridgeshire Flood and Water Contaminated land

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
- 10 Supporting high quality communications
- 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

7.0 PLANNING COMMENTS

7.1 Principle of Development

7.2 The local planning authority is not currently able to demonstrate that it has an adequate five year supply of land for housing. Therefore, all Local Planning 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 set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. This means that development proposals should be approved unless any adverse effects of the development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

7.3 The site is located adjacent to the village framework both on the northeast and southwest corners. The majority of growth within the District is focussed within the market towns of Ely, Soham and Littleport. However, growth is expected in smaller settlements, to enable the Council to meet its housing demands. The village of Isleham lies 9 miles south-east of Ely and 6 miles north-east of Newmarket and has a reasonable range of services including several pubs, a village shop, primary school, recreation ground and churches.

7.4 It is not considered possible for the village to adapt to become self-sufficient within the foreseeable future. Paragraph 78 in the NPPF does make it clear that new housing can make villages grow/thrive and help support local services. It also makes it clear that services in one settlement can help support neighbouring settlements.

7.5 It is noted that services within Isleham are running at or beyond capacity due to the continued growth within the village, specifically the village primary school that includes early year provision.

7.6 It is considered that the application is acceptable in principle, due to its close proximity to the village settlement, in terms of its sustainability. However, the proposal is fully assessed in greater detail below.

7.7 Highways

- 7.8 The developer has had ongoing discussion with the Council's Transport Team over the past year in relation to impacts of the proposal on the highway network, which led to the County's concerns being overcome on the 31st January 2020 subject to conditions in regards to:
- Residential Travel Plan
 - New bus stops on Fordham and Station Road.
 - New 2m wide footpaths along Fordham and Station Road.
- 7.9 The submitted transport information considers the impacts of traffic heading to Fordham, heading towards the A142 and the impacts on Chippenham.
- 7.10 With no objection from the Council's Transport Team who have expertise in interpreting this data, it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on detrimental impact to the traffic flow and impacts on the highway network.
- 7.11 The improvements that would come with the recommended conditions are considered acceptable, as they relate to the development and are required for the proposal to add to the sustainability of the area by ensuring future residents have access to non-motorised and public transport. However, it is noted that the provision of additional bus stops does not necessarily increase the number of busses going through the village.
- 7.12 The proposed application seeks access to be determined and proposes two accesses, one onto Station Road and one onto Fordham Road. The Addendum Transport Assessment January 2020 included a drawing (Z841_PL_SK_200) that showed along Fordham Road a visibility splay of 2.4m x 215m is achievable, which is suitable for this size development onto a 60mph road. On Station Road it is only possible to achieve 2.4m x 160m spays to the south, though this exceeds the visibility splays required for a 40mph by 40m. The visibility splay looking to the north along Station Road exceed this by an even greater margin.
- 7.13 With both access routes being 6m wide with two 2m wide footpaths, with suitable footpaths leading to the development there is no concern over highway safety.
- 7.14 This is supported by the latest view of the Local Highways Authority (7 April 2020), who no longer have an objection to the proposal. The recommended conditions can be added.
- 7.15 With a low density it is considered possible that a layout/design can incorporate sufficient parking for both cars and cycle in any future reserved matters application(s) in accordance with policy COM8 of the Adopted Local Plan.
- 7.16 The proposal is considered to comply with policies COM7 and COM8 of the Adopted Local Plan 2015, subject to the conditions as recommended by the Local Highways Authority.
- 7.17 Visual Amenity
- 7.18 The site forms a key entrance when entering and leaving the village along Fordham Road, as it provides an important visual transition between the built form of the

settlement and the wider flat fen landscape. Along Station Road there are rows of houses that are located on alternative sides of the road, this arrangement leaves visual breaks between the dwellings along Station Road. These provide important links between the countryside on the east and west of Station Road, which gives this area a rural streetscene rather than suburban.

- 7.19 The number of dwellings (originally up to 215 dwellings) and landscape proposed as part of this development has been reviewed and amended following conversations between the developer's and Local Planning Authority's landscape consultants. The Local Planning Authority's landscape consultant provided her final formal comments on the 10 March 2020 (see above) on the amended illustrative master plan (drawing number 1928-100-P2, amended on 2 March 2020), which was for up to 117 dwellings. The landscape consultant concluded:
"it is my view that the proposed scheme would not result in a well-designed extension to the village, it would not contribute to local character and sense of place (despite the proposed embedded mitigation) and is likely to give rise to adverse effect overall."
- 7.20 This view was agreed with as it was considered that too many dwellings were being sought on this parcel of land. While the northern section of the site would be able to accommodate a large number of dwellings, along the southern boundary any new dwellings are likely to lead to detrimental harm on the overall character of the area. This harm is caused by the loss of visual transition between the settlement and countryside as it would provide little opportunity for suitable landscaping within the development (including maintenance space for future SuDS) and will break the visual link between the countryside to the west and east of Station Road.
- 7.21 To overcome this concern the developer has removed 17 dwellings from its maximum proposed number and is now seeking permission for up to 110 dwellings. The loss of 17 additional dwellings (as well as indicatively the areas that should remain undeveloped) were discussed between the Case Officer and the Landscape Consultant. This view was then passed onto the developer, who amended the application. .
- 7.22 The new proposal for up to 110 dwellings (illustrative masterplan 1928-100-P3) maintains a large amount of open space along the southern boundary of the site and in addition provides additional planting, as well as open space, to the south of the site to help provide further soft landscaping to help assimilate the development into the wider fen landscape. This will help ensure the proposal meets with the Landscape Consultants advice, by allowing important visual breaks by allowing visual breaks along Station Road, open space along Fordham Road and the ability to provide layers of planting along the southern edge of the site. It must be noted that any reserved matters will need to demonstrate a high quality design both in built form and landscaping and this might require a final dwelling number below the 110 dwellings for which permission is sought. A future reserved matters will also need to ensure that it meets the balance between good design and highway safety.
- 7.23 It is considered that these amendments have reduced the level of visual harm to a level where it would be unlikely to cause detrimental harm, whilst still providing new homes, with a significant reduction in the overall number from what was originally submitted. It is considered that there may be a moderate local harm to the overall

landscape character of the area, but this could be partially mitigated by the provision of open space and landscaping, in accordance with the proposed masterplan submitted. On this basis, it is considered that the proposal, on balance, meets the requirements of policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the Adopted Local Plan which seek to protect and conserve the landscape.

7.24 Residential Amenity

7.25 With the layout, design and scale not being agreed at this stage it is not possible to provide a detailed assessment in regards to residential amenity. However, with a relatively low gross density (13 dwelling per hectare/5.2 per acre) it is entirely possible for a future developer to come up with a suitable scheme that will protect residential amenity and separation distances for both future and existing residents in accordance with the Design Guide SPD. In addition suitable plot sizes, built form within the plot and private amenity space for future residents should be able to be secured, in accordance with the Design Guide SPD.

7.26 It should be noted that some of the concerns raised by neighbours in regards to private views of countryside and property values are not material to the determination of a planning application.

7.27 Conditions are recommended to ensure that construction work takes place with suitable care (Construction Environmental Management Plan, potential for piling foundations and hours of work) and that the site is fully investigated for potential contaminates.

7.28 Subject to the recommended conditions, the proposal is considered to comply with policies ENV2 and ENV9 of the Adopted Local Plan.

7.29 Education and other services

7.30 Cambridgeshire County Council as the Education Authority have noted that Isleham Church of England Primary School is over prescribed and is seeking a new site within Isleham to provide a new school. The primary school also provides a pre-school. It is noted that this primary school does not have room to expand any further on its existing site.

7.31 The developer was suggesting that land could be provided adjacent to the application site for a new primary school and pre-school to be located. However, the County Council are not seeking this as a potential site and is just seeking an education contribution that the developer has agreed to pay via a S106 Agreement. The development would, therefore, lead to a neutral impact upon the early years/primary education in the medium to long term; though is likely to have a minor to moderate adverse impact in the short term while school spaces are created. The developer has also agreed to pay towards libraries/continues learning and secondary education to mitigate the additional school places required to accommodate the dwellings proposed.

7.32 If a site cannot be found in Isleham for a primary school, then the financial contribution would go to provide additional education spaces in Soham. However, the education contribution should be first sought to be spent in Isleham as making

early years and primary school children travel to Soham would have a negative impact upon the sustainability of the village.

- 7.33 NHS England have not provided any comments on this application within the past year. However, improvements to the Staploe Medical Centre in Soham are listed on the Council's Infrastructure List and therefore the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions from the development can help to mitigate this aspect.
- 7.34 The request of the fire service to provide fire hydrants on site can be accommodate via a condition.
- 7.35 While an increase in the number of dwellings will add to the pressure on some services, this also provides more people in a community to help support services/facilities; for instance village pub and bus service.
- 7.36 The Parish Council will also receive part of the CIL funding in order to help improve or provide infrastructure projects that are important to the local people.
- 7.37 The proposal subject to the completion of a S106 and the payment of CIL will not have a detrimental impact upon infrastructure/services of the district and on this basis complies with policy GROWTH 3 of the adopted Local Plan.
- 7.38 Housing Mix
- 7.39 The proposal due to its size is required to provide space for self build units (at least 5% of the total number of dwellings) and at the reserved matters the proposal will need to provide a range of housing types including provision of accommodation that is suitable or easily adaptable for the elderly or those with disabilities. It is also expected there will be a range of 1 – 5 bedroom properties in any reserved matters application submitted to contribute to current and future housing needs. The developer will need to justify their proposed housing mix as part of the reserved matters application submission to comply with policy HOU1 of the Adopted Local Plan.
- 7.40 The provision of self builds can be secured via a S106 Agreement, while the housing mix will be secured when the layout, scale and appearance of the dwellings is considered in a reserved matters application.
- 7.41 In order to comply with policy HOU3 of the Adopted Local Plan the site will need to provide 30% affordable dwellings with a mix of 77% rented and 23% shared ownership. This will be secured via the S106 Agreement.
- 7.42 Flood Risk and Drainage
- 7.43 The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and on this basis is a location where residential development is considered acceptable in principle.
- 7.44 It is noted the Environment Agency is seeking to ensure that surface water is suitably dealt with and that any contamination is dealt with both before and during construction, as the site is an important source of drinking water.

- 7.45 The Lead Local Flood Authority have removed its objection, subject to conditions involving provision and maintenance of sustainable drainage measures (SuDS). While the provision will be dealt with via a condition, the long term maintenance will be included in the S106 Agreement.
- 7.46 Anglian Water have confirmed that Isleham Water Recycling Centre will have capacity for foul water. A condition in respect of foul water will also need to be appended to any decision to ensure appropriate infrastructure is put in place.
- 7.47 With surface water being able to be appropriately dealt with and with the site being in flood zone 1; it is considered that the proposal will not lead to an increase in risk to either existing or future residents in regards to flooding. On this basis it is considered to comply with policy ENV8 of the Adopted Local Plan, the NPPF and the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD.
- 7.48 Historic Environment
- 7.49 The site is considered of sufficient distance from the historic core of Isleham and other listed buildings; in order to have no material effect on the built heritage of the settlement.
- 7.50 The comments from the County Council Archaeologists (dated 21 January 2020) are noted and accepted. The developer has investigated the archaeological potential of the site and the relevant artefacts are being secured by County Council. There is no additional requirement for the planning process to protect the heritage of the site and on this basis no condition is required.
- 7.51 The proposal therefore complies with the requirements of policy ENV14 of the Adopted Local Plan and the NPPF.
- 7.52 Ecology
- 7.53 The developer has submitted a 'Preliminary Ecological Appraisal', which states that the habitat survey was done at the optimum time. In addition it states that the site has very limited ecology on site. It recommends that biodiversity enhancements include a wildlife pond, new hedgerows are planted, an orchard is provided, bird/bat boxes and hedgehog holes are provided in fences.
- 7.54 A biodiversity improvement condition will be appended to any decision to ensure the recommended enhancement measures are secured and provided prior to first occupation and to ensure the proposal meets policy ENV7 of the Adopted Local Plan, by providing a net increase in biodiversity.
- 7.55 Other Material Matters
- 7.56 The loss of this agricultural land in a district that has a large amount of agricultural land is not considered to be significant enough to have any detrimental harm to either the overall food production of the area or the rural economy.

- 7.57 It is a benefit that the site will create more public open space, though this is primarily in order to mitigate against its own harm on providing additional pressure on local services. It may have a slight positive, due to the low gross density of the scheme and amount of open space being provided. The open space and ongoing maintenance will be secured as part of the s106 Agreement.
- 7.58 Planning Balance
- 7.59 The developer has continued to reduce the number of dwellings during the application process from up to 215 to up to 110 in order to find the acceptable balance between the need to provide homes for people and the impact on the character of the area. This has involved discussions between Case Officer, Landscape Consultant and the developer.
- 7.60 The benefits are that the proposal will provide up to 110 dwellings (with 30% affordable and 5% self build) at a time when the council cannot demonstrate a five year land supply. This will provide much needed homes to people seeking to stay or move into the area.
- 7.61 Through the inclusion of appropriate conditions the proposal will also lead to a net benefit in biodiversity and in the medium term is likely lead to a reduction in surface water flooding risk by providing SuDS within the site. These improvements would not have come about without the development, so are considered a benefit.
- 7.62 The provision of public open space is considered to be slightly positive. However, its provision is primarily due to the increased pressure that the proposed future residents will create.
- 7.63 There will be a short term impact to residential amenity, though this will be tempered by the use of conditions controlling how development takes place. The long term impacts on residential amenity should be relatively low, though this will need to be carefully considered in a reserved matters.
- 7.64 The improvements to sustainable methods of transport (bus stops and footpaths) are to mitigate the increased amount of people seeking to travel in the local area. On this basis they are considered to have a neutral impact when considering the balance of benefit/harm this development will create.
- 7.65 It is considered there will be at worst moderate harm to the landscape of the area, though the amount of potential landscaping and open space to be secured as part of the development will mitigate some of this harm.
- 7.66 The s106 Agreement will secure the open space and the ongoing maintenance of the SuDS and the open space alongside education and library/lifelong learning contributions to mitigate the proposal.
- 7.67 It is considered that the proposal will not cause significant and demonstrable harm; on this basis it is recommended for approval, subject to the recommended conditions and completion of a S106 Agreement.

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 statutory objections.
 - Developer has reduced the number of dwellings significantly to overcome the concerns of the Council's landscape consultant and Case Officer.
- 9.0 APPENDICES
- 9.1 Appendix 1 – Recommended Planning Conditions

<u>Background Documents</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Contact Officer(s)</u>
19/00376/OUM	Andrew Phillips Room No. 011 The Grange Ely	Andrew Phillips Planning Team Leader 01353 665555 andrew.phillips@ea stcambs.gov.uk

National Planning Policy Framework -
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 - 19/00376/OUM Conditions

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

Plan Reference	Version No	Date Received
CSA/4066/107	A	20th March 2019
Z841_PL_SK_200	P02	28th January 2020

- 1 Reason: To define the scope and extent of this permission.
- 2 Approval of the details of layout, scale, appearance and landscape; (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced, and shall be carried out as approved. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made within 2 years of the date of this permission.
- 2 Reason: The application is for outline permission only and gives insufficient details of the proposed development, and to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 3 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within 2 years of the date of the approval of the last of the reserved matters.
- 3 Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.
- 4 No development shall take place until an investigation and risk assessment of the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site, has been undertaken. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons, and a written report of the findings must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:
 - (i) A survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
 - (ii) An assessment of the potential risks to: human health, property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes; adjoining land; groundwaters and surface waters; ecological systems; archaeological sites and ancient monuments;
 - (iii) An appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'. Any remediation works proposed shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timeframe as agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 4 Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors, in accordance with policy ENV9 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. The

condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted.

- 5 In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported to the Local Planning Authority within 48 hours. No further works shall take place until an investigation and risk assessment has been undertaken and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The necessary remediation works shall be undertaken, and following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 5 Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors, in accordance with policy ENV9 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 6 No development shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before first occupation.

The scheme shall be based upon the principles within the agreed Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Enzygo Limited (ref: SHF.1132.188.HY.R.001.A) dated February 2019 and shall also include:

- a) Detailed drawings of the entire proposed surface water drainage system, including levels, gradients, dimensions and pipe reference numbers;
- b) Full details of the proposed attenuation;
- c) Site Investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;
- d) Details of overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance, with demonstration that such flows can be appropriately managed on site without increasing flood risk to occupants;
- e) Full details of the maintenance/adoption of the surface water drainage system;
- f) Measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water

The drainage scheme must adhere to the hierarchy of drainage options as outlined in the NPPF PPG.

- 6 Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted and the details need to be agreed before construction begins.
- 7 No development shall take place until a scheme, including a phasing plan, to dispose of foul water has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority. The scheme(s) shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed phasing plan.

- 7 Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality, in accordance with policies ENV2 and ENV8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted and the details need to be agreed before construction begins.
- 8 Prior to any work commencing on the site a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority regarding mitigation measures for noise, dust and lighting during the construction phase. These shall include, but not be limited to, other aspects such as access points for deliveries and site vehicles, and proposed phasing/timescales of development etc. The CEMP shall be adhered to at all times during all phases.
- 8 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted.
- 9 Construction times and deliveries, with the exception of fit-out, shall be limited to the following hours: 07:30 – 18:00 each day Monday-Friday, 07:30 – 13:00 Saturdays and none on Sundays, Bank Holidays and Public Holidays.
- 9 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 10 In the event of the foundations from the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the commencement of development the applicant shall submit a report/method statement to the Local Planning Authority, for approval in writing, detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Noise and vibration control on the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 10 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 11 Prior to the commencement of development or any reserved matters approval, a Detailed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (DWMMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The DWMMP shall include details of:
 - i) Construction waste infrastructure including a construction material recycling facility to be in place during all phases of construction
 - ii) anticipated nature and volumes of waste and measures to ensure the maximisation of the reuse of waste
 - iii) Measures and protocols to ensure effective segregation of waste at source including waste sorting, storage, recovery and recycling facilities to ensure the maximisation of waste materials both for use within and outside the site
 - iv) Any other steps to ensure the minimisation of waste during construction

- v) the location and timing of provision of facilities pursuant to criteria i) to iv).
- vi) proposed monitoring and timing of submission of monitoring reports
- vii) the proposed timing of submission of a Waste Management Closure Report to demonstrate the effective implementation, management and monitoring of construction waste during the construction lifetime of the development
- viii) a RECAP Waste Management Guide toolkit shall be completed, with supporting reference material
- ix) proposals for the management of municipal waste generated during the occupation phase of the development, to include the design and provision of permanent facilities e.g. internal and external segregation and storage of recyclables, non-recyclables and compostable material; access to storage and collection points by users and waste collection vehicles

The Detailed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

- 11 Reason: In the interests of maximising waste re-use and recycling opportunities; and to comply with policy CS28 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011) and the Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (RECAP) Waste Design Guide 2012; and to comply with the National Planning Policy for Waste October 2014; and Guidance for Local Planning Authorities on Implementing Planning Requirements of the European Union Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC), Department for Communities and Local Government, December 2012.
- 12 No above ground construction shall take place until a scheme for the provision and location of fire hydrants to serve the development to a standard recommended by the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service or alternative scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hydrants or alternative scheme shall be installed and completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development.
- 12 Reason: To ensure proper infrastructure for the site in the interests of public safety in that adequate water supply is available for emergency use. This is supported by paragraph 95 of the NPPF.
- 13 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.
- 13 Reason: To ensure that the highways end appearance is acceptable and to prevent the roads being left in a poor/unstable state, in accordance with policies COM7 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire adopted Local Plan April 2015.
- 14 No development shall commence until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an Agreement has been entered into onto Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a Private Management and Maintenance Company has been established).

- 14 Reason: To ensure satisfactory development of the site and to ensure estate roads are managed and maintained thereafter to a suitable and safe standard, in accordance with policy COM7 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted.
- 15 The hereby approved access roads onto Fordham Road and Station Road shall be built in accordance with drawing number Z841_PL_SK_200 Rev P02 prior to first occupation.
- 15 Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policies COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 16 Prior to first occupation visibility splays shall be provided each side of the vehicular accesses in full accordance with the details indicated on the submitted plan Z841_PL_SK_200 Rev P02. The splays shall thereafter be maintained free from any obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.
- 16 Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with policies COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 17 The accesses and all hardstanding within the site shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway and retained in perpetuity.
- 17 Reason: To prevent surface water discharging to the Highway, in accordance with policies ENV2, ENV7 and COM7 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 18 Prior to the first occupation of the development a Travel Plan for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the programme set out within the approved Travel Plan or any revisions to the Travel Plan that are first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 18 Reason: In the interests of sustainable movement in accordance with COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 19 Prior to the first occupation of the development the details (broadly in accordance with Z841_PL_SK_200 Rev P02) of the four new bus stops (two on Station Road and two on Fordham Road) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All four bus stops shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation.
- 19 Reason: In the interests of sustainable movement in accordance with COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. This is a Grampian condition as the work is outside the site area and is within the public highway.
- 20 Prior to the first occupation of the development the footpaths along both Fordham and Station Road shall be completed in accordance with Z841_PL_SK_200 Rev P02.

- 20 Reason: In the interests of sustainable movement in accordance with COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. This is a Grampian condition as some of the work is outside the site area and is within the public highway.
- 21 Prior to the commencement of development, a strategy for the facilitation of latest technology broadband provision to future occupants of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall seek to ensure that upon occupation of a dwelling, open access ducting to industry standards to facilitate the provision of a broadband service to that dwelling, is in place and provided as part of the initial highway works and in the construction of frontage thresholds to dwellings that abut the highway. Unless evidence is put forward and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority that technological advances for the provision of a broadband service for the majority of potential customers will no longer necessitate below ground infrastructure, the development of the site shall be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy.
- 21 Reason: To ensure that the needs of future residents to connect to the internet do not necessarily entail engineering works to an otherwise finished and high quality environment, and to assist community integration, economic vibrancy and home working, in accordance with Policies ENV2 and COM6 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. The condition is pre-commencement as it would be unreasonable to require applicants to undertake this work prior to consent being granted; and to ensure that the opportunity to provide any necessary enabling works is not missed.
- 22 Prior to or as part of the first reserved matters application, an energy and sustainability strategy for the development, including details of any on site renewable energy technology and energy efficiency measures, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy.
- 22 Reason: To ensure that the proposal meets with the requirements of sustainability as stated in policy ENV4 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 23 Prior to occupation a scheme of biodiversity improvements based on the 'Preliminary Ecological Appraisal' submitted shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The biodiversity improvements shall be installed prior to the first occupation of the hereby approved development and thereafter maintained in perpetuity.
- 23 Reason: To protect and enhance species in accordance with policies ENV1, ENV2 and ENV7 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 24 With the first reserved matters application a scheme for the mitigation of noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme of mitigation shall ensure that noise levels do not exceed the noise criteria based on the current figures by the World Health Organisation Community Noise Guidelines Values/BS8233 as below:
- i. Living/dwellings rooms in daytime: 35dB LAeq, 16 hours;
 - ii. Outdoor living areas in daytime: 50dB LAeq, 16 hours;
 - iii. Inside bedrooms at night-time: 30dB LAeq, 8 hours (45dB LAm_{ax}).

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and no dwellings shall be occupied prior to its implementation and shall be retained as agreed thereafter.

- 24 Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015