STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Sites within Thriplow and Foxton Relating to the Re-development of the Existing Grain Store and Garage Site, Lodge Road, Thriplow

OCTOBER 2017
PROJECT REF: 16-1023
DATE: 03 October 2017

PREPARED:
S Pain
MPLAN BA (Hons) MRTP
Senior Consultant

CHECKED:
J Page
BA (Hons) BTP Dip(Urban Design) MRTP
Head of Planning
CONTENTS

1. Background
2. Policy Framework
3. Consultation
4. Consultation Feedback
5. Summary

Appendix 1 Pre-application Feedback from March 2016
Appendix 2 Meeting Notes April 2017
Appendix 3 Pre-application Feedback from July 2017
Appendix 4 Advertisements for Public Consultation Events
Appendix 5 Exhibition Boards
1. BACKGROUND

1.1 This Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) has been prepared by Beacon Planning Ltd on behalf of Hill Residential Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd. The statement supports three separate but interlinked planning applications for:

- The relocation of the existing grain store from Lodge Road, Thriplow to Fowlmere Road, Foxton;
- The relocation of Revivals car repair garage from Lodge Road, Thriplow to Brook Road, Thriplow; and
- The redevelopment of the existing grain store on Lodge Road, Thriplow for 36 dwellings and new vehicular access.

1.2 This statement sets out the extensive consultation that has been carried out in advance of the submission of the three planning applications. This statement explains the consultation exercise and how this has contributed to the evolution of the proposals.

1.3 Public consultation has been carried out in accordance with national and local planning policy guidance and meets the requirements of South Cambridgeshire District Council’s Statement of Community Involvement. The aims of the consultation were:

- To inform local residents and other stakeholders of the proposals;
- To fully assess the views of local residents and other stakeholders regarding the proposed development;
- To identify any opportunities for the views of local residents and other stakeholders to be represented further in the proposals and subsequent application; and
- To demonstrate how the views of stakeholders will or have been considered.
2. POLICY FRAMEWORK

National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance

2.1 The Framework (2012) advises that local planning authorities should work proactively with applicants to secure developments that deliver economic, social and environmental benefits to the local area, in line with the principles of sustainable development.

2.2 Paragraph 188 of the Framework states that early engagement has significant potential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system for all parties. Good quality pre-application discussion enables better coordination between public and private resources and improved outcomes for the community.

2.3 Paragraph 189 states that where they think this would be beneficial, local authorities should encourage any applicants who are not already required to do so by law to engage with the local community before submitting their applications.

Local Policy Context

2.4 South Cambridgeshire District Council Statement of Community Involvement (2010) sets out the importance of undertaking community consultation during the pre-application stages of a major application.

2.5 South Cambridgeshire District Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (2010) does not provide any guidance for developers on public consultation prior to the submission of a planning application. Instead it rather sets out how the Council undertake public consultation on development plan documents and development management.

2.6 It is however clear from the document the importance that the Council place on the need to thoroughly consult with the public on planning applications, which has been taken into consideration as part of the pre-application consultation on this planning application.
3. CONSULTATION

Engagement with the Council

3.1 Given the interlinking nature of the three applications, a number of pre-application meetings have taken place with the District Council through their formal pre-application process.

3.2 The first meeting took place in March 2016 and was attended by the Principal Planning Officer. The enquiry was supported by a pre-application statement which gave an explanation of all three proposals including the site selection process for the new grain store site and the car repair garage.

3.3 The Council provided their written feedback (Appendix 1) which identified that their informal opinion was as follows for each of the three sites:

- The principle of re-developing the grain store site for residential development was supported if it could be demonstrated that the development is sustainable; that it is in keeping with the character and appearance of the village and would not result in loss of employment;

- The principle of the grain store relocating to a site in the Green Belt would represent appropriate development; and

- The principle of the car repair garage relocating to a site in the Green Belt would represent inappropriate development and that very special circumstances would need to be demonstrated in order to justify this development. Such very special circumstances may include local support for the retention of the business in the village.

3.4 The comments were taken into consideration and in April 2017 a one-off meeting was requested with the Council to review the progress made on each of the schemes in line with previous advice. The meeting was attended by a Senior Planning Officer and Urban Design Officer. Given the nature of the meeting, no written response was forthcoming but a set of meeting notes can be found at Appendix 2. As further advice was required on detailed matters relating to the design and layout of the residential site and new grain store site in particular, a further pre-application meeting was arranged in July 2017.

3.5 This meeting was also attended by the same officers as the meeting in April together with a Landscape Officer. The three written responses for the last meeting can be found at Appendix 3. The responses related to detailed matters for each of the three sites, whilst identifying the Council’s current position in respect of a 5 year housing land supply. The Council’s comments have been taken into account in the final plans submitted with the application.
3.6 In addition to consultation with the District Council, a meeting took place with the County Council Highway Authority to discuss each of the proposals in detail in May this year.

**Engagement with Stakeholders and the Local Community**

3.7 Engaging with local residents and the Parish Council has been a large part in the evolution of these three schemes. It is recognized that the opportunity to re-develop the Grain Store site will be one of largest changes to Thriplow for a number of decades and for that reason it has been important to hear the views and comments of the local population.

3.8 Furthermore, two of the application sites for the residential scheme and the new Revivals car repair workshop are within Thriplow and Heathfield Parish and the proposed grain store site is within Foxton Parish. Our public consultation events recognized this and took that into account.

3.9 The following public events were held:

- Residents Meeting on 26th January from 8pm at Thriplow Village Hall.
- Public Exhibition on 16th March from 3 pm until 8 pm at the Village Hall, Thriplow.
- Public Exhibition on 30th March from 4 pm until 8 pm at the Village Hall, Foxton.
- Residents Meeting on 11th July from 7:30 at Thriplow Village Hall.

3.10 The purpose of these events was to give local residents, community representatives and other stakeholders the opportunity to view and comment on the scheme. At the public exhibitions, the stakeholders involved had the opportunity to view display boards of the proposed development and register their comments.

3.11 A number of methods were utilized to publicise the various different events. These are set out in the table below. Where possible, the advertisements are included in Appendix 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>Means of Publicising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Residents meeting on 26 January in Thriplow | ➣ Social media groups for residents in Thriplow, Heathfield, Foxton and Fowlmere.  
  ➣ An advertisement posted between 13 and 27 January at Thriplow Village Shop, Foxton Village shop and the Fowlmere Church notice board. |
| Public Exhibition on 16 March in Thriplow | ➣ Social media groups for residents in Thriplow, Heathfield, Foxton and Fowlmere. |
An advert was placed in the local newsletter which is received by residents of Thriplow, Healthfield and Fowlmere. It was also distributed electronically to the village mailing list.

**Public Exhibition on 30 March in Foxton**

- Social media groups for residents in Thriplow, Heathfield, Foxton and Fowlmere.
- An invitation was delivered to all residencies in Thriplow, Heathfield, Foxton and Fowlmere on 23 March 2017, one week before the exhibition.

**Residents meeting on 11 July in Thriplow**

Advertisements were posted a week before the event at the following locations:

**Thriplow**
- Church street bus stop
- Church of St George
- Village shop notice board
- Notice board public
- Notice board at the Green Man

**Foxton**
- Foxton village hall
- Foxton post office
- Foxton St Laurence church notice board
- Public notice board High Street

**Conducting the Residents Meetings**

3.12 Each of the residents meetings followed the same format. This started with an update from the project team on how the developments had progressed since the previous meeting and then the team were available to take residents questions. At the meeting in July, the Chair of the Parish Council agreed to chair the question and answer session in a neutral capacity, allowing the project team to focus on the questions that were being asked.
Conducting the Public Exhibition

3.13 Those attending the event were invited to register their interest on arrival, providing their contact details and whether they would like to receive an electronic copy of the exhibition boards. Visitors were then advised of the information on display and that if there were any questions, members of the project team could be identified by their name badges. There were 7 exhibition boards available (Appendix 5), which covered the following areas:

- Welcome – Introduction to who Hill are with examples of previous developments
- Site context - Information relating to the operation of the existing site and the uses that can be found nearby.
- Proposed Development – a description of the proposed residential development and illustrative masterplan.
- House typology – a range of the suggested housing typologies taking into account the character and appearance of Thriplow.
- Floor plans – some example floor plans from the eleven different house types that could be on the site.
- Grain store – Information relating to the existing site and the proposed layout of the new grain store.
- Revivals Car Repair Garage - Information relating to the existing site and the proposed layout of the new garage site.

3.14 During the exhibition members of the project team were available to answer any questions relating to the proposed development. These included members of Beacon Planning Ltd, Hill Residential Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd. Visitors were invited to complete a comments sheet to indicate any concerns or support they had for the proposal which was to be received by Beacon Planning by a specific deadline.

Channels for response

3.15 Stakeholders and members of the public were able to submit their feedback to the proposals in the following ways:

- By email to mail@beaconplanning.co.uk; or
- By attending the exhibition and submitting a comments sheet.
4. CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

4.1 At each of the resident’s meetings, between 80 – 100 people attended. Questions at both meetings picked up on the same themes that were identified at the public exhibitions. The following summarises the comments and provides a response. Some local residents did write in separately following the meeting in July and provided comprehensive comments, which have also been taken into consideration.

Public Exhibition on 16 March 2017 at Thriplow Village Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Feedback</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition response</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendees: 97

Public Exhibition on 30 March 2017 at Foxton Village Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Feedback</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition response</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendees: 29

4.2 Tables 2 to 5 below show responses from the exhibitions. Although all attendees were encouraged to complete the response sheets in full some were left incomplete. This is reflected in the varied totals of each response. The majority of the concerns raised are related to the residential development with limited response relating directly to the grain store and revivals car garage.

Table 2: Residents responses to questions on comments sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Current location for housing in Thriplow correct?</th>
<th>Number of houses</th>
<th>Design of the houses in character?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Public Responses</th>
<th>Project Team Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td><strong>Principle of Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of houses proposed and increase in village population is too high.</td>
<td>The proposal takes into consideration guidelines from the local plan and reflects a growing demand for housing. The proposed density of housing is supported by South Cambridgeshire District Council, which sets a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) and identifies the need to develop land efficiently. The proposed development delivers 27 dph, which takes into account the character and context of Thriplow, while making efficient use of the land in accordance with local policy. It is considered the new households will make a positive contribution to Thriplow supporting local services and that S106 contributions will mitigate against any additional pressures on infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over the scale of development suggesting fewer houses would be needed to accommodate the required parking.</td>
<td>A balance has been achieved between Local Authority guidance on housing density and considerations of the setting within Thriplow. Housing designs have allowed for at least two off street spaces for the houses (including at least one parking space outside of a garage for all houses) and one for each flat in accordance with standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns that scale of development is not in line with group village requirements. Suggest redevelopment of the existing site for a grain store.</td>
<td>The existing grainstore site is not fit for purpose. By redeveloping the site for residential use it is possible to provide housing in an appropriate location while moving the grainstore to a suitable site away from the village. The principle of redevelopment of the site for housing is accepted by Council officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Green Belt land and agricultural buildings is detrimental to the agricultural heritage of the village.</td>
<td>The existing buildings are aging and in need of significant upgrade. They also limit the operational requirements of the farm. The new grain store would enable the farm to improve arrangements and noise and dust could be better managed. All land in the green belt would be retained and existing buildings removed, making way for a comprehensive landscaping strategy and area of open space. Indeed, this would be an improvement upon the existing which is given over to buildings and hardstanding. Dwellings at the village edge are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents are unclear about affordable housing definition. Detail concerning affordable housing is provided by the council and can also be accessed via the Planning Portal website or Planning Aid England. Simply this means social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. This will be of benefit to those in housing need in the village.

Too many affordable and too many houses overall. More parking requested or large enough garages to store cars. Housing numbers, affordable housing provision and parking provision are in accordance with SCDC standards. The garages have been designed to the correct standards to accommodate large cars and bicycles.

Unclear if apartments are appropriate in Thriplow or if this is a sustainable location. Apartments are an efficient way of providing small units and meeting the requirements of addressing the different household requirements. With respect to their appearance, they have been designed to replicate a short terrace of houses. As such, they are in keeping with the character of the scheme and the village as a whole. The site is considered be sustainable and appropriate for its location. This is in line with recent appeal decisions in South Cambridgeshire and is supported by Council officers.

**Transport and Highway Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lodge Road/Farm Lane is not fit for purpose being a small village road and in constant use by families with small children and dogs. There are no footpaths.</th>
<th>As part of the development, footpaths will be created on Lodge Road improving safety for pedestrians and allowing for improved pedestrian access to facilities within the settlement. The carriageway of Lodge Road will also be widened from 3.7 m to 5 m in accordance with discussions with the Highway Authority.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On street parking, currently very limited and crowded particularly during school hours. This is increased during the cricket season.</td>
<td>The proposed development will provide off street parking for the houses in accordance with SCDC car parking standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest one way system on Farm Lane to control traffic on narrow country lanes.</td>
<td>As part of the application, a traffic survey has been carried out on Farm Lane. Please refer to the Transport Statement for specific details. The survey concluded that traffic along Farm Lane was limited and that as a result of the proposed development, use of Farm Lane would not increase, with residents preferring to use more direct routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No regular bus service and therefore car use is essential</td>
<td>It is acknowledged that journeys to local services will in part be by car as this is a rural area. However, within Thriplow there will be...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Facilities</td>
<td>Improved footpath links to allow for short walks to facilities and the school. In addition, the rail station at Foxton is within cycling distance for some journeys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding the scale of development and impact on the village and school.</td>
<td>As part of the application the impacts on the village in terms of community infrastructure have been assessed. Section 106 contributions will be made in accordance with County Council requirements to increase school provision if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior play equipment for children needed on the green space.</td>
<td>The layout of the open space incorporates an equipped area of play which will be for the use of existing and future residents of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed development lighting is not in keeping with a village area.</td>
<td>The lighting scheme for the proposed development has not been provided in any detail as part of the application. This will be covered through a planning condition in the event that permission is given and assessed by the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red brick is not in keeping with Thriplow. More render and Cambridge mix roof tiles suggested. Landscape will be key to softening and helping to integrate the development within village.</td>
<td>Current designs are only indicative of a range available from Hill. This consultation has suggested that a housing scheme which compliments the setting within Thriplow is required. This would be addressed through condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House design inappropriate at present. Suggest house design which reflects cultural heritage. Barn style, courtyard plan, more terraced housing, more 2/3 bed. Smaller units to accommodate the young and elderly should be provided.</td>
<td>The final house designs and layouts will be submitted for consideration by the Council. The design will be in keeping with the area and will incorporate a range of designs and materials. Details will be dealt with through conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object to the housing type proposed. Smaller type houses requested.</td>
<td>A range of housing types and mix will be provided to reflect the demand for housing in the area and local policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to provide a coherent street scape, so the development doesn’t read as a separate estate.</td>
<td>As part of the pre-application discussion with the Council and public exhibition this concern has been identified and the layout re-designed. A through road has also been included to avoid a closed estate type layout. The landscape details would be addressed through conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for energy efficient homes and maximization of South to West facing properties.</td>
<td>Energy saving technologies will be used such as photovoltaic panels, solar-heated water, smart meters and high levels of insulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for houses to face Fowlmere Road with gardens to the south.</td>
<td>Photovoltaics will be installed on south facing roof slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design not in keeping with the village and clearly a separate area not connected to Thriplow.</td>
<td>The design has evolved through discussions with Council officers taking on board residents comments. This was considered as part of the layout but a scheme which fronted Lodge Road was considered more appropriate and allowed the retention of the hedgerow along Fowlmere Road, which is considered to contribute to the landscaped approach to the village from the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Landscaping</td>
<td>The site is on the village edge but this is not unusual. It is immediately adjacent to the cricket pitch, a village facility, and there is housing to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening of trees suggested along western boundary.</td>
<td>This has been considered and screening has been included in the proposal were possible. Details of landscaping will be dealt with through conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Comments</td>
<td>A drainage survey has been conducted which demonstrates that the proposed development can manage the excess surface water runoff from the development including an allowance for climate change. As such the proposed development will address its drainage matters on site and will not lead to an impact off site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage concerns</td>
<td>There is currently no public right of way which allows access to the Newditch Plantation. The application proposes no change to this arrangement. Currently access to the wood is available only by prior agreement with the trustees of the Newditch Plantation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over the access to the nature reserve (believed to be the Newditch Plantation).</td>
<td>Supportive of location and range of housing. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive of the location and improvement to the green space.</td>
<td>Supportive of location and range of housing. Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4: Responses to Public Comments Relating to the Grain Store Proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Public Responses</th>
<th>Project Team Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grain Store</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection to the grain store on the grounds that it is located in open countryside and the associated traffic.</td>
<td>The location of the new grainstore will improve visibility and safety. As an agricultural building the grainstore is considered an acceptable development, appropriate and common place in rural areas. It is also a significant improvement on existing grainstore which is poorly located and show signs of significant wear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns that the proposal should remain in Thriplow and not Foxton Parish.</td>
<td>The proposed site is within the land holdings of Thriplow farms. A number of sites were considered and discussed with Council officers. This one has been identified as the preferred and most suitable site to minimize any potential impact to local residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection to the grain store on the grounds that it is located in open countryside and the associated traffic.</td>
<td>The proposed grainstore location is within the ownership of Thriplow Farms and the most suitable location after consideration with SCDC. The provision of grainstores are common place within the agricultural landscape both in terms of function and appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest making use of the long and straight roads to provide significant visibility along Fowlmere Road, reduce the impact from any increase in traffic numbers.</td>
<td>This has been noted. The location of the development will benefit from significant visibility along Fowlmere Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5: Responses to Public Comments Relating to the Car Repair Garage Proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of public responses</th>
<th>Project team response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revivals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with the proximity of Revivals car garage to the stables and horse paddocks.</td>
<td>Appropriate screening measures will be used to ensure a minimal impact to the stables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revivals car workshop is a very important business for the village.</td>
<td>One of the fundamental aims of the project is to retain Revivals car repair garage within Thriplow and recognise its value to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns over noise issues.</td>
<td>A noise survey has been undertaken which identifies that there are no significant concerns and that the orientation and design of the building has mitigated any adverse effects. Noise will further be avoided through hours of use being limited to 0800 – 1800.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. SUMMARY

5.1 This statement has shown the actions taken by the Hill Residential Ltd, Thriplow Farms Ltd and Beacon Planning Ltd to engage with the local stakeholders. The following public events were held:

- Residents Meeting on 26th January from 8pm at Thriplow Village Hall.
- Public Exhibition on 16th March from 3 pm until 8 pm at the Village Hall, Thriplow.
- Public Exhibition on 30th March from 4 pm until 8 pm at the Village Hall, Foxton.
- Residents Meeting on 11th July from 7:30 at Thriplow Village Hall.

5.2 Responses were recorded as a part of this statement. The majority of comments raised concerns over the proposed residential development, although support was also expressed for the use, location and provision of green space. Overall residents are in favour of the proposed developments for the grain store and Revivals car repair garage.

5.3 The views of local residents and stakeholders have been carefully considered during the design process in coming to final designs.

5.4 The primary concern of local residents is the impact on the community infrastructure from the residential development, parking and road safety, housing mix and scale of development. The above table sets out how these have been addressed.

5.5 The design of the houses and layout of the scheme has also been adjusted to ensure it remains in keeping with the rural setting of the village. Green space has been incorporated throughout the development and on the western side. Soft planting will screen to the buildings reduce any adverse visual impacts. Highway safety has been addressed through the introduction of new footways and location of the access on Lodge Road. S106 contributions will be made in accordance with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council requirements to mitigate against impact on community infrastructure. Full details are provided within the Planning and Design and Access Statements.
Dear Ms Pain

Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Proposal: Re-Location of Grain Store, Re-Location of Car Repair Business and Redevelopment of Grain Store and Car Repair Business Site for Residential Purposes
At: Lodge Road, Thriplow

This letter is a response to your request for pre-application advice dated 23 February 2016 and our meeting on 15 March 2016.

It is my informal opinion that a planning application for a residential development on the site of the existing agricultural buildings and in the countryside is acceptable in principle and supported by officers if it can be demonstrated through the submission of further detailed information with the application that the development is sustainable, in keeping with the character and appearance of the village and would not result in a loss of employment. Residential development on the Green Belt section of the site would not be supported.

The relocation of the grain store to a new site in the Green Belt would represent appropriate development. The site on Fowlmere Road is considered most suitable, as although fairly open, has a number of existing agricultural buildings that contribute to its character.

The re-location of the existing car repair business to a new site in the Green Belt would represent inappropriate development as a result of the material enlargement of the building, different use and associated land use for the parking of vehicles. Very special circumstances would therefore need to be demonstrated to justify this development. Local support for the retention of a successful village business may result in support for the development.

RE-LOCATION OF GRAIN STORE

Site Constraints

Fowlmere Road

The site is located outside of any village framework and in the Green Belt and countryside. A Tree Preservation Order runs along the western boundary. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk).
Continued...

Brook Road

The site is located outside of any village framework and in the Green Belt and countryside. The grade II* listed Parish Church of St George and the boundary of the conservation area are situated 950 metres to the south. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk).

Newton Road

The site is located outside of any village framework and in the Green Belt and countryside. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk).

Planning History

None relevant.

Planning Assessment

Principle of Development

The erection of agricultural buildings is defined as appropriate development in the Green Belt in policy terms in accordance with Policy GB/1 of the LDF and paragraph 89 of the NPPF. It would also comply with Policy DP/7 of the LDF that states outside village frameworks, only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted.

Details of the needs of the business would be required to justify the scale of the development in this location.

Character and Appearance of the Green Belt and Countryside

The group of agricultural buildings would result in a loss of openness and visual intrusion into the Green Belt and countryside, given that the sites are all currently open and undeveloped. However, the development is considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of Fowlmere Road that comprises similar scale groups of agricultural buildings set within open arable land.

The sites at Brook Road and Newton Road have a greater rural character and appearance due to the presence of landscape features and the lack of groups of agricultural buildings. These sites are therefore considered to be more sensitive in landscape character terms in comparison to the site on Fowlmere Road and unlikely to be supported.

Design Considerations

The layout, scale, form, design and materials of the development are typical of agricultural buildings in the surrounding area and likely to be acceptable.

Highway Safety

The development would result in an increase in traffic generation to and from the site. Please contact the Local Highways Authority for its views in relation to the impact of the development upon the capacity and functioning of the public highway.

A Transport Statement is required to be submitted with any application to demonstrate that the development would not have an adverse impact upon highway safety. A Travel Plan may also be required to encourage staff to use sustainable modes of transport.
Continued ...

**Trees and Landscaping**

A Tree Preservation Order covers the trees along the western boundary of the site. These trees should be retained and protected during the course of any development.

**Neighbour Amenity**

The development would result in an increase in the level of noise and disturbance in the area. Please submit a Noise Impact Assessment with any application to demonstrate that the proposal would not adversely affect the amenities of neighbours.

**Flood Risk**

The site is situated within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). The development may increase surface water run-off at the site.

A Flood Risk Assessment is required to be submitted with any application to demonstrate that the proposal would not increase the risk of flooding to the site and surrounding area.

**Renewable Energy and Water Conservation**

The incorporation of solar panels and rainwater harvesting into the proposal is supported. Please ensure the solar panels contribute 10% towards the total predicted energy requirements of the development to comply with Policy NE/3 of the LDF and that rainwater harvesting is a suitable water conservation measure in accordance with Policy NE/12 of the LDF.

**RE-LOCATION OF CAR REPAIR BUSINESS**

**Site Constraints**

The site is located outside of any village framework and in the Green Belt and countryside. The grade II* listed Parish Church of St George and the boundary of the conservation area are situated approximately 300 metres to the south. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk).

**Planning History**

None relevant.

**Planning Assessment**

**Principle of Development**

The replacement of the existing agricultural building with a new building that is significantly larger in floor space and of a car repair business use is defined as inappropriate development in the Green Belt in policy terms contrary to Policy GB/1 of the LDF and paragraph 89 of the NPPF. It would also not comply with Policy DP/7 of the LDF that states outside village frameworks, only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted.

Details of the needs of the business would be required to justify the scale of the development in this location.
Character and Appearance of the Green Belt and Countryside

The expansion in the scale of the building together with the associated use of surrounding land for substantial vehicle parking would result in a loss of openness and visual intrusion into the Green Belt and countryside. This would result in other harm.

Setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Area

The development is likely to preserve the setting of the conservation area and not result in harm to the setting of the listed church given the distance from the site and presence of a group of buildings.

Design Considerations

The scale, form, design and materials of the building should replicate the existing building on the site or reflect the character and appearance of the area.

Highway Safety

The development is likely to result in an increase in traffic generation to and from the site along with a different type of traffic. Please contact the Local Highways Authority for its views in relation to the impact of the development upon the capacity and functioning of the public highway.

A Transport Statement may be required to be submitted with any application demonstrate that the development would not have an adverse impact upon highway safety. A Travel Plan may also be required to encourage staff to use sustainable modes of transport.

Trees and Landscaping

The existing trees and landscaping along the eastern boundary of the site should be retained and a new landscape buffer along the northern and western boundaries of the site provided to soften the impact of the development upon the Green Belt and countryside.

Neighbour Amenity

The development would be likely to increase noise and disturbance in the area that may be detrimental to the amenities of neighbours.

Very Special Circumstances

Whilst it is acknowledged that the retention of the existing car repair business is important to the village, very special circumstances need to be demonstrated to justify such development in the Green Belt that would outweigh the harm through inappropriateness and other harm identified. This may be through the lack of alternative sites in the village together with strong local support for the business.

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Site Constraints

The site is located outside the Thriplow village framework and in the countryside. It lies partly within the Green Belt. The site is situated adjacent to the conservation area and within the setting of a number of listed buildings. It lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk).
Planning History

S/0713/05/O – Residential Development - Refused

Planning Assessment

Principle of Residential Development

The site is located outside the Thriplow village framework and in the countryside. It also lies partly within the Green Belt. Facilities in the village are restricted to a shop, public house and village hall. Public transport is limited with 4 buses per day to and from Cambridge. There is a primary school but no secondary school. There are some farms that provide employment.

The proposed development of 35 dwellings would not comply with Policy ST/6 of the LDF Core Strategy that designates Thriplow as a ‘Group Village’ and only allows residential developments of up to eight dwellings (15 on brownfield land) within village frameworks given the limited range of services and facilities available. It would also not comply with Policy DP/7 of the LDF that states outside village frameworks, only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted.

However, these policies are out of date so please see the later section on housing land supply.

Loss of Employment

The redevelopment of the site would result in the loss of the existing car repair business that would be contrary to Policy EM/6 of the LDF that seeks to retain employment sites in villages. A new site would need to be found to ensure that the proposal would not result in the loss of employment.

Housing Density

The site measures 1.2 hectares in area (excluding Green Belt). The erection of 35 dwellings would equate to a density of 29 dwellings per hectare. This density would fall short of the required density of 30 dwellings per hectare as set out under Policy HG/1 of the LDF. However, a lower density development would be required to ensure that the development would be in keeping with the character of this part of the village.

Affordable Housing

The development would provide 14 of the total number of dwellings to be affordable. This would comply with Policy HG/3 of the LDF that requires at least 40% of the development of two or more dwellings to contribute towards affordable housing to meet local needs. Please contact the Council’s Housing Development Officer to ascertain whether the proposed mix meets the needs in the village and across the district and to confirm the tenure requirements.

Housing Mix

The development would provide 21 market dwellings. The mix should comply with Policy HG/2 of the LDF that states residential developments will contain a mix of units providing a range of accommodation including one and two bed units with regard to economic viability, the local context of the site and the need to secure a balanced community or Policy H/8 of the emerging Local Plan that states that a wide choice, type and mix of housing will be provided to meet the needs of different groups in the community including families with children, older people and people with disabilities. The market homes in developments of 10 or more homes will consist of (i) at least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes; (ii) at least 30% 3 bedroom homes; (iii) at least 30% 4 or more bedroom homes; (iv) with a 10% flexibility allowance that can be added to any of the above categories.
taking account of local circumstances. This policy can be given some weight due to the lack of objections and status of the plan.

**Developer Contributions**

Policy DP/4 of the LDF states that planning permission will only be granted for proposals that have made suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of specific infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms and comply with the CIL regulations. The nature, scale and phasing of any planning obligations sought will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact upon the surrounding area.

The development would be likely to require off-site contributions towards outdoor sports space, indoor community facilities, education facilities, health facilities, transport improvements or any other relevant mitigation measures to offset the development. This infrastructure will be dependent upon the needs of the village in consultation with Thriplow Parish Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and the National Health Service as well as relevant consultees. There would also be a contribution towards maintenance of children's playspace and informal open space on-site if owned by the Parish Council.

**Character and Appearance of the Countryside and Setting of Heritage Assets**

Thriplow is a small village that comprises a low density, dispersed pattern of development along a number of narrow lanes between large open paddocks/meadows and landscaping to the south of the village and more modern development to the north of the village.

The site is located in the southern part of the village and at the entrance from the west. It currently comprises a group of modern agricultural buildings.

The redevelopment of the site for residential purposes is not considered to harm the character and appearance of the countryside, landscape setting of the village, setting of the conservation area or setting of listed buildings providing the development is in keeping with the character and appearance of the village. Given that the existing agricultural buildings on the site are of poor quality, a residential development is considered acceptable. However, the current proposal needs further consideration to ensure that the layout, scale, form, design and materials reflect developments found in the village.

**Design Considerations**

The proposed development on the site has a high density with buildings situated in very close proximity to each other and the layout is formal and uniform in character. This would result in a cramped built form that is not considered to reflect the low density, informal nature and organic character of development to the south east of the site and in the majority of the village. The density and layout need to be revisited to ensure that the development is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

The open space needs to be integrated within the development to ensure that it is useable and safe. The open space on the western side of the site is currently disconnected from the development and is not supported in its current form.

The dwellings should front Lodge Road to create a strong frontage and be set around a single road rather than three separate cul-de-sacs to be in keeping with the character if this part of the village.

Landmark buildings should be considered at the main entrance points to the development and terminating vistas.
Continued ...

The southern part of the site would result in vehicles dominating the street scene. Parking should be on plot to the side of dwellings if possible.

**Highway Safety**

The development is likely to result in an increase in traffic generation to and from the site along with a different type of traffic. Please contact the Local Highways Authority for its views in relation to the impact of the development upon the capacity and functioning of the public highway.

A Transport Statement is required to be submitted with any application demonstrate that the development would not have an adverse impact upon highway safety. A Travel Plan may also be required to encourage new residents to use sustainable modes of transport.

**Trees and Landscaping**

The site comprises trees and landscaping that make an important contribution to the character of the village particularly along the northern boundary of the site when approaching from the west and between the site and the listed building to the south.

A Tree Survey and Arboricultural report is required to be submitted with any application to demonstrate that the development would not result in the loss of this important landscaping.

The development would require a landscape strategy to ensure that it would not harm the character and appearance of the area. A significant landscape buffer is required along the western boundaries to soften the impact of the development upon the surrounding area. Some landscaping should also soften the eastern boundary of the site adjacent to the boundary with the conservation area.

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is required to be submitted with any application demonstrate that the development would not have an adverse impact upon the character of the rural landscape.

**Ecology**

The existing buildings and trees on the site may provide important habitats for protected species such as bats and birds.

A biodiversity survey is required to be submitted with any planning application to demonstrate that the development would not have an adverse impact upon ecological features of interest on the site.

**Flood Risk**

The site is situated within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). The development may increase surface water run-off at the site.

A Flood Risk Assessment is required to be submitted with any application to demonstrate that the proposal would not increase the risk of flooding to the site and surrounding area.

**Foul Drainage**

The development should be connected to the mains sewer. Please contact Anglian Water to ensure that the local sewerage works has adequate capacity for the development.
Renewable Energy and Water Conservation

Please ensure the development comprises renewable energy measures that contribute 10% towards the total predicted energy requirements of the development to comply with Policy NE/3 of the LDF and water conservation measures in accordance with Policy NE/12 of the LDF.

Neighbour Amenity

The redevelopment of the site would be likely to result in a reduction in the level of noise and disturbance in the area as a result of the re-location of the existing agricultural buildings.

The development is unlikely to seriously harm the amenities of neighbours or the occupiers of the new properties through being unduly overbearing in mass, through a loss of light or through a loss of privacy.

Housing Land Supply

Given that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, the policies in relation to the supply of housing in the development plan are currently out of date and the proposal therefore needs to be determined in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF. This states there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and when decision making, this means that where policies in the development plan are out of date, planning permission should be granted unless the any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

The economic, social and environmental benefits of the development are noted. These need to be balanced against the adverse impacts of the development such as the level of services and facilities in the village.

In this case, the benefits of the development are considered to outweigh the adverse impacts providing it can be demonstrated through the submission of further detailed information with the application that the development is sustainable, in keeping with the character and appearance of the village and would not result in a loss of employment.

I hope this guidance is helpful.

Further information and copies of the relevant planning policy documents referred to in the letter above can be found in the planning section of the Council's website at www.scambs.gov.uk

Yours sincerely

Karen Pell-Coggins
Principal Planning Officer
Disclaimer:
The above advice is given for purposes relating to the Town and Country Planning Acts and for no other Council function.

- The advice is given without reference to statutory or other consultees, except where stated. The comments of such consultees may affect the advice given.
- The advice is given on the basis of the information that you have supplied. The Local Planning Authority will not be responsible for any errors resulting from inaccuracies in that information.
- The Local Planning Authority is required to perform within government targets with respect to processing planning applications. You are therefore advised to conclude your pre-application discussions before submitting a planning application.
- The advice given may subsequently be affected by external factors (e.g., new government guidance, local appeal decisions) which could result in a different view being subsequently put forward.
- Planning policies are periodically reviewed and updated. The advice given relates to the policy framework at the time the advice was given.

The Local Planning Authority seeks to provide the best advice possible on any enquiry received. However, the advice given does not bind the authority to any particular decision on any planning application that may subsequently be submitted which will be the subject of the publicity and consultation.
**LOCAL LIST OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WHICH MAY BE REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED TO VALIDATE AN APPLICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity Survey and Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylight / Sunlight Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foul Sewage and Utilities Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Statement (including Historical, Archaeological features and</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monuments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Contamination Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping Details</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Provision</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs / Photomontages</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Obligation(s) / Draft Heads of Terms</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Waste Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Statement and Health Impact Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication Development - Supplementary Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Uses - Evidence to Accompany Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Survey / Arboricultural Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilation / Extraction Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design & Access Statement is a mandatory National requirement for certain types of application**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Design Guide Toolkit</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Conservation Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you are submitting documents in CD form or in electronic format to be loaded into the Public Access System on our website, please note that:

In order to ensure complete compatibility with our online system, please ensure that all documents are under 10MB in size, correctly orientated and are in either Adobe.pdf format or Microsoft Word.doc format.
MEETING

Pre-application meeting regarding three interrelated sites:
1. Relocation of Thriplow Farms Ltd grain store onto Fowlmere Road, Foxton;
2. Relocation of Revivals car workshop onto Brooks Road, Thriplow; and
3. Redevelopment of existing grain store site for residential development, Lodge Road.

DATE / TIME
10 April 2017 – 1 pm – 2:45 pm

LOCATION
South Cambridgeshire District Council Offices

PRESENT
Liz Moon – SCDC – Urban Designer
Lydia Pravin – SCDC – Senior Planner
David Digby – Hill Residential Ltd
Ian Archer – Hill Residential Ltd
Paul Dalkner – Hill Residential Ltd
David Walston – Thriplow Farms Ltd
Sophie Pain – Beacon Planning Ltd
John Dudding – Beacon Planning Ltd

ACTION

1.0 Purpose of meeting

1.1 To discuss the development proposals and for the project team to demonstrate where changes have been made to the schemes to overcome comments made as part of the former pre-application enquiry. The proposals were shared prior to the meeting and accompanied with a supporting statement containing the relevant information for the convenience of officers.

1.2 Key matters for discussion were:
- To obtain the officers view on the initial layouts for each site, together with their appearance;
- To identify where changes had been made to the schemes since the last pre-app meeting and obtain officers views on the acceptability of these changes.

1.3 To agree a way forward and identify key areas which require attention prior to the submission of the applications towards the end of May.

2.0 Relocated Grain store

2.1 The evolution of the grain store with respect to its design, scale, and number of buildings was discussed.

DW explained that the revised layout of the site has been informed by surrounding uses such as Orchard Farm to the south west and that the number of buildings has reduced from 5 to 3 by amalgamating them. This has created a linear form in order to minimise the width of the site and its visual impact on the landscape.

SCDC suggested that the fewer buildings but a more elongated arrangement would penetrate further into the farmland giving greater visual impact.

SCDC to discuss the proposals with their landscape officer David Hamilton to provide advice on landscape proposals to support an application, including the
SP explained that the exact location of the buildings on the site is being tested at the moment. A view on whether they should be closer to the road or further back would be appreciated, allowing for an area of planting to be incorporated, although community access isn’t being pursued for the moment.

Recommendation that the visual impact remain the focus at this stage.

| 2.2 | DD requested guidance from SCDC regarding the need to undertake verified views of the proposed development to support an application. Suggestion made that views from Fowlmere Road and Cambridge Road would be required. Agreement of these viewpoints to be undertaken outside the meeting. | Hill to provide viewpoint locations to SCDC for agreement. |
|     | SP requested advice on the extent of planting required around the boundaries of the site. | LP to discuss with SCDC landscape officer, David Hamilton |
| 2.3 | DW explained that the bund size on north boundary will be dependent on the amount of soil excavated for the stores. |  |
| 2.4 | SCDC accept that the proposed location has the least impact on landscape character. However, in order to demonstrate this, further evidence including consideration of other sites will be required for the application. | Beacon to address issues in planning statement. |
| 2.5 | SP questioned the need for a HIA assessment for this application. | LP to provide confirmation of requirement. |
| 2.6 | SCDC stressed the importance for trees to be contained within Topo survey. | Hill to confirm detail included in topo. |

### 3.0 Relocation of Revivals Car Repair Workshop

| 3.1 | The overall footprint of the proposed development is smaller than the existing workshop area at Lodge Road, due to the efficient layout, but marginally larger than the existing open sided barn on the proposed site. |  |
|     | The development remains inappropriate development in the Green Belt and in this case very special circumstances will have to be demonstrated. | Beacon to collect supporting economic information required and present with planning application. |
|     | LP explained that this will need to comprise of a sequential test demonstrating that there are no suitable alternative sites within the settlement and should include information demonstrating the value of the local business to the community/community support for relocation. |  |
### 3.3
LP/LM expressed concern about whether visibility could be obtained from the site without the need to removed or heavily prune the boundary vegetation.

Discussion around PRoW’s and views into the site. Landscaping should be considered on the northern and western boundaries.

**Hill** to discuss with transport consultant.

### 3.4
Site is in close proximity to the horse stables and paddock raised as potential issue which may need mitigation through screening.

**Hill** to explore screening options.

### 4.0
**Redevelopment of Grain Store site for Residential development**

#### 4.1
Discussion on the main areas of change including the massing and number of houses, development in the Green Belt issues and integration of informal open space into development.

#### 4.2
Response form SCDC road layout currently unacceptable particularly with car spaces, affordable design and position and open space arrangement.

**Hill** to review site layout in light of these comments and those that will be received by Design Enabling Panel.

#### 4.3
General frontage of proposal viewed as unacceptable and needing rearrangement. Perimeter block form suggested as more acceptable.

Good design context appraisal suggested as first point to review arrangement. General view that design context needs further attention as current proposal does not reflect the wider Thriplow area.

“Sense of place” an essential aspect particularly looking at typology and characteristics moving forward with the design.

#### 4.4
Affordable housing discussed in relation to wider scheme.

SCDC view that affordable housing should not immediately look affordable and requires further design and organisation.

Affordable cluster issues discussed as cost of maintenance issue is a major factor.

70/30 split of social housing acceptable.

Rear parking proposed as possible solution to visual dominance of cars.

#### 4.5
Discussion around the position of the access road within the Green Belt and whether this would constitute appropriate development in the Green Belt.

**LP** to consider position of road from Fowlmere Road and whether this is acceptable in the Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Meeting Notes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PMN:</strong> SP emailed LP a case for consideration where the road could form appropriate development as an engineering operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.6</strong></td>
<td>Design of the highway through the development discussed versus a cul de sac type design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic calming and speed issues also discussed, proposed repositioning of speed limit area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hill suggested parking generally felt to be on the upper limit of parking space requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A full ecological assessment would be required for the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A future pre-application meeting may be needed to re assess the proposals including design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detailing identified as an important issue which should be addressed by further contextual analysis and discussion with the Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hill</strong> to do further contextual analysis through next design revision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>AOB</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1</strong></td>
<td>Design enabling panel meeting 27th April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2</strong></td>
<td>Timescale for submission of applications dependent on when the grain store can be constructed. It would need to be available in time for harvest, so would need to start on site in October to achieve this. The submission of applications have been aligned in order to target a specific Committee, at the moment, September. Applications to be submitted as 2 major and 1 minor. SDCD advise that applications should be submitted together. CIL compliance will need review to ensure charges are reasonably related in scale and kind to justify the contribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beacon</strong> to check committee rota for August. <strong>SCDC</strong> to advise on CIL contribution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Ms Pain

Request for Pre-Application Advice
Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 36 dwellings together with open space and other infrastructure
Location: Thriplow Farms Grain Store, Lodge Road, Thriplow, SG8 7RN

Thank you for your enquiry. This letter is a response to your pre-application received 31 May 2017 and subsequent meeting held at South Cambridgeshire District Council on 06 July 2017 seeking the pre-application views of the Local Planning Authority. The relevant information is set out below. Please be aware of the disclaimer at the end of this letter. If you have any questions relating to the advice given, please contact the case officer.

Recommendation

In my informal opinion I cannot say whether or not I would be able to support the principle of demolishing the existing agricultural buildings and car repair business with a residential development of 36 dwellings in the countryside as this would require further evidence the development represents sustainable development, is in keeping with the character and appearance of the village as well as not resulting in loss of employment.

This is subject to the other material planning considerations being addressed which includes housing density, affordable housing, housing mix, impact on the character and appearance of the open countryside and setting of the Heritage Assets, design considerations, residential amenity, car parking and highway safety, trees and ecology, drainage and flood risk, developer contributions and other matters which need to be addressed.

Relevant Planning History

S/0713/05/O – Residential Development - refused
**Site Constraints**
The site is located outside of Thriplow village framework and in the countryside. It lies partly in the Green Belt. The site is situated adjacent to the Conservation Area and within the setting of a number of listed buildings. It lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk).

**Planning Assessment**

**Housing Land Supply**
The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF) requires councils to boost significantly the supply of housing and to identify and maintain a five-year housing land supply with an additional buffer as set out in paragraph 47.

The Council accepts that it cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply in the district as required by the NPPF, having a 4.1 year supply based the methodology used by the Inspector in the Waterbeach appeals in 2014. This shortfall is based on an objectively assessed housing need of 19,500 homes for the period 2011 to 2031 (as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 and updated by the latest assessment of housing delivery (in the housing trajectory March 2017). In these circumstances any adopted or emerging policy which can be considered to restrict the supply of housing land is considered ‘out of date’ in respect of paragraph 49 of the NPPF.

Unless circumstances change, those conclusions should inform, in particular, the Council’s approach to paragraph 49 of the NPPF, which states that adopted policies “for the supply of housing” cannot be considered up to date where there is not a five year housing land supply. The affected policies, on the basis of the legal interpretation of “policies for the supply of housing which applied at the time of the Waterbeach decision, were: Core Strategy DPD policies ST/2 and ST/6 and Development Control Policies DPD policy DP/7 (relating to village frameworks and indicative limits on the scale of development in villages).

Further guidance as to which policies should be considered as ‘relevant policies for the supply of housing’ emerged from a Court of Appeal decision (Richborough v Cheshire East and Suffolk Coastal DC v Hopkins Homes). The Court defined ‘relevant policies for the supply of housing’ widely and held that the term was so not to be restricted to ‘merely policies in the Development Plan that provide positively for the delivery of new housing in terms of numbers and distribution or the allocation of sites,’ but also to include, ‘plan policies whose effect is to influence the supply of housing by restricting the locations where new housing may be developed.’ Therefore all policies in the Council’s development plan which have the potential to restrict or affect housing supply were to be considered out of date in respect of the NPPF. The decision of the Court of Appeal tended to confirm the approach taken by the Inspector who determined the Waterbeach appeal. As such, as a result of the decision of the Court of Appeal, policies including policy ST/6 of the Core Strategy and policies DP1(a) and DP7 of the Development Control Policies DPD fell to be considered as “relevant policies for the supply of housing” for the purposes of NPPF para.49 and therefore “out of date”.

However, the decision of the Court of Appeal has since been overturned by the Supreme Court, in its judgement dated 10 May 2017. The principal consequence of the decision of the Supreme Court is to narrow the range of policies which fall to be considered as “relevant policies for the supply of housing” for the purposes of the NPPF. The term “relevant policies for the supply of housing” has been held by the Supreme Court to be limited to “housing supply policies” rather than more being interpreted more broadly so as to include any policies which “affect” the supply of housing, as was held in substance by the Court of Appeal.

The effect of the Supreme Court’s judgement is that policies ST/6, DP1(a) and DP7 are no longer to be considered as “relevant policies for the supply of housing”. They are therefore not “out of date” by reason of paragraph 49 of the NPPF. None of these adopted policies are
“housing supply policies” nor are they policies by which “acceptable housing sites are to be identified”. Rather, together, these policies seek to direct development to sustainable locations. The various dimensions of sustainable development are set out in the Framework at para. 7. It is considered that policies ST/6, DP/1(a) and DP/7, and their objective, individually and collectively, of securing locational sustainability, accord with and further the social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and accord therefore with the Framework.

However, given that the Council cannot demonstrate currently a five year housing land supply, its “housing supply policies” remain out of date (albeit “housing supply policies” do not now include policies ST/6, DP/1(a) or DP/7). As such, and in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court, para. 14 of the NPPF is engaged and planning permission for housing development should be granted, inter alia, “unless and adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of [the] Framework taken as a whole …”.

This means that even if policies are considered to be up to date, the absence of a demonstrable five year housing land supply and the benefit, in terms of housing delivery of a proposed residential-let development supply cannot simply be put to one side. The NPPF places very considerable weight on the need to boost significantly the supply of housing, including affordable housing, particularly in the absence of a five year housing land supply. As such, although any conflict with adopted policies ST/6, DP/1(a) and, DP/7 is still capable, in principle, of giving rise to an adverse effect which significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefit of the proposed development, any such conflict needs to be weighed against the importance of increasing the delivery of housing, particularly in the absence, currently, of a five year housing land supply.

A balancing exercise needs therefore to be carried out. As part of that balance, in the absence of a five year housing land supply, considerable weight and importance should be attached to the benefit which a proposal brings in terms of delivery of new homes (including affordable homes). It is only when the conflict with other development plan policies – including, where engaged, ST/6, DP/1(a) and DP/7, which seek to direct development to the most sustainable locations – is so great in the context of a particular application as to “significantly and demonstrably outweigh” the benefit of the proposal in terms of delivery of new homes, that planning permission should be refused. This approach reflects the decision of the Supreme Court in the Hopkins Homes appeal.

**Principle of Development**

The site is located outside of the village framework of Thriplow and in the open countryside, the village framework abuts the site. Thriplow is identified as a Group Village under Policy ST/6 of the LDF and Policy S/10 of the Draft Local Plan, one of four categories of rural settlements. The rural settlements, in terms of preference for housing provision, are placed behind the edge of Cambridge and new town of Northstowe. Group Villages are less sustainable settlements than Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, having fewer services and facilities and allowing only some of the day-to-day needs of residents to be met without the need to travel outside the village. The planning objective remains important and is consistent with the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development by restricting development outside development frameworks in unsustainable locations. Therefore existing policies ST/6 and DP/7 which forms a suite of policies to control the distribution and scale of new housing can be afforded considerable weight.

Development in Group Villages is normally limited to schemes of up to 8 dwellings, or in exceptional cases up to about 15, where development would make best use of a single brownfield site. The erection of 36 dwellings within the village framework would not under normal circumstances be considered acceptable in principle. Due to the current lack of a 5 year
housing land supply within the District the next main consideration is whether this level of development would be supported in line with the definition of sustainable development.

Paragraph 7 of the NPPF defines sustainable development as having three elements: economic, social and environmental.

**Economic**
The provision of 36 dwellings will give rise to employment during the construction phase of the development and also has the potential to result in the increase in the use of local services and facilities, both of which will be of benefit to the local economy. Evidence should be provided that the site is available and deliverable within the next 5 years through a deliverability statement.

**Social**
The development would provide some benefit in helping meet the current housing shortfall in South Cambridgeshire through delivering up to a maximum of 36 residential dwellings. Evidence would need to be provided that the dwellings can be brought forward within the next five years for this to be considered relevant to meeting the current housing shortfall.

South Cambridgeshire District Council Services and Facilities Study March 2012 looks at the service provision in Thriplow. It does contain a primary school but there is no GP or library, with only a mobile library service. There is a village store, public house, village hall, cricket ground, allotments, village green and children's play area. Therefore there is considered to be only a limited range of services and facilities which the site would be able to access. Therefore there would be the need to access larger service centres.

**Environmental.**
A key issue is how larger services and facilities are accessed given where the new dwellings would be located. South Cambridgeshire District Council Services and Facilities Study March 2012 outlines there is the number 31 bus service located a 5 minute walk from the site via a public footpath. This bus service operates to and from Cambridge with only one bus to Cambridge on a Monday to Saturday between 07:00-09:29 and one bus from Cambridge from 16:30-18:29. There are 3 buses to Cambridge and 2 buses from Cambridge between 9:30-16:29 on a Monday-Saturday and no bus on a Sunday.

It is acknowledged that occupants of the proposed development would need to make journeys to larger centres, such as Cambridge, to meet day to day needs and the bus provision is limited. Therefore justification would need to be provided that the environmental harm arising from reliance on the private car to access more than basic services is not substantial enough to outweigh the benefits of the proposal, including the provision of affordable housing in relation to the adopted policy requirement.

**Loss of Employment**
The redevelopment of the site would result in the loss of the existing car repair business. This is contrary to policy ET/6 (Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses) of the adopted Development Control Policies which states the redevelopment of existing employment sites to non employment uses will be resisted unless evidence is provided that the site is not suitable for any continuing employment use through 12 months marketing evidence or if the overall benefit to the local community outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities or the existing site is creating environmental problems such as noise, pollution or traffic problems and any alternative employment use would continue to generate these problems.

This policy is not consistent with paragraph 7 of the NPPF which promotes the use of brownfield land that has been previously developed providing that it is not of high environmental value. Therefore limited weight can be given to existing LDF policy ET/6. With regard to E/14 (Loss of Employment Land to Non Employment Uses) of the draft Local Plan due to the strength of
representations received prior to the receipt of the Inspectors Report, little weight can be given to the emerging Local Plan policy as there is no certainty that it would be included in the adopted Local Plan. Fundamentally this part of the site is brownfield in nature and the land is not considered to be of high quality agricultural land. However, justification would need to be provided that the proposal would not result in the loss of employment.

**Housing Density**
The site measures 1.2 hectares in area (excluding Green Belt). The erection of 36 dwellings would equate to a density of 30 dwellings per hectare and complies with policy HG/1 of the adopted LDF 2007.

**Affordable Housing**
The development will provide 14 affordable dwellings. This will comply with policy HG/3 of the adopted LDF 2007 and policy H/9 of the Draft Local Plan. This requires at least 40% of the development to contribute towards affordable housing to meet local needs.

**Housing Mix**
In terms of housing mix, some weight is being attached to the emerging Local Plan policy H/8 which only sets requirements on the mix contained within schemes of 10 market dwellings or more. If market homes were proposed there should be at least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom, at least 30% 3 bedroom properties and at least 30% 4 or more bedroom homes. A 10% flexibility allowance can be added to these categories taking into account local circumstances. The housing mix would meet the policy requirements.

**Impact on the character and appearance of the Countryside and Setting of Heritage Assets**
Thriplow is a small village that comprises of low density, dispersed pattern of development along a number of narrow lanes between large open paddocks and meadows and landscaping to the south of the village and more modern development to the north of the village.

The site is located in the southern part of the village and at the entrance from the west. It currently comprises a group of modern agricultural buildings.

The Landscape officer commented on the development as follows

**Existing landscape character**
At National Level the site is situated within the National Landscape Character Area (NCA) 87: East Anglian Chalk. At Regional level the site is situated within the Lowland Village Chalklands as assessed by Landscape East.

At local level the site is situated within The Chalklands as assessed by SCDC within District Design Guide SPD March 2010.

**Landscape Value**
The value attached to the landscape—Low Value. The landscape has limited recognisable elements of the landscape type.

**Landscape Sensitivity (The landscape’s ability to accommodate change or development without detrimental effects on its character).**
The overall sensitivity of the existing landscape resource is low.

- The landscape has few positive characteristics or one that is not particularly valued for its scenic quality.
- The character of the landscape, existing land use, pattern and scale are tolerant of change and offer considerable opportunities for successful mitigation and landscape enhancement.
The features that would be introduced include widening of existing access road (Lodge Road). Residential development inclusive of flats, open space and the retention of gas tanks to the south west corner.

Landscape effect
Magnitude of landscape effects and the judgement of size/scale, duration and reversibility of landscape effects – negligible to low. This is due to the:
- Introduction of minor unnatural features into the landscape which do not detract substantially from the existing character.
- Introduction of minor new features or elements in to the landscape which leaves it mainly unchanged with some perceptible differences.
- The effects would be confined to the development site.
- No notable loss or alteration of any key characteristics, features or elements of the landscape.

Existing views and visual amenity
Sensitivity of visual receptors – medium. This is due to:
- People engaged in outdoor recreation (cricket ground) not focused on the landscape.
- Travellers on roads in predominately rural landscapes.

Visual effects
Magnitude of visual effects and the judgement of size/scale, duration and reversibility of visual effects - low. This is due to:
- Minor loss of, or alteration to the views, and/or the addition of new features in the view that will be apparent but will not contrast greatly from the existing view.
- The new elements will result in a perceptible change to a particular view or views.

Mitigation Works
Measures to mitigate potential landscape and visual impacts can avoid potential adverse effects, or reduce the scale of unavoidable effects. Ideally, mitigation works can create beneficial effects in the landscape.
The applicant has indicated some potential measures to mitigate the landscape and visual impacts. These included the following:
- No development proposed within the Green Belt
- The mature boundary hedge running along Fowlmere Road to be protected and retained
- Boundary planting indicated to the west of the site
Applicant to consider further mitigation works which would be a sympathetic treatment in keeping with the local characteristics and help the integration of the new development into the surrounding landscape.

Final statement of likely significant landscape and visual effects
Following mitigation works the predicted level of landscape and visual impact is therefore assessed by considering the sensitivity of the landscape resource or visual receptor, the magnitude of change (including duration and reversibility) and professional judgement at varied stages through the process.
Landscape – Neutral. The development would be in character of the area and/or would maintain the existing value of the landscape.
Visual – Neutral. The proposed development would maintain the value of the view.

Opportunities for the applicant to consider within the detailed design
- I would recommend that the applicant undertakes a landscape appraisal to assess and address the predicted level of landscape and visual impact.
- Undertake further mitigation works following appraisal.
- The finished height of the proposed flats does not obscure views in or out of the village.
• Filter views through the development to be encouraged.
• Thriplow is a well treed character and this should be considered within the detailed design including sufficient space for tree and shrub planting.
• Thriplow is a rural village, applicant to avoid the use of standardised and intrusive urban materials and street furniture. Applicant to include traditional building styles, materials, colours and textures of the locality.
• Open space to be included with wildlife areas
• Enclose boundaries by low, or high, flint walls with brick detailing, simple decorative railings, picket fencing or hedging.
• Appropriate boundary treatment around gas tanks to be considered which reflects the local landscape character.
• Inclusion of SUD’s

Overall given that the existing agricultural buildings on the site are of poor quality, a residential development is not considered to cause significant harm to the open countryside, setting of the conservation area or setting of the listed buildings.

Design Considerations
The Urban Design Officer commented the general form of the layout is acceptable with the following exceptions. Plot 15 should provide a more positive vista stop/landmark when viewed from Lodge Road. To achieve this the axis of house should not be angled but be oriented to face down the street with its garage set further back within the curtilage and Plots 16/17 aligned with Plots 18/19. Plots 21 and 22 do not appear to have any garaging and parking in front of the dwellings will not be acceptable. Parking should be accommodated to the sides or backs of dwellings. The location of these single storey units on the Lodge Rd frontage is not considered appropriate given the relationship to the conservation area and the need to create an attractive street scene. These units would be better located in a courtyard location within the site such as in the location of Plots 11 and 12.

With regard to the elevations the proposals appear to have adopted a traditional vernacular style for most house types. This is acceptable subject to the appropriate detailing. The pair of units which seem at odds with this style are the bungalows ‘house Type D’. These units need a bit more thought in their design. Traditional single storey buildings are alms house and simple double pitched out buildings/barns which can provide cues for the design of these units. With regard to plot 5 the extended roof over the bay and doorway is too dominant in the composition. I would suggest omitting the roof over the door and a simple door hood would be more appropriate.

Plot 15 - The front and rear elevations need to be re-elevated. The rear elevation which faces the open space is poor and should have the ‘blank’ windows reinserted. This will also allow a greater degree of natural surveillance of the open space. The front elevation will need to be elevated like Plot 20 but without the bay. Plot 29 - The single bay disrupts the symmetry of the elevation. Omit the front bay or balance with an additional bay on the other side of the door. Therefore further work is required to ensure the development will not cause significant harm to the character of the area.

Residential Amenity
The District Design Guide SPD adopted March 2010 states it is preferable that a minimum distance of 15m is provided between windows and any boundary to avoid a significant overlooking issue. The development is unlikely to seriously harm the amenities of neighbours or the occupiers of new properties through being unduly overbearing in mass, through loss of light or privacy.