The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 21 March 2017

Site visit made on 21 March 2017

by David Cliff BA Hons MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/16/3157596
Land at Hurdleditch Road, Orwell, Cambridgeshire SG8 5QG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by K.B. Tebbit Ltd & Davidsons Development Ltd against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- The application Ref S/3190/15/OL, dated 15 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2016.
- The development proposed is 'outline planning application for up to 49 dwellings, community car park and coach drop-off facility, pumping station and associated infrastructure'.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for up to 49 dwellings, community car park and coach drop-off facility, pumping station and associated infrastructure at land at Hurdleditch Road, Orwell, Cambridgeshire SG8 5QG in accordance with the application reference S/3190/15/OL, dated 15 December 2015, and subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Application for costs

2. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by K.B. Tebbit Ltd & Davidsons Development Ltd against South Cambridgeshire District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary matters

3. The application is in outline with details of access to be considered as part of the application whilst details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are matters reserved for future consideration. The application was accompanied by a revised layout plan (CAM1060_003 rev: H) but it has been confirmed that this should be treated as being illustrative other than the proposed access arrangements. Further details of the access arrangements are provided on drawing 110637/1000 rev D. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

4. A signed though undated planning obligation under Section 106 (s106) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) was provided at the Hearing. A dated version (24th March 2017) of the same obligation was subsequently submitted following the Hearing. This provides for affordable housing, on-site open space, off-site sports area and contribution, along with SSSI, household waste receptacle, footpath, bus stop maintenance and Traffic

Regulation Order contributions. I will consider the s106 agreement later in this decision.

5. Following the Hearing, I invited additional written representations from both main parties on the implications of the recent Supreme Court Judgement in Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd and SSCLG, Richborough Estates Partnership LLP and SSCLG v Cheshire East Borough Council ('Supreme Court Judgement'). I have taken the comments received into account in this decision.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

   i) The suitability of the location of the site for the proposed development, with particular regard to its access to services and facilities, and any resulting need to travel by the private car, and

   ii) The effect of the proposed development upon the existing landscape character of the area and the setting of the village.

Policy and housing land supply

7. There is agreement between the parties that the Council is not able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing. The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) states that the Council's latest Annual Monitoring Report (December 2016) has found there to be a supply of 3.7 years for the period 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2021. The 1.3 year deficit equates to 1,912 dwellings when taking into account the application of a 20% buffer. The SoCG goes on to say that whilst there has been a rise in predicted completions at unallocated windfall sites, this has not been sufficient to overcome the decline in supply which is largely accounted for by a reduction of delivery rates at large strategic allocations.

8. Further to the recent Supreme Court Judgement referred to above, where there is a lack of five year housing land supply, this indicates that the policies for the supply of housing in the development plan are out of date and the tilted balance in paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') applies. The weight to be given to the relevant development plan policies is a matter of judgement for the decision maker.

9. Notwithstanding the representations made by the parties at and prior to the Hearing, the Supreme Court Judgement makes clear that it is not necessary to label policies DP/1 (part a) and DP/7 of the Adopted Local Development Framework Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2007 (DCP) and ST/6 of the Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2007 (Core Strategy) as being out of date.

10. However, whilst these policies are generally consistent with those aims of the Framework seeking to steer developments to accessible locations to reduce the dependency on the need to travel by the private car, their weight is reduced in this case due to the significant shortfall in terms of housing supply within the District and the difficulties faced by the Council in addressing the deficit. The strict application of these policies would prevent improvements to the large shortfall in the supply of housing.

11. Paragraph 14 of the Framework states that where the development plan is out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or there are specific policies in the Framework which indicate that development should be restricted.

12. I consider there to be a very significant shortfall in the supply of housing. The proposal would provide for up to 49 new houses, of which 40% would be affordable dwellings. In the context of the Council's shortfall in the supply of housing, the scheme would make a substantial contribution to which I give considerable weight.

13. The emerging South Cambridgeshire Local Plan is in the examination stage with several weeks of hearings scheduled from 6th April 2017 along with further hearings scheduled for the summer. Given its stage in the examination process its policies afford only limited weight and it does not have any significant bearing on the outcome of this appeal.

Reasons

Suitability of the location of the site for the proposed development

14. Policy ST/6 of the Core Strategy designates Orwell as a Group Village. Within Group Villages the policy goes on to say that residential development up to an indicative maximum size of 8 dwellings, or exceptionally 15 dwellings on brownfield sites, will be permitted within village frameworks. However, the site is located just outside the village framework in this instance and consequently the Council has confirmed in its appeal statement that there would be no conflict with this policy.

15. Policy DP/1 of the DCP states that development will only be permitted where it would be consistent with the sequential approach to development as set out in the Core Strategy. It also requires that developments should minimise the need to travel by the private car. Policy DP/7 seeks to ensure that outside of village frameworks, only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation or other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted. Policy TR/1 of the DCP seeks to ensure that developments achieve a sufficient standard of accessibility to offer an appropriate choice of travel by public transport or other non-car travel mode(s).

16. In terms of shops and services, Orwell contains a village store (including post office), a public house, a hairdresser, a village hall, church hall, some recreation facilities and a mobile library service. Whilst located just outside of the village framework, the proposal would be within reasonable walking distance of facilities within the village. Such facilities would be unlikely to fully cater for the day to day needs of residents of the village including those of the proposed development. Nevertheless, whilst being limited I consider that they provide a reasonable level of facilities providing residents with the opportunity for some day to day needs to be met without needing to travel by car.

17. Employment provision within the village is more limited and it is likely that the large majority of working residents would need to travel outside of the village in order to reach their place of employment.

18. Turning to education provision, the site is located adjacent to Petersfield Primary School which has capacity to accommodate the primary school needs

of the proposed development. There is a secondary school in nearby Bassingbourn which also has sufficient capacity and is accessible from the village via a school bus service operating from the village. Access to early years and sixth form education provision would be more limited, but overall the site has reasonably good access to local education provision.

19. Whilst there is a reasonable range of facilities within the village, I acknowledge the Council's concern that its residents would need to regularly travel outside of the village by car for some of their needs, particularly for employment. A wider range of facilities including employment opportunities is located in Melbourn which is approximately 4.5 miles away, Royston which is 6 miles away and Cambridge which is 9 miles away.

20. In terms of the opportunity to access other facilities by public transport, the proposal includes provision for two new bus stops to be provided on Hurdleditch Road close to the site. This would provide access via bus to Cambridge, though such provision would be constrained by the limited frequency of buses. Other bus services to nearby centres would also be available but their use would also be constrained by the infrequency of services.

21. Further opportunities for travel by rail would be available from the nearby railway station at Shepreth with reasonably regular services on the Cambridge to London line, including stops at Royston, Hitchin and Stevenage. Whilst residents would be largely dependent on travel to this station by car, it would allow for some journeys, including commutes to work, to be made for the most part by public transport. Against this, I note that parking is limited at Shepreth station which may deter some users, although some rail users may be dropped off and picked up at the station. More car parking is available at Meldreth railway station (on the same line as Shepreth) which is located within 5 miles of Orwell. I also note that, based on 2011 data, the percentage of people living within Orwell Parish who travel to employment by rail is higher than both the district and national average. However, the survey data also shows that travel by car to employment is also above the district average for Orwell residents.

22. Journeys by bicycle would also be possible to the railway stations mentioned above and nearby centres, though I consider these would be limited due to the lack of cycle routes connecting the stations with Orwell along with the distances needed to be travelled in each case.

23. In conclusion on this issue, I consider that that the site would be located close to existing local facilities and services providing for some day to day needs of residents and would allow for the opportunity for some journeys to be made by public transport to facilities and services located further afield. Nevertheless, the location of the development would result in the likelihood that residents would utilise the private car in order to access those services and facilities that are located further afield with only limited or no public transport accessibility. I conclude that the proposal would result in moderate harm to the objectives of policies DP/1, DP/7 and TR/1 of the DCP along with the relevant provisions of paragraphs 7 and 17 of the Framework. I will go on to consider this as part of the overall planning balance later in the decision.

Landscape character and setting of the village

24. The appeal site comprises open, largely flat, arable farmland located immediately adjacent to the village framework boundary. It forms part of a larger arable field located between the village boundary and the A603, thereby making a reasonably positive contribution to the rural setting and character of the village. The main parties agree that the proposed development would not have any adverse impacts in terms of long distance views, the Council's objections being concerned with the impacts at a local level.

25. The appeal development would extend the built envelope of the village into the surrounding countryside. The illustrative layout plan shows how the proposed development could be provided on the site including opportunities for landscaped areas adjacent to the northeast and south east boundaries of the site. However, because landscaping and layout are reserved matters it is conceivable that a more substantial belt of landscaping could be achieved along the north-west boundary of the site if it were considered necessary.

26. The existing landscaping on the south east boundary of the site (also forming the edge of the existing village framework) is limited. The recently constructed housing development on the opposite side of Hurdleditch Road also has very limited landscaping on its boundary, meaning that existing built development is clearly visible on the approach to the village along Hurdleditch Road including its junction with the A603.

27. Whilst the proposed development would encroach into the large arable field, the large majority of this field would remain free of development. In effect the proposal would move the built envelope of the village closer to the A603, but the remaining field would still provide an open rural setting for the village. Although the development would mean that the urban features of the village would be experienced sooner than otherwise would be case when approaching along Hurdleditch Road, the existing open approach to the village along Hurdleditch Road would be largely retained.

28. The existing layout and pattern of development within the village is in my view quite mixed. Although the development would extend beyond the settlement edge, I do not consider the protection of the existing settlement edge to be of such importance in this location to protect the setting of the village or the landscape character of the area.

29. The Council has confirmed that it does not object in terms of the impact of the proposed development on views to the Church of St Andrews from Hurdleditch Road, though representations have been made by other parties expressing concerns in this respect. Given that the proposed development would only affect views to the church for only a limited section of Hurdleditch Road, I do not consider that any significant adverse impacts would result in this respect.

30. The illustrative layout plan shows opportunities for new planting on the boundary of the site with Hurdleditch Road and the northwest boundary. Matters of landscaping are reserved for future consideration. However, whilst the northwest boundary does not follow any existing physical boundary, with appropriate design and species selection to reflect the existing characteristics of the area, new planting would be possible that provides the opportunity to soften the visual impact of the new housing in views on the approach to the village. The avenue of trees on the edge of Hurdleditch Road would need to be

broken to allow the construction of the access points, but with additional planting I do not consider the retention of the entire avenue of trees to be of fundamental importance to maintain the existing landscape character in this location.

31. For the above reasons, and considered against policies DP/2, DP/3 and NE/4 of the DCP, I consider that the proposal would result in only modest harm to the landscape character and setting of the village.

Other matters

32. Whilst the proposed development may constrain the opportunity for any future expansion of Petersfield Primary School there is no detailed evidence before me which provides any firm justification for there being a need for the existing school to expand, including projections for a significant future growth in pupil numbers. Neither are there any firm details of proposals for any such school expansion. The parties also agree that there is sufficient space within the existing school for the increase in demand for places arising from the proposed development. I have therefore found no significant harm arising in terms of any impacts upon the future of the school.

33. The County Highway Authority has confirmed that is has no objections in principle to the proposed access arrangements. Improvements to the junction of Hurdleditch Road with the A603 are sought through a planning obligation and the existing 30 mph speed limit is proposed to be extended further along Hurdleditch Road. Although the proposed development would increase levels of traffic, I do not consider that such increases would be so significant to lead to any congestion or highway safety problems. The scheme provides for additional parking adjacent to the existing school along with a bus turning area. Whilst concerns have been expressed about this arrangement, there is no evidence before me which suggests to me that the proposed development would result in any significant worsening of local highway conditions in comparison to the existing situation. Nor do I consider it likely that it would result in any significant increase in the number of journeys made by the private car to the school given that on-street parking is freely available elsewhere. Furthermore, other than the proposed access, the overall layout of the scheme is a reserved matter for subsequent consideration.

34. Construction impacts on the surrounding area, including the adjacent schools would be able to be controlled through the imposition of conditions including traffic management measures and a Construction Environmental Management Plan. In terms of the period beyond construction, there is no compelling evidence to suggest that any significant noise and disturbance would arise from the proposed development and any associated infrastructure that would affect the operation of the school.

35. I am satisfied that conditions would be able to be imposed requiring further details of both surface water and foul drainage to ensure that the proposal would not result in any significant flooding or drainage impacts. Neither the Environment Agency nor the Lead Local Flood Authority has raised objection to the proposal. Appropriate measures would be provided through the s106 agreement to mitigate the increased pressure that would result upon the nearby Orwell Clunch Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest.

36. Taking account of the substantial distance of the proposed development from the Grade 1 listed St Andrews Church and the only limited obstruction of views to the church, I do not consider that the proposed development would result in any harm to the setting of this listed building. I also note in this respect that the Statement of Common Ground suggests that such a matter could be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.

37. Concerns regarding the constraints of the existing recreation area are resolved through the provision within the S106 agreement for a new recreational area. Such matters are dealt with further below.

Planning Obligations

38. As noted earlier in this decision, I have been provided with a signed and dated s106 agreement which includes several provisions. The obligation to provide not less than 40% of the total number of dwellings as affordable housing units accords with policy HG/3 of the DCP and is necessary to ensure the proposal meets the need for affordable housing in the area.

39. The obligation for the provision and maintenance of on-site open space is necessary to meet the recreational and amenity needs of the residents of the development and accords with policies SF/10 and SF/11 of the DCP along with Open Space in New Developments SPD.

40. Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the s106 sets out provisions (via transfer to the Council or its nominee), for management and maintenance of an off-site sports area. Part 4 of Schedule 2 includes provision for an off-site sports contribution to fund the layout and maintenance of the area. Such obligations are necessary taking account of the existing identified deficit of sports spaces in the area and the need that would be creating by the incoming residents of the development. This would accord with policy SF/11. From the evidence before me there appears to be a strong likelihood that the contribution would be able to be utilised for the intended purposes at the proposed off-site sports area.

41. However, in the unlikely event that it is not, I have not given any weight to the additional fall-back clause that the contribution could be applied and spent at the Council's discretion for the provision or upgrading of sports facilities elsewhere in Orwell. This is because there are no specific details of where or on what it would be spent and therefore no guarantee that it would accord with Regulation 123 of the CIL Regulations regarding the pooling of payments. However, given that from the evidence this scenario is unlikely to occur as there is agreement between the relevant parties on the provision, my finding in this respect does not alter the weight I attach to this factor in the overall planning balance.

42. Also in part 4 of Schedule 2, the play area contribution for the purpose of providing children's play equipment at Orwell Recreation Ground is necessary given the increased demand for children's play facilities that would arise. The SSSI contribution is necessary to provide for mitigation and management measures in respect of the Orwell Clunch Pit SSSI, taking into account the additional recreational pressure upon it arising from the proposed development. The household waste receptacle contribution and footpath contribution are both necessary to meet the needs of the future residents of the proposed development.

43. Part 5 of Schedule 2 provides for bus stop maintenance and TRO (Traffic Regulation Order) Contributions which are necessary to encourage the use of public transport and to extend the 30mph speed restriction on Hurdleditch Road in the interests of highway safety.

44. From the evidence before me I am satisfied that, with the exception of the fallback off-site sports contribution provision, the above obligations accord with the three tests set out in paragraph 204 of the Framework and comply with the pooling restrictions in Regulation 123 of the CIL Regulations.

Planning Balance

45. In respect of the location and accessibility of the site, the proposal would result in moderate harm in the context of policies DP/1, DP/7 and TR/1 of the DCP along with the relevant provisions of paragraphs 7 and 17 of the Framework. The weight to be attached to the conflict with policies DP/1 and DP/7 is reduced by the significant shortfall in the Council's housing land supply. Policy TR/1 carries significant weight given that its aims are substantially consistent with those of the Framework. The proposal would also result in modest harm to the landscape character and setting of the village contrary to policies DP/2, DP/3 and NE/4 of the DCP. These policies can be afforded significant weight in this case as they generally relate to design and landscaping matters and are substantially consistent with the Framework in this respect.

46. Set against this harm are the very substantial social and economic benefits of addressing the under supply of housing in the District. I attach very significant weight to the provision of up to 49 units, 40% of which would be affordable. There would also be a modest benefit to the local economy during the construction phase and in the longer term new residents would help to support shops and services in the village through an increase in local household spending. Paragraph 55 of the Framework includes support for new housing where it would enhance or maintain the viability of rural communities. In this case, I consider that the additional residents resulting from the proposed development would help the viability of existing services within the village and their future retention.

47. The development also makes provision for 1.62 ha of adjacent land for outdoor sports and recreation purposes along with a financial contribution towards the facilities to be provided on this land. Furthermore it would make a financial contribution towards improving the existing play facilities at the adjacent existing recreation ground.

48. Overall the adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Consequently the proposal would represent sustainable development as defined in the Framework, and material considerations indicate that planning permission should be granted for development that is not in accordance with the development plan.

Conditions

49. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the requirements of the Government's Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision I have altered the conditions to better reflect the guidance.

50. I have attached conditions limiting the life of the planning permission and setting out requirements for the reserved matters in accordance with the relevant legislation. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty.

51. A contamination condition is necessary to prevent unacceptable risks for future residents, construction workers, adjacent land users, controlled waters and ecological systems. A condition requiring renewable energy provision is necessary in order to provide an energy efficient development and in the interests of the environment. A foul water drainage condition is required in order to safeguard the water environment and provide for appropriate sewerage arrangements. I have amalgamated the Council's two suggested surface water drainage conditions into one condition for precision. The resulting condition is necessary to safeguard the development from surface water flooding. Tree and hedge protection details are necessary in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

52. The junction and footway requirements of conditions 11 and 12, along with a condition requiring the provision of visibility splays are necessary in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety. A traffic management plan is also necessary in the interest of highway safety. A travel plan is necessary in order to reduce car dependency and promote alternative methods of transport. A condition requiring bus stop provision on Hurdleditch Road is necessary for the same reason.

53. An updated badger survey and any appropriate mitigation, along with a condition requiring a scheme of ecological enhancement and the protection of the buffer zone adjacent to the north east boundary are required in the interests of local ecology and the environment. A scheme of archaeological work is necessary in order to safeguard any archaeological interest at the site.

54. Details of the housing mix are required in order to ensure that the proposals meet local housing need. These should be provided with the reserved matters as they will influence the design details of the proposal.

55. Waste management details are necessary in order to maximise opportunities for waste re-use and recycling. A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is required in order to minimise the impacts of construction upon the surrounding area. In the interests of precision and given that some aspects are covered by separate conditions on transport and waste I have not included the long list of requirements as suggested by the Council. The matter of the detailed content of the CEMP would be for the parties to consider.

56. I do not consider it necessary to attach the Council's suggested landscaping condition as this would be dealt with through a subsequent reserved matters application. I have not imposed a condition relating to water conservation as from the evidence before me no justification has been provided in terms of a clear and justified local need to exceed the general building regulations requirement in this respect. I do not consider that a condition is needed regarding drainage and displacement from the proposed accesses onto the highway as such matters are covered by other legislation.

57. I am not convinced that a condition regarding the potential omission of the proposed car parking area and associated access in connection with the Petersfield Primary School is necessary. The car parking area is illustrative and

any revisions to the proposed arrangements could be dealt with at a later stage if necessary and appropriate. I do not consider that a condition is necessary for a noise assessment and noise mitigation measures in respect of the coach/car parking area as I do not consider that its nature and frequency of use would be such to result in any significant noise impacts upon the adjacent school. I have not included the suggested condition on power operated machinery and construction hours as such matters can be dealt with by the separate CEMP condition. Although included in the Council's initial list of suggested conditions appended to its statement, conditions on lighting and finished floor levels were not included on the updated list of suggested condition that was subsequently provided prior to the hearing. I therefore see no reason to include them.

58. Some conditions require details to be approved before development takes place. This is necessary in the case of conditions 6 and 7 because these conditions may affect the design of the scheme. It is necessary in the case of conditions 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 because these conditions address impacts that could arise during construction.

Conclusion

59. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Cliff

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Greg Shaw	Pegasus Group
Robert Barber	Pegasus Group
James Atkin	Pegasus Group
Susan Bridge	Davidsons

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Rebecca Ward	Senior Planning Officer
Carol Newell	Assistant Landscape Officer
James Fisher	s106 Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES

Aidan Van De Weyer	District Councillor
Nigel Szembel	Petersfield Primary School
Wayne Talbot	Orwell Parish Council

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

1. Appeal Decision – Land at Linton Road, Balsham (APP/W0530/W/16/3162747)
2. Signed s106 Agreement
3. Map showing location of the site in relation to key settlements

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE HEARING

1. Signed and dated s106 Agreement
2. Council's response to appellant's costs application
3. Appellant's comments on Council's costs response
4. Appellant's representations on the recent Supreme Court Judgement
5. Council's representations on the recent Supreme Court Judgement

Schedule of Conditions

1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.

2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 2 years from the date of this permission.

3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: CAM1060_001 rev: C, CAM1060_003 rev: H (in respect of access arrangements only) and 110637/1000 rev D.

5) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until:
   a) A detailed scheme for the investigation and recording of contamination and remediation objectives (which have been determined through risk assessment) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
   b) Detailed proposals for the removal, containment or otherwise rendering harmless of any contamination (the remediation method statement) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
   c) The works specified in the remediation method statement have been completed, and a validation report submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the approved scheme.
   d) If, during remediation works, any contamination is identified that has not been considered in the remediation method statement, then remediation proposals, together with a timetable, should be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the remediation as approved shall be undertaken within the timeframe as agreed.

6) No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision of on-site renewable energy to meet 10% reduction in projected carbon emissions from the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented and thereafter retained in operation.

7) No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with an implementation programme which shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

8) Prior to the commencement of development, including site preparation or the delivery of materials, an updated arboricultural assessment and method statement including a tree and hedge protection strategy shall

be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

9) Prior to the commencement of development a traffic management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include details of:
   a) Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted highway);
   b) Contractor parking (all such parking shall be within site boundary and not on the street);
   c) Movement and control of deliveries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted public highway);
   d) Control of dust, mud and debris, in relationship to the functioning of the adopted public highway.

10) Prior to the commencement of development, an up-to-date badger survey together with any necessary mitigation measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to determine whether badger activity has increased and whether any mitigation measures need to be provided. Any mitigation required shall be carried out in accordance with a programme that shall also have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

11) No development shall take place until a scheme of ecological enhancement, including a programme of implementation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The ecological enhancement scheme shall include details of the features to be enhanced, recreated and managed for species of local importance both in the course of development and in the future. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved programme of implementation.

12) Prior to the commencement of development, details of the protective fencing to be erected to maintain the undeveloped 25m buffer zone adjacent to the stream on the north eastern boundary shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

13) No development shall take place until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details.

14) Prior to the commencement of development a full Site Waste Management Plan and Waste Audit shall be submitted in writing and approved by the Local Planning Authority. These shall include details of:

   a) Construction waste infrastructure dealing with how inert waste arising will be managed/recycled during the construction process;
   b) Anticipated nature and volumes of waste and measures to ensure the maximisation of the reuse of waste;

c) 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;
d) Any other steps to ensure the minimisation of waste during construction;
e) The location and timing of provision of facilities pursuant to criteria a, b and c;
f) Proposed monitoring and timing of submission of monitoring reports;
g) The proposed timing of submission of a Waste Management Closure Report to demonstrate the effective implementation, management and monitoring of construction;
h) A RECAP Waste Management Guide toolkit shall be completed with supporting reference material;
i) Proposals for the management of municipal waste generated during the construction phase of the development, along with 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 is required.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

15) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

16) Prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted, a scheme for a footpath connecting the site up to the existing footpath along Hurdleditch Road shall be carried out in accordance with details which shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

17) Prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted, a scheme for improvements to the junction of Hurdleditch Road with the A603 shall be carried out in accordance with details which shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of new signage, road markings and other minor works to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

18) No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before any details are submitted to the local planning authority an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system, having regard to Defra's non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (or any subsequent version), and the results of the assessment shall have been provided to the local planning authority. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:

a) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;

b) include a timetable for its implementation; and,

c) provide, a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

19) No dwelling shall be occupied until visibility splays to the approved access have been provided in accordance with the details shown on the submitted plan No. 110637/1000 rev D. The splays shall thereafter be maintained free from any obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.

20) No dwelling shall be occupied until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan should be in general conformity with the principles and measures outlined at Chapter 5 of the submitted Transport Assessment (Ref R3.6, May 2016). The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

21) No dwelling shall be occupied until details of the design and location of bus stop improvements to include shelter for Cambridge bound buses along with hard standing and raised kerbs on both sides of Hurdleditch Road have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Parish Council. No dwellings shall be occupied until the shelters have been provided in accordance with the approved details.

22) As part of any reserved matters application details of the housing mix (including both market and affordable housing) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall proceed in accordance with such approved details.