



Appeal Decisions

Site Visit made on 21 September 2021

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th November 2021

Ref: APP/W0530/W/21/3269789

Land to the North and South of Bartlow Road, Linton CB21 4LY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by conditions of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Abbey Developments Ltd against South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: S/1963/15/CONDA, dated 19 November 2020, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 19(iii) of planning permission Ref: S/1963/15/OL granted on 1 September 2017.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 18 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a residential development for up to 55 dwellings with landscape buffer and new vehicular accesses from Bartlow Road.
 - The details for which approval is sought are described as: No. 19(iii) (archaeology)
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval Ref: S/1963/15/CONDA given to the details pursuant to condition No. 19(iii) of a planning permission Ref: S/1963/15/OL

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Abbey Developments Ltd against South Cambridgeshire District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matters

3. I am considering three other appeals on the same site. Whilst these have been made by the same appellant, they raise differing issues. In consequence, I have made separate decisions.
4. Following the submission of this appeal, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. I have considered the proposals in the light of this revised document, having first given the parties an opportunity to comment on its content.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the submitted details would secure a planning policy requirement development, with regards to the investigation of archaeology.

Reasons

6. The site consists of two undeveloped parcels of land on the periphery of the settlement. However, the site is also adjacent to countryside.

7. Given the site is undeveloped, adjacent to open areas and near to a historic settlement, there is the potential for undiscovered findings of archaeological significance given that the site would not have been disturbed through previous development processes.
8. In result, it is important that this be appropriately investigated in order to ensure that harm to heritage assets does not occur. The documentation originally submitted to the Council suggests that the possibility of findings into the Mesolithic period had not been investigated.
9. However, subsequent to the appeal being submitted, the appellant has undertaken additional work into this area. The evidence before me includes documentation that this has been assessed by the County archaeological advisor and that no issues have been raised in respect of its contents. I share this expert view as I have no reasons to find otherwise.
10. In consequence, the proposed development would result in the appropriate investigation of matters of archaeological interest and, as a result, it has been demonstrated that matters of interest would not be harmed by the development process.
11. I therefore conclude that the submitted details demonstrate that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect upon heritage assets. The details in this regard would comply with Policy NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018). Amongst other matters, this seeks to ensure that developments sustain and enhance heritage assets.

Conclusion

12. I have identified that the submitted details in respect of archaeology are consistent with the requirements of the Development Plan and are therefore acceptable. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR