



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 19 September 2023

Site visit made on 19 September 2023

by Mr JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/23/3322754

Land south of The Causeway, Kneesworth, Cambridgeshire SG8 5JB

- 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 M Scott Properties Ltd against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/04153/OUT, dated 15 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 9 self-build dwellings, associated infrastructure and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for the erection of 9 self-build dwellings, associated infrastructure and landscaping at land south of The Causeway, Kneesworth, Cambridgeshire SG8 5JB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/04153/OUT, dated 15 September 2022, subject to the conditions in the Conditions Schedule below.

Preliminary Matters

2. This appeal seeks outline planning permission with all matters except access reserved for later consideration. With regard to the matter of access, it was agreed by the parties that permission was sought under this appeal for the alignment of the access road within the site and its junction with The Causeway, as well as the 2 new driveways to be formed to The Causeway, and the establishment of a pavement along the site frontage.
3. An application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council, and that is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this case are
 - a) whether the development accords with the District's spatial strategy;
 - b) whether it is a sustainable location;
 - c) its effect on the character and appearance of the countryside;
 - d) whether the infrastructure payments sought are justified;
 - e) the effect on best and most versatile farmland and

- f) if development plan conflict would result from any of the above, whether there are material considerations that indicate the decision should be otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Reasons

The Spatial Strategy

5. The housing subject of this appeal would sit to the south of The Causeway. The site is outside of, but immediately adjacent to, Kneesworth's development framework. In the *South Cambridgeshire Local Plan* (the Local Plan) the development framework boundary is identified at this point as running along The Causeway, and then down the east of the site, on the other side of a narrow intervening belt of low trees.
6. Local Plan Policy S/6 says that development in rural areas will be limited and housing will be focused on Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres. Local Plan Policy S/7 gives more specific detail, stating that on sites, such as this one, that are outside development frameworks, only certain specified forms of development will be permitted. The self-build housing subject of this appeal falls under none of those specified criteria and so is not supported by that policy. By saying housing should be '*focused*' in Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, Local Plan Policy S/6 appears to accept some development outside of those centres. I consider though that is in acknowledgement of the exceptions cited in Local Plan Policy S/7, and does not justify this housing here.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be contrary in principle to the spatial strategy as laid down in Local Plan Policy S/7.

Sustainable location

8. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) states that when assessing applications for development proposals it should be ensured that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be taken up. It recognises though that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between rural and urban areas.
9. Local Plan Policies S/2 and TI/2(1) follow this guidance through. Together they seek housing in sustainable locations where there is access to a range of services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport, to provide a real travel choice for some or all of the journey.
10. I consider this context of national and local policy does not mean new houses should be limited to places where all the needs of its residents could be met by a choice of transport modes other than by private motorised vehicles. This is because there would be few, if any, undeveloped sites with such a level of accessibility in this rural district. Rather, there is an acceptance of certain sites being developed even though future occupiers would be reliant, to some extent, on the private car. Such a position is reflected in the Council accepting that a notable amount of its new housing will be met in settlements such as Bassingbourn, which is immediately next to Kneesworth.
11. The Council accepted at the Hearing that the concerns about the sustainability of the location related solely to access to employment opportunities, and it raised no objections to access to other services and facilities.

12. Although outside of the development framework boundary, the evidence before me shows Kneesworth and the adjacent Bassingbourn (the 2 villages) together contain schools and a range of shops and facilities, and I consider these are within a reasonable walking distance of the site. The Causeway is relatively flat and straight, so could well encourage cycling as an attractive way to access the services and facilities the 2 villages offered. Whilst the pavement along The Causeway might be narrow, it did not seem heavily used, and if 2 pedestrians met there was opportunity for them to pass. Moreover, there is a clustering of many of the services, meaning joint trips could be attractive. I therefore concur with the view that, for a rural area, there is a reasonable access to shops, schools, and other similar facilities that would not place undue reliance on the car.
13. Turning to the matter of employment, it was accepted that the bus service to and from Royston would be of limited value to someone working conventional hours there. However, some employment opportunity is nearby in the hospital, the schools and the barracks, and these appeared to be accessible along pavements. The Wireless Station Industrial Estate, which lies just outside of Kneesworth, is also in walking distance and, judging by the number of businesses, is an appreciable source of employment. While the road to it has no pavements and so is relatively unattractive for pedestrians, that is an existing situation that would apply to all who worked there, whether they lived in the appeal scheme or in any existing properties in the village.
14. There is clearly no means of controlling where people work or whether future residents at the scheme would take up employment opportunities nearby. Overall though, while the range and number of jobs in the 2 villages is limited, I consider that, for a rural location, it is not unreasonably deficient.
15. Accordingly, I conclude that the access to shops, services, schools, employment and other facilities would be sufficient to mean this would not be an unsustainable location and there would not be a conflict with Local Plan Policies S/2 and TI/2(1) or the Framework.

Character and appearance

16. This 1.7ha site is currently part of a larger ploughed field, with trees and bushes to the east and south. When to the west looking from The Causeway, this planting contains the site to some extent, and means the housing that is beyond, between the site and the A1198, is substantially concealed. Otherwise, from this road the site lies in the foreground of expansive views over the gently undulating, open landscape with relatively few hedgerows that lies between Kneesworth and Royston. Similarly, when travelling westwards along The Causeway, these views open up once past the planting on the site's eastern boundary.
17. Looking from the footpath that runs to the south and south-west, the site again appears as part of a large, open field, and is seen against the varied housing along the northern side of The Causeway. Once more though the trees and shrubs on the eastern and southern sides have a containing role, and substantially screen the housing beyond.
18. Given the scale of the scheme, its location tight up to the settlement, and the effect of the trees to the east and south, I am satisfied the scheme would not cause harm to the wider landscape. However, it would nonetheless be

changing a field, which respects the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, into an area of housing. Furthermore, by impeding the views from The Causeway southwards, it would be reducing an appreciation of the countryside from that road and the dwellings opposite. For these reasons it would therefore be harming the character and appearance of the area and not protecting the local landscape of which it is a part.

19. It was also said that it would dilute the separation between the 2 villages. However, the scheme would be at the extreme eastern end of the gap between Bassingbourn and the main block of houses in Kneesworth to the south of The Causeway. This would mean a substantial portion of the gap would remain. Furthermore, in between would be a row of semi-detached properties. In my opinion, the location of this row in the centre of this gap means it has a far more pronounced effect on the strength of the separation between the 2 villages than would the scheme before me. Finally, to the north of The Causeway the separation between Bassingbourn and Kneesworth is limited to just a few metres on the ground, and so when looking from the south it is difficult to perceive. Taking these matters together, I therefore find the scheme would not adversely affect the separation between the 2 villages.
20. In assessing the impact on the surroundings, I accept that the large open area at the southern end of the site would integrate the scheme to some degree into the landscape. I acknowledge too that the reinstatement of hedging along the western side may have benefits, although the eventual value of this would depend to some extent on the development permitted behind. However, whilst these factors would restrict and limit the adverse impacts of the scheme in this regard to a certain extent, I am not satisfied they would totally mitigate its harmful effects.
21. Accordingly, I conclude that the scheme would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area, and so would conflict with Local Plan Policy NH/2, which seeks development that respects and enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape.

The effect on best and most versatile farmland

22. The Framework states that decision-makers should recognise the wider benefits from natural capital, including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. It defines this as land falling in Agricultural Land Classifications 1, 2 or 3a.
23. The appeal site is Grade 2 land, and would be taken out of agricultural production. Whilst I recognise that, as a single field, the benefits it offers to the rural economy would be relatively slight, those benefits would nonetheless be lost. As such the development would conflict with the guidance in the Framework.
24. Local Plan Policy NH/3 says that planning permission will not be granted for development that would lead to the irreversible loss of Grades 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land. In that regard the policy echoes the part of the Framework referenced above. However, it then draws on other areas of the Framework by accepting that this loss can be accepted if one of 2 tests are passed, the first being that the site is allocated and the second is that sustainability considerations and the need for the development override the need to protect the land. It is reasonable to assume a development proposal need satisfy only

one of these 2 tests, as, if allocated, the issues of sustainability considerations and need would not be expected to be outstanding.

25. The irreversible loss of agricultural land that would result means the scheme is in conflict with the opening of this policy. Turning then to the 2 tests, the site is not allocated and so it does not satisfy the first. In relation to the second, I have already found above that the access to shops, services, employment, schools, and other facilities would mean this would not be an unsustainable location, and no other sustainability considerations have been highlighted. However, whether or not the level of need is sufficient to override the loss, and so whether or not there is a conflict with this policy in the development plan, is a matter that must be delayed until after the planning balance below.

Infrastructure payments

26. When the application was being considered, no infrastructure payments were sought by the Council or offered by the appellant. As a result, the lack of any financial contributions was not a Reason for Refusal. Moreover, in the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) agreed between the appellant and the Council, it was said that monetary contributions were not necessary to meet the tests in the *Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010* (the Regulations). However, the Council's appeal statement (submitted to the Inspectorate on the same day as the SOCG) noted that discussions about the extent of contributions were on-going and I understand that the Council raised the need for these with the appellant. In response, and to avoid any delay in the determination of the scheme, the appellant submitted a Unilateral Undertaking at the Hearing that included committing to such payments (the Contributions). This though was offered without prejudice to its case and in the belief that they were not justified. Moreover, at the Hearing the Council confirmed that had the commitments in the Undertaking not been forthcoming it would not have been raising this issue as a new Reason for Refusal.
27. I am unclear as to why the Council changed its approach to this matter over the course of the application and subsequent appeal. However, putting that aside, it is now for me to consider whether such payments are justified.
28. To my mind a key policy in the Local Plan that is particularly relevant to this issue is Local Plan Policy TI/8, as this is a policy entitled '*Infrastructure and New Developments*'. Whilst other policies refer to infrastructure payments, there clearly cannot be any internal contradictions within the plan and so they have to be interpreted in line with this policy that appears to outline the context for such contributions.
29. The policy says planning permission will only be granted for developments that have made suitable arrangements for '*the improvement or provision of infrastructure*'. The supporting text opens by referring to contributions to, among other things, the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities, and to my mind this covers the list of monies sought through the Undertaking.
30. However, in paragraph 10.47 of the supporting text to Policy TI/8 adds that
- 'There are some forms of development where contributions will not be sought as set out in planning practice guidance. These include custom and self-build homes...'*

It was the Council's case that although the planning practice guidance (PPG) once did not require contributions for such housing, that was no longer so. As a result, this clause did not now apply.

31. However, I do not read paragraph 10.47 as saying whether or not contributions should be sought is dependent on the wording of the PPG. Rather, I see it as a statement made by the Council, which draws on the PPG to seek support. Indeed, deeming it to be a view of the Council's is strengthened by the Local Plan being adopted, with this text, after the date when I was told this clause concerning self-build and custom housing had been deleted from the PPG. I also note this paragraph does not impose qualifications relating to the numbers or sizes of custom and self-build homes and it does not say it does not apply if other policies are engaged. Rather it can be applied to any scheme for such properties.
32. In interpreting this point, reference was also made by the Council to Local Plan Policy SC/4 entitled '*Meeting Community Needs*'. It says, in an absolute manner, that all housing will include or contribute to the provision of services and facilities necessary to meet the needs of the development. In the supporting text though it then qualifies this, adding that, '*reflecting the Planning Practice Guidance*', contributions will not be sought for '*sites under 10 dwellings (and which have a combined gross floor space of no more than 1,000m²)*'. Whilst this site will have under 10 dwellings, as all matters but access are reserved the amount of floor space to be created is unknown at this stage. There was therefore a debate about whether or not this clause in the supporting text to Local Plan Policy SC/4 applied to what was before me. Putting that aside though, my attention was drawn to nothing in Policy SC/4 (including its supporting text) that specifically concerned custom and self-build housing. Consequently, I see no reason why it should negate the unqualified acceptance in paragraph 10.47 that contributions will not be sought for custom or self-build homes.
33. Moreover, the extract from the supporting text to Local Plan Policy SC/4 quoted above appears to be based on a Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) from 2014. Although the WMS remains extant, its provisions exempting small sites from tariff-style contributions have not been incorporated into the current version of the Framework and were removed from the PPG chapter on Planning Obligations when it was updated in March 2019.
34. Reference was also made to Local Plan Policies NH/6, SC/6 and SC/7, all of which sought contributions to various things. Again though I have no basis to consider these mean the unqualified acceptance in paragraph 10.47 does not apply.
35. Therefore, while I note the commitments to make the Contributions defined in the definitions of the Undertaking and to be delivered under Schedule 3, as paragraph 10.47 in the Local Plan states they will not be sought for self-build housing I consider they are not necessary to make the development accord with the development plan or make it acceptable in planning terms. As a result I concur with the agreed SOCG and find the elements of the Undertaking relating to providing the Contributions would not meet the necessary tests set out in the Regulations. Consequently, they are not afforded weight in my decision-making and not taken into account. Even given this, I conclude there would not be a conflict with Local Plan Policy TI/8. Moreover, my findings on

this matter mean I consider the Council's Monitoring Fee should be reduced to £700, in line with its definition found in the Definitions in the Undertaking.

36. Comments were also made about the justifications for individual contributions, but given my findings on this matter these are not things I need to explore.

Other matters

37. Whilst water scarcity may well be an issue in the area, the Council considered it was not a reason to resist planning permission for a smaller development such as this. I have no reason to disagree.
38. Visibility from the 3 access points to The Causeway would be satisfactory. Although the lower, southern part of the site adjacent to a brook is in Flood Zones 2 and 3, the density of the scheme and the intended provision of extensive open space mean the houses could nonetheless be accommodated without flood risk.

Other considerations & planning balance

39. I have found that the scheme would conflict with the development plan in that it is contrary to the spatial strategy for the District, and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Moreover, it would also involve the loss of best and most versatile land, and I find this does not accord with the Framework or the opening of Local Plan Policy NH/3.
40. However, section 38(6) of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* says development should be in accordance with the development plan '*unless material considerations indicate otherwise*', and this is reaffirmed in the Framework. Therefore, whilst the development plan has primacy in decision-making, there are situations where material considerations could indicate a decision that was otherwise than in accordance with the plan.
41. In this regard the principal consideration offered by the appellant was concerning the shortfall in the delivery of custom and self-build housing, and, through the Undertaking, I consider the dwellings before me could be suitably and reasonably secured as forming such housing into the future.
42. The Local Plan is not silent on this subject, but Policy H/9 merely states that a wide choice, type and mix of housing will be sought to meet differing needs, including the needs of those who wish to build their own home. It identifies a requirement for provision on sites of 20 or more homes, but beyond that it gives little further guidance on the delivery of this housing type. The Framework similarly identifies those wishing to build or commission their own home as a type and tenure of housing that needs to be reflected in planning policy.
43. The Council accepted it was not keeping up with the demand for such housing, as the numbers added each year to the register significantly exceeded the number of planning permissions. Consequently, it acknowledged its shortfall of well over 200 self-build homes was '*substantial*'. I was not told whether all on the register are still looking for plots, or, as it is District-wide, where within South Cambridgeshire the demand for plots lies. However, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I afford this shortfall significant weight.
44. It said this need was to be met through the large, strategic sites, drawing attention particularly to those known as Waterbeach and Northstowe. However,

on the evidence presented it was clear that the contribution these and the other strategic sites would make to reducing this deficit by any appreciable degree would be many years hence, and at best in the 2030s. Given this delay, the strategic sites therefore seem unlikely to address the needs of those now on the register. Rather, it was acknowledged they were a long-term solution with smaller sites offering a solution in the short-term.

45. These 9 units would make only a small contribution to reducing the overall shortfall, but nonetheless it would be a positive step that would have some tangible effect. I therefore afford this benefit an appreciable weight.
46. Beyond this, there are also benefits arising from the Biodiversity Net Gain, as well as economic benefits during the construction phase and from future residents (though this has to be tempered to some extent by the loss of economic potential from taking Grade 2 land out of agricultural production). I afford these moderate weight, as they could apply to any housing development outside of the settlement boundary.
47. In relation to the planning balance, I had no decisive evidence before me to show that addressing the substantial shortfall in custom and self-build housing plots for those now on the register could be delivered solely within the development frameworks. As a result, land outside of those frameworks will be required. Furthermore, as the Council accepted at the Hearing, this will often be on best and most versatile land as that is found extensively across the District. I also note the contained nature of the site and its position tight against the existing settlement, which limit the scheme's effect on the character and appearance of the area, and these factors temper the conflict with the development plan policies on these matters. Mindful of this, I find the benefits of providing 9 more custom and self-build houses outweigh the development plan conflict and justify a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, I conclude that planning permission should be granted.
48. I recognise that the Inspector determining the appeal at land north of Westfield in February 2022 went through a similar process, but found the material considerations did not justify a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. However, the nature and impacts of the harm they identified differed to my findings on this current case. On the evidence before them they also were not of the view that the Council was failing to grant sufficient permissions for self-build houses to meet current need. Based on the submissions I have read and heard, that is not a view I can share.
49. Returning to the effect on best and most versatile land, from the above it is clear that as well as finding the sustainability considerations do not offer a reason to resist the scheme, I consider there is a need for the development to help reduce the substantial shortfall in self-build plots. Given the size of the site, these outweigh the harm to the economy and the loss of other benefits from taking this best and most versatile land out of agricultural usage, and mean there is no conflict with Local Plan Policy NH/3.
50. Although I have found I cannot attribute weight to the provision of Contributions in the Undertaking, had I come to the contrary view this would have had no bearing on my overall conclusions as the signed Undertaking was still before me.

Conditions

51. Conditions concerning the submission of reserved matters and the commencement of development should be imposed for the avoidance of doubt [Conditions 1 & 2]. For this reason too the development should be in accordance with the approved plans, insofar as they relate to the matter of access [4].
52. Given that the site would be developed by individual house-builders, having regard to the character and appearance of the area and biodiversity it is necessary that the delivery, maintenance and management of the areas of open space outside the private gardens is secured [3] and external lighting is in accordance with details first approved [19]. For reasons of biodiversity it is also necessary that a Construction Ecological Management Plan, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, and a scheme for ecological enhancement be agreed [7, 8 & 9].
53. In the interests of highway safety a Construction Traffic Management Plan should be agreed and the access points and estate road should be provided with suitable sight splays and details of their maintenance and management, [13, 17, 18 & 15].
54. To ensure suitable drainage a drainage scheme should be agreed [5] and floor levels should be at specified heights to avoid risk of flooding [20]. Having regard to the archaeological potential of the site there should be a programme of archaeological work implemented [12].
55. Mindful of the needs of sustainability, measures to reduce carbon emissions and promote water efficiency should be installed, and there should be broadband cabling to encourage home-working [10, 11 & 16]. To protect the living conditions of residents, sound proofing to the homes facing The Causeway should be agreed and the hours of construction working should be limited [6 & 14].
56. However, conditions relating to the specific landscaping scheme, tree protection and roadway construction are best addressed under reserved matters submissions while the drainage of the road will be dealt with under the drainage condition. I have also not been persuaded of the need for a condition to tackle contamination that is currently unknown, or to secure a Construction Environment Plan.

Conclusion

57. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

JP Sargent

INSPECTOR

Conditions Schedule

- 1) No works shall be commenced on any dwelling or other part of the development until details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale ('the reserved matters') for the relevant dwelling plot, or for the communal areas of the site, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 2) Applications for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission. The development shall be commenced not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 3) No works shall be commenced on any dwelling or other part of the development until details of a timetable for the implementation of the landscaping works to lie outside of domestic curtilages, together with a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan and a programme for their management and their maintenance have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Biodiversity Net Gain Plan and all landscaping that is to lie outside of domestic curtilages shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable, and managed and maintained in accordance with the approved programme.
- 4) The development shall be undertaken in accordance with Drawing numbers 75-05A & ZZ-SK-D-0003 Rev P3, insofar as those plans relate to matters of access.
- 5) With or before the submission of reserved matters for each plot, a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of how the foul and surface water systems are to be managed and maintained. No dwelling shall be occupied until the foul and surface water drainage infrastructure to serve that dwelling has been installed and brought into operation, and the foul and surface water drainage infrastructure shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) With or before the submission of reserved matters for any house with an elevation facing directly onto The Causeway, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority of the method of protecting residents within the dwelling from unreasonable noise nuisance from traffic on The Causeway. Prior to the first occupation of any of those dwellings the method of protecting residents within the dwelling from unreasonable noise nuisance from traffic on The Causeway shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.
- 7) With or before the submission of reserved matters a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall include details of any ecologically sensitive features or species present on the site, and proposed measures and timetables to mitigate the impacts of the development on those features and species during construction. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP and its timetables.
- 8) With or before the submission of reserved matters a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the

- local planning authority. The LEMP shall include details of existing and proposed ecological features, proposals for their future management and a timetable for their implementation. These ecological features shall thereafter be managed in accordance with the approved LEMP.
- 9) With or before the submission of reserved matters details of a scheme for the delivery and maintenance of ecological enhancement, together with a timetable for its implementation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
 - 10) With or before the submission of reserved matters details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority of the measures necessary to achieve a 10% reduction in carbon emissions compared to the baseline figure to be calculated with reference to the Building Regulations, through the use of on-site renewable energy and/or low carbon technologies. No dwelling shall be occupied until the approved measures have been installed, and they shall thereafter be retained.
 - 11) With or before the submission of reserved matters details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority of the measures necessary to achieve a minimum water efficiency standard to 110 litres/day per person. No dwelling shall be occupied until the approved measures have been installed, and they shall thereafter be retained.
 - 12) No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work has been implemented, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - 13) No development shall take place until a Construction Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the development shall then be undertaken in accordance with the approved Plan.
 - 14) During the construction period,
 - no machinery or plant shall be operated,
 - no works audible at the boundary of the construction site shall be carried out, and
 - no construction-related deliveries shall be taken at or despatched from the site,at any time except between the following hours:
Mondays to Fridays 0800h – 1800h
Saturdays 0800h – 1300h
 - 15) No dwelling shall be occupied until details of the arrangements for the future management and maintenance of any internal estate road and footways have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, any internal estate road and footways shall be managed and maintained in accordance with these approved details.
 - 16) No dwelling shall be occupied until it has been made capable of accommodating fibre-optic, high-speed broadband cabling, in accordance with the guidance note 'Data Ducting Infrastructure for New Homes' published by

- MHCLG in 2008, or any successor document published by HM Government prior to the commencement of development.
- 17) No dwelling shall be occupied until the footway, access and dropped crossings on the frontage to The Causeway have been provided in accordance with details first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - 18) No dwelling shall be occupied until pedestrian sight splays of 2m by 2m have been provided to either side of the access and the dropped crossings on the frontage to The Causeway, and those pedestrian sight splays shall thereafter be kept clear of any obstruction greater than 0.6m in height when measured from the adjacent public highway.
 - 19) No external lighting shall be used unless its details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - 20) Finished floor levels of each dwelling shall be set no lower than 27.16m AOD, or, where land levels already exceed that, 150mm above existing ground level.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

| | |
|---------------|----------------------|
| A Davies | Planning Consultant |
| I Dudley | Landscape Consultant |
| R Winsborough | Appellant |

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

| | |
|----------|-------------------------------|
| B Elzein | Principal Landscape Architect |
| J Fisher | S106 Officer |
| T Gray | Principal Planning Officer |

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE HEARING

FROM THE APPELLANT:

APP1: Signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking
APP2: Document entitled *Request for Planning Obligations*
APP3: Policy TI/8 from the *South Cambridgeshire Local Plan*

FROM THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

LPA1: Inset No 9 Bassingbourn (Maps 1 & 2) from the *South Cambridgeshire Local Plan*
LPA2: Inset No 64 Kneesworth from the *South Cambridgeshire Local Plan*
LPA3: Appeal Decision APP/W0530/W/21/3282234 (dated 1 August 2023) for Land at St Peters Street, Caxton