

PLANNING COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday 7th September 2017

Time: 10.30am – 12:26PM

Place: Room 128, Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillors A Bradnam, D Connor (Chairman), I Gardener (Vice-Chairman), L Harford, B Hunt, S Kindersley, M Smith and J Whitehead.

7. APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillor Hudson, Councillor Mandy Smith substituted.

Councillor Bill Hunt informed the Committee that he would need to leave the meeting following the first application but hoped to return before the end of the meeting.

There were no declarations of interest.

8. MINUTES – 12TH JUNE 2017

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 12th June 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

9. EXTRACTION OF SAND & GRAVEL, AND CLAY FOR LANDFILL CELL ENGINEERING, AS AN EXTENSION TO AN EXISTING QUARRY; FIELD CONVEYOR; CONTINUED USE OF EXISTING PROCESSING PLANT, STOCKING AREAS, SILT LAGOONS, OFFICE & WELFARE BUILDINGS AND PRIVATE ACCESS ROAD; AND IMPORTATION OF WASTE FOR RESTORATION

AT: MEPAL QUARRY, BLOCK FEN, CB6 2AY

LPA REF: F/2001/16/CM

FOR: AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES UK LTD

The Committee received a planning application that sought permission for the extraction of sand and gravel and clay for landfill cell engineering, as an extension to an existing quarry; field conveyor; continued use of existing processing plant, stocking areas, silt lagoons, office and welfare buildings and private access road; and importation of waste for restoration.

Location and site plans were shown to Members and the significant structures and access routes to the site were highlighted and Members were reminded of the route and views they observed on the site visit. Two other mineral operators, Hanson and Tarmac also had sites in close proximity to the application site and attention was drawn to their location. It was noted that the Hanson quarry was not currently operational, and that the proposed extension covered area that was currently grade 1 and 2 farmland.

It was proposed that Mepal quarry would be extended over 62 hectares of intensively farmed agricultural land that contained 1.9m tonnes of sand and gravel which would be extracted over 6 to 9 years at a rate of between 211,000 and 317,000 tonnes per year.

Attention was drawn to nearby residential properties and their proximity to the proposed extension area. Members noted that during phases 4, 5 and 6 soil storage bunds would be created that would provide visual and acoustic screening. Backfilling of the site would also not take place concurrently during phases 6 and 7 of the development. It was noted that no objection had been received from local residents.

It was noted that the strategic allocation (Core Strategy Policy CS5) had been made taking account of the international designations and the failing nature of the Ouse Washes, where complementary habitat could be provided. The allocated areas, production areas and the restoration area types in the adopted Master Plan were illustrated. Reference was made to a trial wet grassland area, where the Independent Planning Inspector had been taken during the Examination in Public, to demonstrate that the proposed restoration was deliverable. Reference to the difference in the restoration and the potential for inert landfill opportunities in the Hanson and Tarmac quarry areas were also touched upon.

Restoration of the site would be accomplished through the importation of inert waste at a rate of 120,000 – 130,000 cubic metres per year. The restoration would allow approximately 53 hectares of the land to be returned for use as intensively farmed arable land. The remainder would form a 3.6 hectare area of open water body and 2 small water bodies with aquatic marginal vegetation surrounded by wet grassland.

Attention was drawn to the National Planning Policy Framework that stated, where proposed development conflicted with an up-to-date development plan, the application should be refused unless other material considerations indicated otherwise. Members also noted the Block Fen / Langwood Fen Master Plan which conformed to and built upon the proposals set out in the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (MWCS) that identified the Earith / Mepal area as a strategic area for sand and gravel extraction and construction / waste management. There was a requirement within the Master Plan for the application area that it be restored to wet grassland. The application represented a departure from the development plan and in conclusion there were no significant material reasons for which to recommend approval of the application and significantly deviate from the development plan.

Wider matters, including the required upgrade highway works to Block Fen Drove through Policy CS32; the lack of historic environment information to inform the mitigation required through Policy CS36 and the NPPF; the lack of ecological assessment on the southern site required through Policy CS35; and potential impacts in relation to noise on sensitive receptors were also touched upon by the officer as part of the presentation. It was noted that the lack of information in relation to the historic environment and ecology reasons for refusal could be covered by more information, and that with the appropriate use of planning conditions the noise mitigation and upgrade works to the Block Fen Drove highway works were capable of being controlled and delivered if permission was granted. Officers noted that negotiations and discussions had been undertaken with the applicant, but on the basis that the restoration could not be changed to reflect the development plan officers recommended refusal for the reasons set out in the officer report.

In response to Member questions officers:

- Explained that the Ouse Washes were in an unfavorable condition due to the area experiencing high levels of unseasonal flooding which detrimentally affected the grassland and the success of ground nesting birds such as Snipe and Godwit.
- Advised that there was no information on the financial arrangements between the land owner and the site operator.
- Advised that there were more than adequate mineral reserves at other permitted sites in the area, noting that the mineral landbank stood at approximately 18.7 years based on the 10 year rolling average calculation set out in the NPPF which was far in excess of the minimum of 7 years required by national guidance. Furthermore in relation to inert landfill reference was made to the economic downturn meaning waste arisings had been lower than predicted within the Minerals and Waste Plan and that officers were not aware of any immediate problems, noting the potential for inert landfill in the other Block Fen Quarry areas.
- Agreed that measurements in officer reports would contain Imperial Measurements as well as Metric going forward. **ACTION**

Speaking on behalf of Natural England in objection to the application, Janet Nuttall drew attention to the significant departure the application represented from the Council's development plan vision and was not compliant with its policies. By restoring only 6 hectares of land to wetland grassland habitat, the proposal would fail to deliver the benefits for wildlife and people that were originally envisaged, including the provision of habitat to support the Ouse Washes internationally designated site and that of the wider Block Fen. The opportunities for wildlife would not be delivered through a return to intensive arable farmland. Granting planning permission would represent a major deviation from agreed policies across Block Fen and would risk setting a precedent for future mineral applications to disregard the objectives of the Master Plan. Permitting the development would risk undermining the requirement for developers and planning authorities to comply with their legal obligations through the planning process as the application was not compliant with paragraphs 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and would compromise the delivery of the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy, the Ouse Washes Habitat Creation Project and UK Biodiversity Action Plan targets. In conclusion, Janet Nuttall on behalf of Natural England requested that the application be refused unless the applicant will agree to amend the restoration plan so that it accorded with the requirements of the development plan to deliver the objectives of the Block Fen Master Plan.

Speaking in support of the application Kirsten Hannaford-Hill on behalf of Aggregate Industries and Mr Philip Sole, land owner addressed the Committee. Ms Hannaford-Hill drew attention to the benefits of the application and emphasised that it was an established site for mineral extraction that would be well screened. The current site was operated to high environmental standards and Members were assured that any archaeological remains would be mapped, sampled and potentially left in situ. Whilst acknowledging that the application represented a departure from the development plan for the area, Ms Hannaford Hill emphasised the economic benefits of the application that would secure 6 full-time jobs directly at the site and 10 further jobs indirectly through haulage. In conclusion Ms Hannaford-Hill pointed out that in both scenarios the report recognised the implications of both refusal and approval; informed Members that biodiversity at the site

would be encouraged; and hoped Members would see the benefits of the application and approve planning permission.

Mr Sole informed Members that his farm grew and supplied high quality vegetables and had recently constructed a new vegetable processing plant. Mr Sole highlighted the experience he and his family had with regard to land restoration following mineral extraction and estimated that the land could be returned to full production following a period of approximately 5 years. Mr Sole drew attention to the considerable wetgrassland area and wildlife habitat in the area, including approximately the wet grassland area provided for RSPB, concluding that the site could run alongside that habitat successfully.

In response to Member questions:

- Mr Sole confirmed that he was party to the discussions that took place regarding the Master Plan during its development and had raised concerns originally about the amount of land and type of restoration being sought. Mr Sole explained that he had asked at stakeholder meeting to be kept informed of developments but the Council had not done so and he had expected a representative to visit him but that did not happen.
- Officers clarified the application area within the context of the existing permission area, noting that the area discussed by the landowner related to the original application area and was outside the scope of this planning application. If the application area was not restored to wet grassland it would fragment the area of wet grassland that could be created.
- Mr Sole confirmed that he had no further engagement with the planning authority regarding the Master Plan for the area following initial discussions despite the farm land covering 2m tonnes of aggregates and having a commercial relationship with the companies carrying out the mineral extraction.

Speaking in objection to the application Mrs Amy Crossley representing the RSPB and Wildlife Trust welcomed the comprehensive officer report and supported the recommendation to refuse planning permission. The applicant's proposed restoration scheme to a largely arable use threatened key strategic objectives of the Master Plan for the area, in particular the creation of a 48 hectare block of lowland wet grassland, which had ramifications for the vision as a whole. The central location of the application area would fragment the block as a whole, isolate the proposed area of wet grassland that Mick George Ltd had committed to provide to the west of the application site and severely compromise the potential of habitat created to support Ouse Washes species, and so to function as enhancement habitat as the Master Plan intended. The application was the first significant application since the formal adoption of the Master Plan, therefore granting permission for the application would set a precedent that could cause the failure of the Master Plan vision. Mrs Crossley drew attention to the conservation of high quality peat soils that provided climate change mitigation and the provision of new recreational opportunities that were threatened by the application. The RSPB and the Wildlife Trust considered that the justification the applicant presented to depart from the Master Plan rested on a poorly evidenced argument that suggested the greater profitability of arable farming should be reason to depart from adopted minerals policy. The justification was a flawed interpretation of local and national planning policy. In conclusion Mrs Crossley urged Members to refuse the application and to uphold the positive minerals and waste plan.

In response to Member questions:

- It was explained that following the preliminary consultation the applicant was invited to amend the proposed restoration scheme and the application before Members for consideration was the amended version. Fragmentation of the area severely compromised the ability of species to succeed in the area.
- Confirmed that the land when restored to the requirements set out in the Master Plan would be for agricultural use (pasture for grazing), just not intensive arable use.

Local Members Councillors Dupre and Gowing were unable to attend the meeting but asked that their comments be relayed to the Committee.

Councillor Dupre supported the representations made by Mepal and Sutton Parish Councils. Should planning permission be granted, she requested that routing agreements be required to ensure that HCV traffic used the Council's advisory freight routes and did not pass through Sutton.

The Chairman confirmed that Councillor Gowing supported the officer recommendation of refusal.

During the course of discussion Members:

- Drew attention to the comments of Mepal Parish Council contained within the officer report stating that there was no reason presented for which to go against the Master Plan for the area; to do so would set a poor precedent.
- Expressed concern that the landowner had failed to participate in the process that developed the Master Plan.
- Emphasised the benefits of the Master Plan to be able to support.
- Expressed concern that it would not be possible to restore the site to as good a standard as it was presently.
- Drew attention to the Master Plan and the basis that it was written for the restoration of the area.

Councillor Bradnam, seconded by Councillor Harford proposed with the agreement of Members that the officer recommendation be put to the vote. On being put to the vote, planning permission was unanimously refused, for the reasons set out in Appendix A.

Following the conclusion of the item the Chairman adjourned the meeting for 10 minutes, during which time Councillor Hunt left the meeting and was able to return to the meeting before the start of the next agenda item.

10. ERECTION OF TWO TEMPORARY MOBILE CLASSROOMS FOR A TEMPORARY PERIOD OF FIVE YEARS UNTIL 31 AUGUST 2022 AND ASSOCIATED WORKS INCLUDING RELOCATION OF EXISTING SHED

AT: SPRING COMMON ACADEMY, AMERICAN LANE, HUNTINGDON, PE29 1TQ

LPA REF: H/5013/17/CC

FOR: CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

The Committee received a planning application for the erection of two temporary mobile classrooms for a temporary period of five years and associated works that included the relocation of an existing shed. Colleagues from the Transport Assessment Team were introduced, in case Members had any specific transport questions.

The location of site, American Lane and California Road were highlighted to Members together with the nearby Butts Grove car park approximately 0.3km away. Members noted that of the 2 representations received on the application, only the location of one was known.

The proposed siting of the temporary classrooms was shown together with photographs and elevation drawings that showed various views of the site. Members noted that some trees affected by the application would be re-located, along with gym equipment and a poly-tunnel using permitted development rights.

Speaking in support of the application on behalf of the applicant, Mr David Fletcher drew attention to the school's urgent need for the additional accommodation in order to meet increasing pupil demand. Mr Fletcher emphasised the work undertaken by the applicants to address the objections raised in respect of parking. An annual license from Huntingdonshire District Council had been secured that provided the Academy with six car parking spaces at the nearby Butts Grove Centre.

Local Member, Councillor Tom Sanderson addressed the Committee. Although supportive of the expansion of the school, Councillor Sanderson expressed concerns regarding car parking at the site and suggested that the school boundary fence be moved closer to the road in order to provide additional car parking at the school. Councillor Sanderson also raised concerns regarding the availability of car parking at the nearby Butts Grove Centre.

A Member clarified that Councillor Sanderson believed that it was not clear how the provision of 6 car parking spaces at the Butts Grove Centre would be accommodated.

Councillor Kindersley proposed, seconded by Councillor Harford that the officer recommendation be put to the vote. On being put to the vote it was unanimously resolved to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in appendix B to these minutes.

11. ERECTION OF 7-BAY MOBILE CLASSROOM BUILDING WITH ACCESS RAMP FOR A TEMPORARY PERIOD UNTIL 31ST AUGUST 2022

**AT: BASSINGBOURN COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL, BROOK ROAD,
BASSINGBOURN, SG8 5NP**

LPA REF: S/0234/17/CC

FOR: CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

The Committee was presented a planning application for the erection of a 7-bay mobile classroom building with an access ramp for a temporary period until 31st August 2022 at Bassingbourn Community Primary School, Bassingbourn.

Members noted the submission of a late representation in support of the application from Dr Whitely.

The site location and the location of Bassingbourn Barracks in relation to the site were illustrated to Members together with views of the proposed location of the temporary classrooms and elevational drawings.

Ian Davis speaking on behalf of the applicant in support of the application drew attention to the amount of work undertaken by all parties involved in the application to address issues raised in the consultation. The proposal was consistent with all national and local policies and the initial objections by the 2 statutory consultees (Sport England and the Transport Assessment Team) have been withdrawn. The re-opening of Bassingbourn Barracks had driven an acute need for additional accommodation at the school with up to an additional 90 children that could not be accommodated. Mr Davis acknowledged the traffic issues at the school, but it was an issue common to all schools and the Highways Authority was satisfied with the impact. The school had an active travel plan and this would be monitored and reviewed, alongside the additional provision for cycle parking that was proposed.

Members clarified the status of the route school children would walk to school. Area Education Officer, Rob Lewis informed Members that a route review was undertaken in 2011 and following an appeal it was determined that the route met the criteria as an available route. It was confirmed that there was a public footpath along the route that was well lit.

Local Member, Councillor Susan van de Ven was unable to attend the meeting, therefore the Chairman read out a statement on her behalf that emphasised the urgent need for the additional accommodation at the school as conditions were cramped and unsuitable. Councillor van de Ven acknowledged the concerns regarding traffic due to problematic car parking issues at the school and drew attention to the array of measures being developed by the school to mitigate the problem. In conclusion, Councillor van de Ven urged the Committee to provide improved teaching and learning conditions by supporting the planning application.

Councillor Kindersley, seconded by Councillor Bradnam proposed with the agreement of Members that the officer recommendation be put to the vote.

It was resolved unanimously to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in appendix C to these minutes.

12. ENFORCEMENT UPDATE REPORT

Members received the enforcement update report for the period 1 April 2017 to 31 July 2017 (noting that the dates on the front of the report were incorrect, but the rest were correct). A number of updates regarding ongoing enforcement action contained within the report were relayed to Members including:

- Plasgran, Manea Road. A planning application had now been received and was currently undergoing the validation process.
- Land known as “Asgard”/Field 6184, Little Downham. Discussions had begun with Counsel regarding whether the activities taking place at the site could be viewed cumulatively. Further discussions were scheduled to take place with Counsel and senior management. A further update would be provided to the Committee following the outcome of the discussions.
- Land at Warboys Airfield Industrial Estate. Photographs had been received that showed significant progress in the removal of waste electrical and electronic equipment.
- Barrington Quarry. There had been no breaches of condition regarding vibrations and following a change in the train operator there had been no early morning or late night trains. The situation would be kept under review, but it was hoped that this was now resolved.
- Earl Woodwaste, Benwick Road, Whittlesey. Overnight and early morning monitoring of the site had been undertaken and evidence obtained for the issuing of formal notices. A further update to Members would be provided once action had been taken.

During discussion of the report:

- Members noted that the fire that took place at the Amey Cespa recycling facility at Waterbeach was outside of the site inspection remit undertaken by the Council and that the Fire Service alongside the Environment Agency had been involved in this incident.
- Officers agreed to provide a briefing for Local Members regarding paragraph 11 of the officer report that would provide an update following the meeting with senior management and LGSS Law, noting the Counsel advice, scheduled to take place on 20th September 2017. **ACTION**
- Members noted the introduction of Sandra Bucci as a new officer to the Monitoring and Enforcement Team and expressed thanks to Enforcement Officers for their work.
- Members confirmed that communication took place with Parish Councils regarding enforcement action in their Parishes prior to the update report and local members are informed at key stages of the investigation.

13. SUMMARY OF DECISIONS MADE UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

It was requested by Members that the Scheme of Delegations be reviewed as the two applications for temporary school classrooms appeared to be relatively uncontentious and perhaps should have been dealt with under delegated powers. Officers agreed to review the Scheme of Delegations.

It was resolved to note the decisions made under delegated powers.

Chairman

Appendix A

1. It is a strategic objective of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2011) that enhancement habitat will be created adjacent to the Ouse Washes through mineral extraction and restoration (policies CS1, CS2 and CS3). The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals Waste Development Plan Block Fen / Langwood Fen Master Plan Supplementary Planning Document (adopted July 2011) provides a more detailed land use planning framework for mineral and waste development in the Earith / Mepal area and shows the proposed quarry extension area as being restored to complementary Ouse Washes habitat.

The application is for 52.9 hectares (91%) of the proposed extension area to be restored to arable agricultural land and 5.3 hectares (9%) to wet grassland. This is contrary to policies CS1, CS2 and CS3 in that it will not deliver one of the strategic objectives of the Development Plan within the proposed quarry extension area. The size of the proposed quarry extension area and its location at the centre of the land identified for complementary Ouse Washes habitat would significantly reduce the benefits of creating complementary Ouse Washes habitat on adjacent land and would make the Master Plan undeliverable in that respect.

2. Policy CS25 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2011) states that where restoration could assist or achieve the creation of priority habitats and / or Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Biodiversity Action Plan targets the relevant biodiversity afteruse must be incorporated within the restoration scheme. The restoration of the proposed quarry extension area could create 58.2 hectares of complementary Ouse Washes habitat but the proposed scheme would deliver only 5.3 hectares. This is contrary to policy CS25 and paragraphs 109 and 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).
3. The applicant has not provided sufficient information to determine the character, extent and significance of the archaeological interest of the proposed extension area and to inform appropriate strategies to mitigate the impact of the development. Without this information it is possible that undesignated heritage assets could be harmed by the proposed development. For these reasons the application does not comply with policy CS36 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2011), policy LP18 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014) and policy ENV 14 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (adopted April 2015) and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).
4. The applicant has not provided sufficient information to establish the impact of the proposed development on all of the application site particularly the Sutton and Mepal Pumping Station Drains County Wildlife Site and any protected species that may inhabit it. Without this information it is possible that the features of the Sutton and Mepal Pumping Station Drains County Wildlife Site and / or protected species could be harmed by the proposed development. For these reasons the application does not comply with policy CS35 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2011), policies LP16 (b) and LP19 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014) and policy ENV 7 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan

(adopted April 2015) or with ODPM Circular 06/2005: *Biodiversity and geological conservation – statutory obligations and their impact within the planning system.*

Appendix B

1. Time Limit for Two 7 Bay Mobile Classroom Buildings

The two 7 Bay mobile classroom buildings hereby permitted shall be granted permission for a limited period and shall expire and the mobile classrooms and all associated access ramps and steps be removed from the site by 31st August 2022, or upon the provision of permanent accommodation, whichever is the sooner. Within 1 month of the removal of the mobile classrooms, the land shall be restored to its former condition i.e. amenity grassland.

Reason: To limit the development to that applied for and to avoid any unnecessary long-term impact by requiring removal of the development when it is no longer necessary and the satisfactory restoration of the site in accordance with policy En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995).

2. Approved Plans and Documents

The retention of the mobile classrooms hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the planning application dated 15 June 2017 and the following drawings documents and as amended by the documents listed below (received 26 May 2017 unless otherwise stated) and the following conditions:

Name/Number	Description/Date
5156243-ATK-Z1-00-DR-A-4010 Rev PL2	Location Plan dated 14.06.17 received 15.06.17
5156243-ATK-EXT-ZZ-DR-L-0001 Rev P1	External General Arrangement Plan KS1 Temporary Classroom Layout dated 24.05.17
5156243-ATK-EXT-ZZ-DR-L-0001 Rev P1	External General Arrangement Plan KS4 Temporary Classroom Layout dated 24.05.17
5156243-ATK-EXT-ZZ-DR-L-0003 Rev P1	General Arrangement Plan KS1 Temporary Classroom Layout dated 24.05.17
5156243-ATK-EXT-ZZ-DR-L-0004 Rev P1	External General Arrangement Plan Overall site layout dated 24.05.17
5156243-ATK-Z1-GF-DR-A-4100 Rev PL1	Key Stage 1 Modular Building Proposed Ground Floor Plan dated 23/05/17
5156243-ATK-Z1-GF-DR-A-4101 Rev PL1	Key Stage 4 Modular Building Proposed Ground Floor Plan dated 23/05/17
5156243-ATK-Z1-GF-DR-A-4150 Rev PL1	Key Stage 1 Modular

	Building Proposed Elevations dated 23/05/17
5156243-ATK-Z1-GF-DR-A-4151 Rev PL1	Key Stage 4 Modular Building Proposed Elevations dated 23/05/17
5156243-ATK-BHM-ARB001	Tree Protection Plan Sheet 1 of 2 dated 22/05/17
5156243-ATK-BHM-ARB002	Tree Protection Plan Sheet 2 of 2 dated 22/05/17
2017 Spring Common Academy School Travel Plan	Received 22.08.17

Reason: To define the site and protect the character and appearance of the locality in accordance with policies En20, En22, En24 and En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995)

3 **Travel Plan**

Within 3 months of the date of this decision an updated Travel Plan which shall take into account the use of parking spaces at the Butts Grove Centre and include measurable actions and/or targets and a specified implementation timetable shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Upon approval of the revised Travel Plan, it shall be implemented in its entirety in accordance with the approved timetable, throughout the life of this planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity, and the safe and efficient operation of the highway in accordance with Policy H30 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995).

4 **School Term Time construction Delivery Construction Hours**

No construction related dispatches from or construction deliveries to the site shall take place other than between the hours of 09:30 and 15:30 on Monday to Friday and 09:30 and 13:30 on Saturdays. No construction works or construction collection / construction deliveries shall take place on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residential properties and ensure the environmental impact of construction of the development is adequately mitigated in accordance with Policy H30 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995).

Hours of use of mobile classrooms

- The mobile classrooms hereby permitted shall only be used between the hours of 0800 and 1800 each day on Mondays to Fridays inclusive. They shall not be used outside of these times or on Saturdays, Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy H30 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995).

6. **Landscaping Implementation**

The approved landscaping scheme shown on drawings numbered 5156243-ATK-EXT-ZZ-DR-L-0001 Rev P1 and titled External General Arrangement Plan KS1 Temporary Classroom Layout and External General Arrangement Plan KS4 Temporary Classroom Layout; and on drawing number 5156243-ATK-EXT-ZZ-DR-L-0003 Rev P1 and titled General Arrangement Plan KS1 Temporary Classroom Layout shall be implemented in its entirety during the first planting season (October to March) following the substantial completion of the development.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of visual amenity biodiversity in accordance with Policies En20 and En22 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995).

7 **Replacement of Trees and shrubs**

If within a period of five years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub that tree or shrub, or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes, in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place during the first available planting season following the removal, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests Visual amenity and biodiversity in accordance with Policies En20 and En22 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (1995).

Informatives

The Provision of six parking spaces at the Buttsgrove centre

In considering this planning application it has been taken into consideration that the County Council has made a separate application to Huntingdonshire District Council for a licence which will secure six parking spaces at the Buttsgrove Centre and that these spaces are to be made available for the five year life of this planning permission for the use of the staff at the academy to enable the six additional staff that are expected to result from this planning permission to be provided for taking into account the on-street parking concerns.

Highways Development Management Informative

The County Council's Development Management Team has advised that all storage and manoeuvres associated with the construction of this project will need to be restricted to the site and should not take place within the highway.

Compliance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework

In accordance with paragraphs 186 & 187 of the NPPF, the County Planning Authority has worked proactively with the agent, and consultees to ensure that the proposed development is acceptable in planning terms. This has resulted in a separate commitment being made by the County Council to secure six off-site parking spaces at the Butts Grove Centre to ensure that this proposal is not likely to result in any increase in on-street parking within the vicinity of the school.

Appendix C

1. Time Limit for 7-Bay Mobile Classroom Building

The 7-bay mobile classroom hereby permitted shall be for a limited period and shall expire and the mobile classroom and all associated access ramps and steps be removed from the site by 31st August 2022, or upon the provision of permanent accommodation, whichever is the sooner. Within 1 month of the removal of the mobile classroom, the land shall be restored to its former condition i.e. grass.

Reason: To limit the development to that applied for and to avoid any unnecessary long-term impact by requiring removal of the development when it is no longer necessary and the satisfactory restoration of the site in accordance with policy DP/3 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (July 2007).

2. Approved Plans and Documents

The retention of the 7-bay mobile classroom hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the planning application dated 28 April 2017 and the following drawings documents and as amended by the documents listed below (received 28 April 2017 unless otherwise stated) and the following conditions:

Name/Number	Description
Mc77-LP-001-EX	Mobile Classroom Location Plan Existing dated Mar 17, received 5 May 17
Mc77-SP-00-PR	Mobile Classroom Site Plan Proposed dated Mar 17, received 5 May 17
Mb651p-01-000	7 bay Modular Classroom Building Number 651 Plan (Floor Plan) dated Mar 17
Mb651p-01-000	7 bay Modular Classroom Building Number 651 Plan (Elevations) dated Mar 17
Revised Documents:-	
Bassingbourn Primary School Transport Statement August 2017 Rev B	Received 11 Aug 17
Bassingbourn Primary School, Travel Plan August 2017 Rev C	Received 18 Aug 17

Reason: To define the site and protect the character and appearance of the locality in accordance with policies DP/1, DP/2 and DP/3 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (July 2007).

3. **Travel plan implementation**

The mobile classroom hereby permitted shall not be used other than in accordance with the full implementation of the School Travel Plan August 2017 received 18 August 2017 and any subsequent amendments resulting from the monitoring and review process which shall have been previously submitted to and agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, residential amenity and sustainability in accordance with Policies TR/1, TR/2 and TR/3 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (July 2007).

4. **Additional Cycle/Scooter Parking Provision**

Within 9 months of the date of this decision full details of the position and design of no less than 10 covered two wheeled parking spaces for cycle and /or scooters shall be submitted in writing to the County Planning Authority for its written approval. The approved two wheeled cycle and or scooter parking provision shall be implemented in its entirety in accordance with the approved details within 3 months of their approval in writing by the County Planning Authority and thereafter retained together with the 40 existing cycle parking spaces throughout the duration of this permission.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, residential amenity and sustainability in accordance with Policy TR/3 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (July 2007).

Compliance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework

In accordance with paragraphs 186 & 187 of the NPPF, the County Planning Authority has worked proactively with the applicant, consultees and a representor to ensure that the proposed development is acceptable in planning terms. This has resulted in 10 additional two wheeled parking spaces being proposed and the withdrawal of a holding objection by the Transport Assessment Team, which has enabled the conditional grant of permission to be recommended.