

PLANNING COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday 10th March 2016

Time: 10.00am – 11.35am

Place: Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillors P Ashcroft, B Ashwood, D Connor, L Harford, W Hunt, A Lay, M Loynes, M Mason, P Sales and M Smith

In attendance: Councillors C Boden, R Butcher and R Henson

168. APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councilors Scutt (Councillor Sales substituting) and Kindersley.

There were no declarations of interest.

Councillors Ashwood and Loynes declared non-pecuniary interests as members of the Joint Development Control Committee – Southern Fringes in relation to item 170; Councillor Harford declared an interest as a substitute member on the same Committee.

169. MINUTES – 11TH FEBRUARY 2016

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 11th February 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

A written update had been tabled on matters raised at previous meetings, and likely items for the next Committee meeting.

170. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD DELEGATIONS

The Committee received a report which provided clarification of the delegations that had been made by full Council to the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board in December 2014, including those delegations relevant to the County Council's Planning Committee. The Greater Cambridge City Deal covers the administrative areas of Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils. The original delegations were effectively a 'blanket' delegation of powers to City Deal, but officers and legal representatives felt that it would be helpful to clarify the detail of the delegations.

Members noted the functions delegated to the City Deal, and the specific delegation for Planning Committee was the Granting of Planning Consent. This related only to specific City Deal infrastructure schemes, and the proposal was that those decisions were delegated to the existing Cambridge Fringes Joint Development Control Committee, and that the Terms of Reference for that Committee should be amended accordingly, especially as City Deal schemes could be anywhere in the City Council and South Cambridgeshire area i.e. not restricted to the existing geographic area defined as "Cambridge Fringes". The report provided a definition of what constituted a "City Deal Infrastructure Scheme", and the processes and proposed way of managing that consent.

A Member sought clarification of what would happen if the schemes or delegated powers failed to materialise – how could the County Council regain its powers? The Executive Director advised that the delegation had already been made by full Council, and it was within the gift of full Council to reclaim powers. If the City Deal Board ceased to exist, the powers would revert to the relevant authority.

A Member observed that there had been some discussion on the general procedure with respect to the City Deal and Joint Development Control Committees (JDCCs), with reference to the virtual disbandment of Northstowe Section 101 Committee, which had left the whole planning situation at Northstowe in abeyance. Members had been advised that because the District Council had virtually unilaterally withdrawn from the Northstowe Committee, the functions of that Committee dissolved legally. The Executive Director confirmed that the Northstowe JDCC required two parties, and if one party pulled out, the Committee could not exist in the form it was constituted. Likewise if the Cambridge Fringes JDCC ceased to exist, the County Council could seek to take those powers back.

A Member asked where Local Members fitted in to the process. The Executive Director advised that there had been significant debate about Local Member involvement and consultation issues at Economy & Environment (E&E) and Highways & Community Infrastructure (H&CI) Committees, which had also delegated functions to the City Deal. The Board had established a protocol: essentially, the statutory responsibility to consult fully transferred from County Council to the City Deal Board, and this included the duty to consult with Local Members. It was noted that the H&CI Committee had made a specific amendment to the recommendation regarding consultation, which would be circulated to the Committee, for information. **ACTION: Clerk to email Planning Committee Members the H&CI Decision Summary.**

A Member outlined the history of planning decisions in local government, and how he saw the principles of accountable decision making being undermined by the City Deal. He felt that the processes had been rushed in to meet government conditions relating to the City Deal funding, but there was no real accountability within the system, and the delegations were a retrograde step. He also expressed concerns about potential conflicts of interest from officers representing the County Council, City Deal and other authorities, both in City Deal and other partnerships/shared service arrangements.

A Member observed that the only relevant matter for the Planning Committee was the granting of planning consent to the Fringes JDCC, which included County Councillors who were Local Members. Another Member supported those comments, pointing out that the JDCC comprised County, City and District Councillors from the City Deal area, and it was not attempting to take away Planning Committee responsibilities. Other Members agreed that these decisions should be made by Local Members on the JDCC.

It was resolved, by a majority, to:

endorse and propose to Council that the responsibility for considering planning applications for City Deal infrastructure schemes is delegated to the Fringes Joint Development Control Committee and that the Terms of Reference of the Cambridge Fringes Joint Development Control Committee are amended accordingly.

171. APPLICATION UNDER REGULATION 3 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING GENERAL REGULATIONS 1992 FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A SINGLE CARRIAGEWAY ROAD SOUTH OF THE EXISTING A605 (PETERBOROUGH ROAD) FROM A POINT 480 METRES WEST TO 435 METRES EAST OF THE CURRENT KING'S DYKE LEVEL CROSSING PASSING SOUTH OF THE COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES TAKING THE NEW A605 ROAD OVER THE RAIL LINE ON A BRIDGE, ALSO INCLUDING TWO NEW 3 ARM ROUNDABOUT JUNCTIONS (ONE WITH FUNTHAM'S LANE AND ONE WITH THE BRICKWORKS ACCESS), TWO UNDERPASSES MAINTAINING PRIVATE ACCESS REQUIREMENTS, A SHARED FOOTWAY/CYCLEWAY ALONG THE FULL LENGTH OF THE LINK ROAD, TWO SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE/SOAKAGE PONDS, A SURFACE WATER ATTENUATION DITCH, STREET LIGHTING, SAFETY FENCING, SIGNAGE, LANDSCAPING/PLANTING, A SITE COMPOUND AND A TEMPORARY ACCESS TO THE BRICKWORKS

AT: LAND TO THE SOUTH OF THE A605 (PETERBOROUGH ROAD) FROM A POINT 480 METRES WEST TO 435 METRES EAST OF THE KING'S DYKE LEVEL CROSSING

APPLICANT: CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY)

LPA NO: F/2010/15/CC

The Committee considered an application for a single carriageway bypass and bridge to replace the King's Dyke Level Crossing, including the construction of two roundabouts, a bridge, plus associated lighting, landscaping, drainage, etc, to alleviate congestion on A605 between Peterborough and Whittlesey. The proposal included two underpasses, one for the riding school to access their paddocks which would be the other side of the bypass.

Members noted the location of domestic properties, businesses and industrial units, also the large distribution centre to the north of the current road. Members visited the site on 9th March, and witnessed the problems at that location in terms of congestion and difficulty for vehicles and pedestrians crossing at the level crossing.

The outcome of consultations, planning policies, planning history and land use planning considerations were all taken into account. Plans and aerial photos were shown, illustrating the location and various elements of the site, in relation to the planned development and existing highway network and properties. They also noted the Applicant's visualisations, including access to properties and businesses, and of the scheme from the footpath south of the King's Dyke watercourse. Officers advised that there were a number of detailed highway design matters that would need to be worked up to overcome the departures from highway design standards. It was clarified that the footway/cycleway was two metres wide and only on one side, on the inner, northern curve.

There were representations from businesses who supported the proposals and also representations from local residents, some of whom raised design and operational issues that could be addressed through the detailed highway design; a number had raised the visual impact of the proposed bypass, which would be mitigated as far as possible in the landscape planting scheme.

A Member thanked officers for their excellent presentation. He asked about the screening which was proposed temporarily until the vegetation matured, to ensure that headlights did not shine into properties, and the planting scheme, specifically the reference to "*the detailed scheme shall include the locations of hibernacula and log piles and the location and spacing of trees and shrubs*". Officers confirmed that a comprehensive landscaping scheme was proposed, but that these detailed proposals had not yet been developed. The scheme would include native species, endorsed by the wildlife officers and the County Council's ecologist. The Applicant would need to determine where the glare problems were, and erect a suitable

temporary artificial barrier. It was suggested that the biodiversity enhancement areas needed to be maintained by individuals who understood ecological issues. Officers advised that Condition 8 required a series of updated ecological surveys and measures to reduce dust and noise, and the requirement to protect trees through the construction phase. Councillor Lay indicated that he would like to be involved in the selection of the trees as part of the landscape planting.

A Member queried whether the span of the bridge was sufficient to cover four railway lines if Network Rail chose to increase the capacity of the line. The Applicant confirmed that it would not.

A Member asked if the position of Network Rail was known with regard to the existing crossing and Control Box. It was confirmed that the understanding was that these would be removed completely. Officers highlighted Section 4.13 of the report, which confirmed that the intention for the existing crossing to be removed, and that there would be no replacement pedestrian facility on the crossing.

A Member noted that the report suggested that the headlights would lead to a loss of amenity to relatively few people, but pointed out that this could have quite a detrimental effect on those individuals. It was noted that more mature trees in the planting scheme was not a viable option, as they would need to be more widely spaced and require greater maintenance than saplings. Moreover, dense, fast growing, low vegetation was more appropriate to stop the glare. This issue was being addressed by the temporary barrier, and the Applicant would need to establish the height of lights and therefore the required height and extent of the barrier.

A Member suggested that the footway/cycleway should be increased from two to three metres, and ideally provided on both sides of the carriageway. It was noted that that point had been raised by Peterborough City Council as the neighbouring local highway authority, but it had been acknowledged that it did not breach any kind of standard and they had no objections to this application.

A Member asked if, given the proximity of the development to the most important archaeological excavation in the country, what would happen if archaeological remains were discovered when work commenced? Officers advised that there was a fairly low risk of this happening, as most of the site had already been assessed and was previously developed land. Since the archaeological assessment took place the scheme layout had changed to include a small area of extra land. Archaeological investigation of this land can be secured by planning condition.

Sarah Wallis (Atkins), Andy Brand (Abbey Group, who own a lot of the land south of the railway line), Tim Watkins (Cambridgeshire County Council) and Richard *Bensley* spoke on behalf of, and in support of the applicant. They welcomed the report recommendations. Mr Brand explained that his company's site comprised industrial units and offices, the main tenant being Asda, who operate a distribution centre at this location: 200 people were employed at the distribution centre, and this would be increasing to 225. Abbey Group also employed 50 people at the location. Both Asda and the Abbey Group supported the proposal, and the consultation indicated that the majority of people support the new road. The proposal had been carefully assessed, and it would provide benefits to the people of Whittlesey, with a limited environmental impact.

In response to a Member question, the Applicant's representatives confirmed that the bridge was not wide enough to span four railway tracks, if Network Rail chose to expand the tracks from two to four at that location. However, the applicant was working in partnership with

Network Rail, who support the scheme as proposed. Network Rail was seeking to improve the capacity of the line, mainly through electrification of railway line and reducing the number of level crossings on this route. Increasing the span of the bridge would increase the cost of the scheme significantly, and would not be affordable. Capacity of the rail network was an issue for Network Rail.

A Member commented that there was not much information with regard to drainage, and asked how much consultation there had been with the Middle Level Commissioners and the Internal Drainage Board (IDB). He believed additional bunding would be needed with regard to the infiltration ponds, and he was concerned that he had not seen the detailed design in the Red Line (application) area. Richard Bensley confirmed that he had been talking to the IDB about the section to the south. Water would be collected in gullies to a low spot, and there would be a new ditch southwards, going underneath King's Dyke initially. There had been regular meetings with the IDB, and the run off would not overload the system, as it was designed to attenuate to the greenfield run off rate. It was also clarified that the impact of climate change had been taken into consideration when developing the drainage proposals, and the very worst case scenario had been used. Infiltration basins were being used rather than balancing ponds, as these hold water until it soaks into the ground.

Councillor Henson spoke as a Member representing an adjacent Division, with the Chairman's prior permission. He thanked the Chairman for letting him speak, and also for allowing him to attend the site visit on 9th March. He stressed the importance of the crossing being closed. He felt that the scheme as proposed was inadequate, and the bypass should be a dual carriageway, and he suggested that the scheme should be reevaluated. He outlined the problems caused by congestion due to the volumes of traffic on the road, and the number of local businesses that used this road. He confirmed that he was in favour of the scheme, but felt it was inadequate for current and future needs.

Councillor Butcher spoke as Local Member. He expressed disappointment that the scheme had taken so long to reach the planning stage. He addressed some of the issues raised by Members:

- Network Rail have a fifty year plan for the route, including plans to close as many level crossings as possible. To his knowledge, Network Rail were not planning to increase the number of railway lines, as this would require many other engineering schemes to roads and bridges to allow four lines through;
- Outlined his work on and with local IDBs, and explained that he was happy with the proposed drainage schemes, especially as there was no history of drainage being a problem at this location;
- Whilst preferring a wider footway/cycleway, he advised that most cyclists used the "Green Wheel", an off road cycleway between Whittlesey and Peterborough on the embankment;
- Noting the comment by Fenland District Council about being "detrimental to industry", he believed this related to the land next to the riding school. He felt that this was not significant, as there were many opportunities for industrial development in that area;
- Making the A605 a dual carriageway for this short section of bypass, when the rest was single carriageway, would lead to bottlenecks;

Councillor Butcher concluded by welcoming the officers' recommendations. The Chairman thanked Councillors Butcher and Henson for their comments.

With regard to a Member question on the lack of response from the IDB, officers explained that the Middle Level Commissioners who provide the IDB with technical advice did not have the resources to respond on every planning application.

A Member welcomed the officers' recommendations and the Local Member's comments. She suggested that it was unhelpful to put up obstacles, the need was great and the problem needed to be addressed. Allocation of resources should be prioritised to enable the scheme to come forward as quickly as possible. A number of other Members expressed their support for these comments.

A Member asked for a clearer definition on Condition 20, specifically whether the applicant needed to enter into legal agreement about the drainage part of this agreement, and who would adopt and maintain drainage.

It was resolved unanimously:

That planning permission is granted, subject to the applicant giving a written and binding commitment that all amendments to existing Traffic Regulation Orders and new Traffic Regulation Orders will be active from commencement of use, and the conditions set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes.

172. SUMMARY OF DECISIONS MADE UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

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

173. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: THURSDAY 14th APRIL 2016

Chairman

It is recommended that planning permission be granted under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, subject to the applicant giving a written and binding commitment that all amendments to existing Traffic Regulation Orders and new Traffic Regulation Orders will be active from commencement of use, and the following conditions:

Implementation

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Approved Plans

2. The development hereby permitted shall not proceed except in accordance with the details set out in the submitted application and supporting documents and the following drawings unless amended by revisions resulting from compliance with the conditions below:

- 5040171/HW/PL/012 Rev C Location Plan dated Dec 09, 2015
- 5040171/HW/PL/002 Rev C General Arrangement dated Nov 26, 2015
- 5040171/HW/PL/003 Rev D Proposed Alignment Typical Cross Section and Long Section dated Dec 09, 2015
- 5040171/HW/PL/005 Rev E Drainage Layout dated Dec 09, 2015
- 5040171/HW/PL/011 Rev A Site Access and Compounds dated Nov 26, 2015
- 5040171/HW/PL/017 Rev A Outline Environmental Design Sheet 1 dated 20/11/15
- 5040171/HW/PL/018 Rev A Outline Environmental Design Sheet 2 dated 20/11/15
- 5040171/HW/PL/019 Rev A Outline Environmental Design Sheet 3 dated 20/11/15
- 5040171/HW/PL/020 Rev A Outline Environmental Design Section Elevations A-C dated 20/11/15
- 5040171/HW/PL/021 Rev A Outline Environmental Design Section Elevations D-E dated 20/11/15

Reason: To define the permission and to protect the character and appearance of the locality in accordance with policies LP15 and LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014)

Highway design

3. No development shall commence until a scheme that restricts vehicular access along the severed A605 alignment north of the Kings Dyke Level Crossing has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include fencing, gates, street lighting, signage and lines as appropriate. The approved scheme shall be completed prior to the commencement of first use of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To prevent unauthorised access/parking along a public highway in accordance with policy LP15 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014). This affects the design of the scheme so needs to be approved before development commences.

4. No development shall commence until full details of the highway construction, road markings, signage and street lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The street lighting details shall include the measures set out in section 4.5.3 of the Ecological Impact Assessment dated December 2015. The

development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory measures are employed to address any highway safety issues resulting from any Relaxations or Departures in Standard in accordance with policies LP15 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014). To minimise the impact of the development on bats in accordance with policies LP16 and LP19 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014). This affects the design of the scheme so needs to be approved before development commences.

5. No development shall commence until details of maintenance bays on the proposed east and west roundabouts have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To provide safe access in order to maintain the new roundabout infrastructure in accordance with policy LP15 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014). This affects the design of the scheme so needs to be approved before development commences.

6. No development shall commence until a scheme detailing the footways and access for Funtham's Lane realignment and Peterborough Road realignment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be completed prior to the commencement of first use of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To provide safe pedestrian access and satisfactory realignment of Peterborough Road/Funtham's Lane in accordance with policy LP15 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014). This affects the design of the scheme so needs to be approved before development commences.

7. No development shall commence until any Relaxations and Departures in Standard remaining, following detailed scheme design, have been the subject of a detailed exception report which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy LP15 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014). This affects the design of the scheme so needs to be approved before development commences.

Construction Environmental Management Plan

8. No development shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include but not be limited to:

- re-surveys of trees for bats
- Precautionary Method of Working to minimise the risk of harm and disturbance to reptiles
- Great Crested Newt surveys at waterbodies shown as DP1 and DP4 on Figure F-1 Waterbodies of the Ecological Impact Assessment dated December 2015
- re-survey for badgers
- re-survey for water voles in the ditch shown as D1 on Figure F-1 Waterbodies of the Ecological Impact Assessment dated December 2015
- measures to protect nesting birds

- mitigation of dust
- mitigation of noise and vibration
- a timetable for survey work
- a programme of implementation

The approved plan shall be complied with at all times during the construction phase.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers in accordance with policies LP16 and LP19 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014). The CEMP relates to the construction phase so must be in place before the development starts.

9. No removal of hedgerows or trees shall take place between 1 March and 31 August inclusive unless a competent ecologist has undertaken:

- a detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before vegetation is cleared; and
- provided written confirmation to the County Planning Authority prior to the removal of any vegetation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site.

Reason: To protect breeding birds in accordance with policies LP16 and LP19 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014).

10. Except for the works set out in paragraph 2.2.7 of the Noise Impact Assessment dated December 2015 carried out under Network Rail possessions, no construction work or collections from or deliveries to the site shall take place other than between the hours of:

0700 to 1900 on Mondays to Fridays; and
0800 to 1300 on Saturdays.

Additionally, no construction work or collections from or deliveries to the site shall take place on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the amenity of nearby residents/occupiers in accordance with policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014).

Contaminated land

11. No development shall commence until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority:

- 1) A site investigation scheme, based on the Tier 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment summarised in the Preliminary Sources Study Report dated December 2015 to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
- 2) The results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (1) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
- 3) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (2) are complete and

identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

The approved scheme shall be implemented in full.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and policy of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014). Remediation measures may be needed as part of the construction phase so must be in place before development starts.

12. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants in accordance with policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014)

13. In the event that contamination that was not previously identified is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it shall be reported in writing to the County Planning Authority within 24 hours.

No further development shall be carried out until the developer has submitted in writing a remediation strategy to the County Planning Authority detailing how this contamination shall be dealt with; and written approval has been obtained for the remediation strategy required by this condition from the County Planning Authority.

The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the approved remediation strategy has been implemented in full. Within one month of the completion of the measures identified in the approved remediation strategy a verification report shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants in accordance with in accordance with policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014)

Archaeology

14. No development shall commence until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. For land that is included within the WSI, no development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives; and:

- The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
- The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material.

Reason: To secure the provision of archaeological excavation and the subsequent recording of any remains in accordance with policy LP 18 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014). Archaeological remains could be damaged by development therefore an approved WSI must be in place before development starts.

Noise mitigation

15. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a scheme, which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority, to mitigate the impact of noise on the receptors identified in paragraph 5.1.3 of the Noise Impact Assessment dated December 2015 has been implemented in full. The mitigation measures shall be retained in full in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents in accordance with policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014)

Vehicle headlights

16. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a scheme that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority to mitigate the impact of vehicle headlights on residential properties has been implemented in full. The scheme shall include triggers for removal of any temporary measures.

Reason: Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents in accordance with policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014)

Landscape and biodiversity proposals

17. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until landscaping and biodiversity enhancement measures have been fully carried out in accordance with a detailed scheme that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The detailed scheme shall include the locations of hibernacula and log piles and the location and spacing of trees and shrubs.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the locality and to enhance biodiversity in accordance with policies LP16 and LP19 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014)

18. The landscape and biodiversity enhancement scheme approved under condition 17 shall be managed in accordance with Section 5: Management and Maintenance of the Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan dated December 2015.

Reason: To protect and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment in accordance with policies LP16 and LP19 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014)

19. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting 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, becomes in the opinion of the County Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted in the same place, unless the County Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the locality and to enhance biodiversity in accordance with policies LP16 and LP19 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014)

20. No development shall commence until details of the detailed design, implementation, maintenance and management of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). Those details shall include:

- a) Information about the design storm period and intensity (1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+30% allowance for Climate Change)), discharge rates and volumes (both pre and post development), temporary storage facilities, means of access for maintenance, the methods employed to delay and control surface water discharge from the site, and the measures taken to prevent flooding and pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water;
- b) Flood water exceedance routes, both on and off site; and
- c) A timetable for implementation.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no flood risk on or off site resulting from the proposed development in accordance with policy LP14 of the Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014). This affects the design of the scheme so needs to be approved before development commences.