

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

Report Paragraph number	Respondent	Comment and related section / reference	Council Response	Proposed Amendment
3.3	Cambridgeshire County Council - Highways Development Management (comment 1 of 3)	It is suggested that 'temporary access during the period of construction' be added to Section 13.	Planning officers have discussed this suggestion with highway colleagues to ensure that they understand what would be required and for which proposals. And, how this relates to section 13A. Planning officers agree that this addition is relevant, necessary, and material to the level of information required. This would allow the Highway Authority to assess the safety implications of construction periods. It is recommended that this should be applied to both sections 13 and 13A.	Yes – text added to Section 13 and Section 13A referring to temporary access during construction periods. This additional requirement is added to the examples given of information required. It is also explicitly required in the Heavy Commercial Vehicle construction traffic section in 13A. Details of temporary accesses have been added to the existing requirement for a layout plan showing detailed information relating to the design of proposed accesses to be used by heavy commercial vehicles.
3.3	Cambridgeshire County Council - Highways Development Management (comment 2 of 3)	Section 13A Construction Environmental Management AND Traffic Management Plan - it is appreciated that it is not possible to include all criteria in the 'What information is required' section, However, it is strongly suggested that this should include: (i) Identifying and mitigating construction traffic impact upon sensitive receptors (i.e. local schools opening/closing times/ peak traffic conditions); and (ii) Proposals to reduce the number of vehicles visiting the site during the period of construction.	It is essential that highway safety construction traffic impacts are fully considered and managed. Planning officers agree that this information should be added, to ensure sufficient information is known from the outset. Planning officers also noted that the 'Types of Applications that require this information' section of 13A, consistent with the current Local Validation List (LVL), was omitted in error from the consultation document.; so it is proposed that this is also added back in..	Yes – text added to Section 13A and missing section on the 'Types of Applications that require this information' has been added back into the guidance. Also the following text is proposed to be added – ' For proposals, the construction of which would be likely to have impacts for the occupiers of nearby properties will require a Construction Environmental Management Plan.' to ensure that this section relates also to the already introduced Construction Environmental Management Plan requirement.
3.3	Cambridgeshire County Council - Highways Development Management (comment 3 of 3)	It is good to note that Section 12: Transport Assessment or Statement, is augmented with Section 13. Parking and access arrangements, where many proposals will fall within a level where a formal assessment is not required, but a level of traffic information is desirable to enable an informed decision to be made.	Feedback acknowledged and welcomed.	No – no action required.
3.4	Cambridgeshire County Council - Public Health.	Unable to respond owing to the Covid pandemic	No action requested.	No – no action required.
3.5	Sport England	Sport England has not provided a detailed response as this is not a development within its statutory remit. However, attention was drawn to guidance on Sport England's website https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications	Links and guidance checked based on links supplied by Sport England.	No – no action required.

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

		<p>http://sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthycommunities</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-andplanning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design</p>		
3.6	Gamlingay Parish Council (comment 1 of 2)	Neighbourhood Plans need to be referred to in the Local Validation List. Neighbourhood Plans may have specific references with regards to specific landscape, transport and development themes which should be taken account of in Minerals and Waste applications.	Planning officers welcomed the response and acknowledged the importance and relevance of Neighbourhood Plans. Adopted Neighbourhood Plans are already referred to in Section 1 (Planning Statement) as part of the District and City Council Planning Policies that need to be considered as part of the Development Plan for the area. This level of detail is already adequate to ensure that future applicants are asked to take account of Neighbourhood Plans.	No – no action required.
3.6	Gamlingay Parish Council (comment 2 of 2)	Also reference to Natural England's 'Impact risk Zones' to identify potential impact on woodland areas should be included in the Local Validation List.	Planning officers agree that Natural England's 'Impact risk Zones' must be considered. However, references to pre-application discussions with other government organisations and statutory bodies, including Natural England, is already included in the existing Local Validation List Guidance Notes. Furthermore, planning officers also note that Natural England's 'Impact risk Zones' are also checked upon receipt of planning applications as part of considering when to consult Natural England. Natural England is consulted if proposals fall within their protection zones, and meets the appropriate criteria, ensuring that appropriate consideration is given. Therefore, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to refer to this detail as part of the validation process.	No – no action required.
3.7	Historic England	A Design and Access Statement should be a requirement for every application, as is currently the case.	Design and Access Statements are a national requirement required by article 9 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, which sets out which applications will require this detail to be submitted. Given that this is a Local Validation List that sets out requirements in addition to the national requirements no further action is necessary or recommended.	No – no action required.

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

3.8	Ely Drainage Board	In relation to Section 7A – Surface Water - over half the area of Cambridgeshire is covered by an Internal Drainage Board (IDB). Within these districts, Boards have supervisory duties in relation to drainage under the Land Drainage Act 1991. Under what information is required, I would like to see reference made to IDBs and their Byelaw requirements.	The Land Drainage Act 1991 is separate legislation. The Local Validation Guidance Requirements should only require the information necessary to process planning applications and not information sought for other purposes. Furthermore, reference to drainage boards is already covered under 'Where to look for further assistance' in Section 7A. It is included as part of the Cambridgeshire County Council's Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document (July 2016) . Paragraph 3.2.8 and Page 15 of the Flood and Water SPD document draws attention to Internal Drainage Boards and their bylaws. Therefore, no further action is necessary or recommended.	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (1 of 24)	<p>Section 1 Planning Statement – no objection to the requirement for a planning statement for the majority of applications. However, it is not a necessary validation requirement for applications of more than 1000 square metres in South Cambridgeshire to require an assessment of inclusion of public art. The critical wording within Policy HQ/2 is that public art is only encouraged to be considered and it is not a mandatory requirement. The LVL should therefore not require developments of greater than 1000 square metres in size to assess public art provision because there is no planning policy basis for doing so. The following amended text has therefore been recommended for consideration: -</p> <p>Where relevant for developments of proposed new floor space of 1000 square metres, consideration of integrating public art into the design of the development is encouraged to be included within the Planning Statement, but it will not be a reason to invalidate the application if an assessment is not included.</p>	Both the published guidance for planning statements that is currently adopted in the Local Validation List (June 2019) and the text that was consulted on as part of the proposed Local Validation List (June 2021) refer to ' <u>consideration</u> ' of integration of public art into the design of the development for proposals of 1,000 square metres or more. Neither the adopted Local Validation List (LVL) nor emerging LVL propose that it will be necessary to include public art. Only that <u>consideration</u> needs to be included to demonstrate that public art is being encouraged and considered within South Cambridgeshire. It was accepted following consultation in 2019 when no concerns were received. Given the concern raised, planning officers have reviewed this again. Planning officers still consider that <u>consideration</u> of public art is relevant to South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 Policy HQ/2; is reasonable for proposed developments of 1,000 square metres or more. Planning Officers reports will need to demonstrate that encouragement has been given to public art as a material consideration in the determination of the application. Therefore, it is appropriate to retain this requirement as part of the LVL validation criteria. Additional explanation is proposed to be added to the guidance to explain that this is not an onerous requirement. It avoids the need for this information having to be requested later in the application process to inform the officer report ahead of determination. Consideration of policy requirements is also actively encouraged as part of the pre-application process when an early scoping assessment could be undertaken by the applicant team.	Yes (in part) – The relevant text within the LVL guidance has been amended to read 'Where relevant for developments of proposed new floor space of 1,000 square metres or more, consideration of integrating public art into the design of the development is encouraged. And that a statement addressing the consideration of this policy requirement should be included within the planning statement to meet the requirements of Policy HQ/2 of South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (2 of 24)	Section 2 Local Authority (LA) Development Letter - No objection is raised in relation to the need for an LA Development letter.	No objection acknowledged and welcomed.	No – no action required.

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (3 of 24)	Section 3 Statement of Community Involvement - No objection is raised to the requirement to prepare a Statement of Community Involvement on the basis that it is only required for Category A development proposals. The size / level of this needs to be clarified with regards to mobile buildings which can either be small standalone projects or part of much larger schemes.	The County Council's Statement of Community Involvement has been through public consultation. It clearly sets out the requirements expected from applicants. A separate statement is required for category A High Level Community Involvement. Category B development can be covered within the planning statement. Clarification of which level is appropriate is normally given as part of a formal pre-application response when the Local Validation Guidance Requirements are considered. Planning officers actively encourage all applicants to submit pre-application requests. It is acknowledged that on occasion there is a need for temporary modular buildings to be separated out from larger project proposals. When they are included sometimes this can result in an element of confusion, especially for residents. This is a separate matter unrelated to the validation list requirements.	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (4 of 24)	Section 4 Biodiversity Survey and Report - No objection is raised in relation to the requirements in respect of Biodiversity Surveys and Reports, which reflect a more detailed guidance on the matter.	No objection acknowledged and reference to more detailed guidance on the matter is welcomed.	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (5 of 24)	<p>Section 5 Statement of Sustainable Design and Construction – Three concerns were raised in relation to all applications needing a statement of sustainable design in the South Cambridgeshire area; two concerns about the guidance in this section for Health Impact Assessments; and a final concern around the location of the requirement for a foul drainage strategy within the guidance.</p> <p>The first three concerns on the guidance for South Cambridgeshire planning applications are as follows: -</p> <p>(i) A Climate Change Emergency that has been declared by Cambridgeshire County Council and other District Councils. The Statement of Sustainable Design & Construction requirements could benefit from being simplified. It is not justified to require a Statement of Sustainable Design and Construction for all applications within the South Cambridgeshire area. As within the other authority areas it should be based on whether the floor space is more than 1000 square metres in size.</p> <p>(ii) It is unclear why an application under Section 73 for variation of a planning condition would require a Statement of Sustainable Design and Construction</p>	<p>Planning officers have reviewed all six concerns under Section 5 of the Local Validation List guidance. Each point is addressed separately below: -</p> <p>(i) Policy CC/1: Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Applications of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018), includes: - 'Applicants must submit a Sustainability Statement to demonstrate how these principles have been embedded into the development proposal.' This relates to all development and not just those with a floorspace of over 1000 square metres. Supporting text in paragraph 4.12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018): - 'The policy requires applicants to submit a Sustainability Statement to demonstrate how the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation have been embedded within the development proposal. The Council would recommend that in the case of larger-scale developments (100 or more dwellings or exceeding 5,000m2 of other floorspace) that a BREEAM Communities assessment is undertaken as part of demonstrating how they have integrated sustainable design into the master planning process.'</p> <p>Planning applications must be considered in relation to the relevant district's adopted planning policies. Policy CC/1 also states that 'The level of information provided in the Sustainability Statement should be proportionate to</p>	<p>Yes (in part) –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) no action required (ii) no action required (iii) no action required (iv) It is proposed to move the Health Impact Assessment requirements into a separate section (5A) (v) Additional signposting references have been added to help assist with these policy requirements, which includes the October 2020 Public Health England guidance on HIAs in spatial planning. And (vi) The requirement for a foul drainage strategy is proposed to be moved under the surface water strategy section in 7A.

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

		<p>for all applications. For example, if it is proposed to amend the hours of use, the need to submit a full Statement of Sustainable Design and Construction is not proportionate or reasonable having regard to the tests set in the Growth and Infrastructure Act.</p> <p>(iii) For the provision of a mobile classroom which is of modular design, the requirement to submit a full Statement of Sustainable Design and Construction is not considered to be reasonable. The ability to change the Design and Construction of the mobile classroom is very limited. It is not considered warranted for this to be provided as a standalone document for developments of a floor space of less than 1000 square metres and it could be dealt with as a section within the Planning Statement.</p> <p>Based on the three points raised above it was recommended that the following changes are made to the wording:</p> <p><i>Within all districts and Cambridge City Council:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For New schools and all developments creating more than 1,000m² of floor space. <p>The next two points in relation to Health Impact Assessments are set out as points (iv) and (v) below:</p> <p>(iv) It is confusing for Health Impact Assessments (HIA's) to be included under a Statement of Sustainable Design and Construction. HIA's tend to be standalone documents that should have a separate category.</p> <p>(v) The requirement for the HIA is taken from District and City Council's requirements, which is acknowledged. However, no clear explanation is provided of the difference between a Rapid HIA and a Full HIA. HIA's also provide a duplication with a lot of information that is within a Planning Statement. It is important that the HIA requirements are proportionate to the scale and size of the development. For schools in wider growth areas the vast majority of the decisions relevant to HIA's relate to external factors outside the applicant's control, such as position of the local centre etc. and HIA's have already been submitted and approved</p>	<p>the scale and nature of the proposed development'. this should provide comfort. The requirements can be scoped during pre-application discussions.</p> <p>(ii) Applications for a variation of conditions include a wide range of proposals. If there is no new operational development that forms part of an application nor a material change of use, then a sustainable design and construction statement would not be relevant to the application and therefore would not be requested. This would normally form part of any pre-application discussion.</p> <p>(iii) In South Cambridgeshire consideration needs to be given to Sustainable Design and Construction. Modular buildings are not exempt from policy CC/1 above. It is normally the length of the consideration or a technical specialism that determines whether the information is submitted in a separate report or as part of a planning statement. Modular buildings can be assessed against the BREEAM calculator. Some modular buildings have remained in situ for several years. The response already outlined in point (i) above is relevant. Planning officers consider that the existing requirement is based upon a relatively recent requirement of the adopted Development Plan for this area. This principle is followed elsewhere in the Local Validation List requirements.</p> <p>(iv) Planning officers agree that it would be beneficial to separate out the Health Impact Assessment requirements.</p> <p>(v) It is agreed that the HIA should be proportionate to the development. The Health Impact Assessment (HIA) can be scoped with Cambridgeshire County Council's Public Health Officer and the relevant district/city officers at pre-application stage. This would help to scope the relevant factors. It is accepted that the applicant may wish to draw upon information already prepared for wider outline applications to prepare their own submission. For example, referring to an earlier original HIA could help set the baseline data. However, Regulation 3 applications are stand-alone planning applications and need to be supported by updated and complete documents. Also, some additional signposting is recommended to local references, which are contained in the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (2019), to address concerns about a lack of explanation on the difference between Rapid HIAs and Full HIAs. And, more generally to Also, Public Health</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

		<p>as part of Outline application consents. The HIA's for these schemes should be light touch and refer back to the HIA approved as part of the wider Outline consent.</p> <p>The final point in relation to the location for the request for a foul drainage strategy within the guidance is set out as point (vi) below:</p> <p>(vi) The need for a foul drainage strategy is understood. However, this should be situated elsewhere in the LVL under item 7A.</p>	<p>England's document of October 2020 'Health Impact Assessment in Spatial Planning' is written for local authority public health and planning teams, planning applicants, impact assessment practitioners, and others involved in the planning process. It sets the scene and seeks to ensure that HIAs put people and their health at the heart of the planning process. It also provides information to support the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on promoting healthy and safe communities.</p> <p>(vi) A foul drainage strategy is an integral part of the design of most development. Therefore, historically it has been included under the Statement of Sustainable Design and Construction section. Upon review planning officers agree that it makes sense to relocate this requirement alongside the surface water drainage information under item 7A. This and the comments raised by Anglian Water below have been discussed with Lead Local Flood Authority colleagues to ensure that they have been fully understood</p>	
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (6 of 24)	<p>Section 6 Tree Survey -The need for a tree survey is understood. The wording could be amended to provide additional clarification as to when a survey is needed. For example, for some school applications, the development site may in some instances include the full extent of the school boundary, but the areas where the trees are located 'within the development site' are a considerable distance away from any built development/engineering operations. New wording has been recommended based on the existing text as set out below:</p> <p><i>When there are trees or hedges on the development site that are likely to be or could be impacted by the development;</i> <i>And/or</i> <i>When there are trees or hedges on land adjacent to the development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape. See Standard Application Form.</i></p>	<p>The existing clarification states: -</p> <p>'When there are trees or hedges on the development site And/or When there are trees or hedges on land adjacent to the development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape. See Standard Application Form.'</p> <p>Tree surveys are only requested when there are trees that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape. It is agreed that this can be clarified.</p>	Yes – the addition of 'that are likely to be or could be impacted by the development' is repeated to ensure that it also applies to trees on the development site.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (7 of 24)	Section 7 Flood Risk Assessment - No objection is set out in relation to the requirements for a Flood Risk Assessment.	No objection acknowledged and welcomed.	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital	Section 7A Surface Water Drainage Strategy – No objection is raised in relation to the requirements for	Each point is addressed below: -	Yes (in part) –

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

	Strategy Manager (8 of 24)	<p>a Surface Water Drainage Strategy. However, three points were raised as set out below:</p> <p>(i) Surface and foul water tend to be considered together and therefore it is recommended that the requirement for a foul water drainage strategy be moved to this section.</p> <p>(ii) The requirements for a foul water drainage strategy should reflect the current criteria of a surface water drainage strategy.</p> <p>(iii) With regards to modular buildings, there is an agreement between the LABC authorities agreeing that surface water that falls on a temporary mobile building will be the same as that which falls on the same area if the building was not there. This agreement suggests that surface water can drain to grass. Where a building is on a hardstanding area it is diverted to the nearest surface water drain. Should a copy of this agreement be included with applications?</p>	<p>(i) It is already recommended to move the foul drainage strategy guidance (see our response to item 5 of 24 point (vi) above).</p> <p>(ii) The consultation response does not explain what is meant by 'should reflect the current criteria of a surface water drainage strategy'. Planning officers have proposed amendments upon the advice of Anglian Water below and have also discussed the validation criteria with Lead Local Flood Authority colleagues.</p> <p>(iii) This statement and question is not directly relevant to the local validation list requirements, which are not drafted to specifically relate to a specific type of development. It can be asked and answered outside of the context of this report and can be included in the scope discussed at the pre-application stage.</p>	<p>(i) agreed as Item 5 of 24 (iv) in this section above.</p> <p>(ii) No action required other than as amended in relation to Anglian Water Ltd comments</p> <p>(iii) No action required</p>
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (9 of 24)	Section 8 Heritage Statement - No objection is raised in relation to the requirements and triggers for a Heritage Statement.	No objection acknowledged and welcomed.	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (10 of 25)	Section 9 Landscape Impact Assessment - No objection is raised in relation to the requirements and triggers for a Landscape Impact Assessment. However, with regard to modular buildings (mobiles), it has been suggested that this may not be required or, if it is, to a lesser extent. There has, historically, been a paragraph in planning statements that detail close by listed buildings and the extent of the impact the mobile will have, if any. Will this short section in the planning statement suffice?	<p>This question does not relate to the requirements of this section. Landscape Impact Assessments are only required: - 'For large buildings and other TALL structures e.g. anaerobic digestion tanks and emission stacks on sites in open locations outside the settlement development boundary as defined in the relevant City/District council local plan or development plan document.'</p> <p>Listed buildings are Heritage Assets and are therefore relevant to Section 8, which deals with Heritage Statements.</p> <p>The question could be asked, if necessary, during a pre-application for a specific development.</p>	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (11 of 25)	Section 10 Landscape proposal - No objection is raised in relation to the requirements for Landscape Proposals to be submitted. However, it was confirmed that 'mobiles generally have no real landscape proposals except where mounds may be removed to accommodate buildings on a level ground surface, or when trees are removed and are to be replaced elsewhere on the site.' In making this	This statement and the question about mobile classrooms are not directly relevant to the local validation list requirements, which are not drafted to specifically relate to one type of development. It can be asked and answered outside of the context of this report, as it is more properly suited to a pre-application for a specific development.	No – no action required.

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

		statement it was requested whether this would still be acceptable?		
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (12 of 25)	<p>Section 11 Landscape and Biodiversity Management Scheme – Noted that whilst the need for a Landscape and Biodiversity Enhancement Management Scheme is appreciated, in some instances this can be dealt with by way of suitably worded pre-occupation planning conditions. The advantage of this approach is that it allows the document to be prepared once the Landscape Planting proposals have been fixed following the determination of the planning application. It is recommended that the following changes are made to the List:</p> <p>‘Where soft landscape or biodiversity enhancement measures are proposed the submission of a Landscape and Biodiversity Management Scheme will be encouraged. Where applications are not accompanied by Landscape and Biodiversity Management Schemes, the requirement for them can be dealt with by way of a suitably worded planning condition (see sections 4 [Biodiversity Survey and Report] and 10 [Landscape] above). <i>Applications for new landfill sites or their extension will require aftercare of the restored land.</i>’</p>	<p>The purpose of the Local Validation Requirements is to ‘front-load’ the planning system. It enables a landscape and biodiversity management scheme to be given consideration at the earliest opportunity. Delay can lead to failure and the poor establishment of planting and the inefficient chasing of outstanding information. The discharge of conditions necessitates a second application and increases the pressure upon specialists to respond to separate consultations. It is more efficient to address the information, whenever possible at the time of the application. The only time that it is not, is if there is a high risk that a development is not likely to go ahead, which is not normally so with the County Council’s own development. The recommended change would not amount to a validation requirement and would not be appropriate for a wide range of schemes including complex and sensitive schemes. As such this cannot be supported by planning officers.</p>	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (13 of 25)	<p>Section 12 Transport Assessment or Statement – Acknowledged that the need for both a Transport Assessment and Transport Statement are both understood. However, they raised the following six points to demonstrate why they consider the scope and validation requirements for this section need amending:</p> <p>(i) They consider that the LVL needs to be refined to account for when they are required.</p> <p>(ii) As set out within paragraph 4 of the national government guidance for Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Transport Statements it is stated that where the transport impacts of a development are not significant, it may be that no Transport Assessment or Statement or Travel Plans are required.</p> <p>(iii) The current approach being taken by the County Planning Authority is to require a Transport Statement for all increases in school size regardless</p>	<p>The concerns raised in relation to Section 12 (Transport Assessment or Statement) were shared with the Manager of the Transport Assessment Team to ensure that planning officers had the benefit of their specialist knowledge and advice on such matters before providing a response. As a result of these discussions the following responses are provided with input from and the support of the Transport Assessment Team. Each point is addressed below:</p> <p>(i) The CCC Transport Assessment Guidelines Document sets out when a Transport Assessment (TA) or Transport Statement (TS) is required. Ultimately the level of evidence required relates to the level of intensification of trips, and the nature of the evidence (study area, modelling tools etc.) is discussed through scoping at the pre-application stage. As such officers do not consider that it is necessary to refine the LVL to say when they are required. The document already provides the necessary information and signposting for where to look for further guidance.</p>	No – consideration has been given to all six points raised and no action is required.

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

		<p>of the size of the expansion. It is therefore important that the LVL is revised so that Transport Statements are only required for developments, which will have a 'significant' impact in accordance with national guidance.</p> <p>(iv) An example was provided to illustrate their concerns - a single classroom extension to a primary school, which relates in 2 additional staff members and 30 additional children at the school is highly unlikely to have a 'significant' impact and therefore in most instances a Transport Statement would not be required. This is particularly the case, for schools which have a good Travel Plan in place, which in turn will enable an assessment to be made regarding how many children will travel to school by foot or cycle. For these smaller developments, it is considered that transport impact could be dealt with within the Planning Statement.</p> <p>(v) In respect of Transport Assessments, it is also stated that they are required for all new schools. Objection is raised to this approach. The vast majority of new schools within the County are situated within growth area sites, which have been subject to a full Transport Assessment as part of a wider Outline application site. Therefore, the traffic and transport movements to and from the new school will have already been assessed as part of the Outline consent.</p> <p>(vi) It is considered that a clear distinction needs to be made between new schools that are within wider growth areas and new schools that have not had their transport impact assessed as part of wider Outline Application Consents. To account for the fact that Regulation 3 applications are Full applications that need to be considered on their own merits, it is considered that this can be dealt with by cross-referencing to the Transport Assessment that has been completed as part of the Outline Consent.</p> <p>Based on the above six points the following recommended changes are proposed to the LVL:</p> <p>Types of applications that require this information <i>Transport Assessment – where the proposed development has significant transport implications including new schools that have not been assessed</i></p>	<p>(ii) Officers already acknowledge in Section 12 of the LVL that '<i>There will be some cases, dependent on the location and nature of the development, where information less than a professionally produced transport statement will suffice. However, it is essential that the applicant provides accurate information at both the pre-application stage and in the documents that are submitted in support of an application</i>'. Otherwise, how would transport colleagues know if the impacts are significant or not without any transport evidence or pre-application discussions to scope the level of information required? A TA/TS is required to answer this question. For very small developments, the transport evidence would be much less onerous, but in all cases, it needs to be clear what the transport impacts are (even if the conclusion is 'no impact'). Again, scoping discussions in advance are key, which is why officers strongly recommend early pre-application discussions.</p> <p>(iii) Officers do not wish to require unnecessary information. It is fully accepted that requirements need to be reasonable having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development. But an appropriate level of evidence for the proposals is necessary, so the transport impacts can be fully understood. This is clearly a matter which is likely to be a material consideration in the determination of any planning application. In line with the response set out in point (ii) above, officers cannot support a recommendation to only require Transport Statements for developments that have a 'significant' impact without fully understanding the likely transport implications and cumulative impacts of the development being considered. As set out within the CCC Transport Assessment Guidelines Document for smaller developments a 'Transport Statement' may be more appropriate than a full TA and can address specific concerns that the Planning and Highway authorities may have. Early pre-application discussions are recommended and reference is made to '<i>even smaller developments will need to make an assessment of the number of all-mode trips likely to be generated by the proposed use, and of the existing use for redevelopments or changes of use</i>' to allow an assessment of the development against the relevant adopted planning policies.</p> <p>(iv) In this scenario transport assessment colleagues have confirmed that they would request a short transport statement which simply sets out the assumptions behind</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

		<p><i>already as part of a wider Outline application consent. Where new schools are within locations, where the transport impact of the school has already been assessed as part of the Transport Assessment for the wider site, the Transport Statement will cross reference to the Transport Assessment for the wider site.</i></p> <p><i>Transport Statement – schemes where the proposed development has significant transport implications, such as projects which involve an increase in school size by at least 3 classrooms.</i></p> <p><i>For projects of a smaller, scale for example school projects of one/two classroom expansion (including mobile classrooms applications) a Transport Statement will not normally be required, but transport matters can be dealt with within the Planning Statement.</i></p>	<p>the numbers/amount of trips, how the trips will be made, and why this would not cause severe impact. Such matters can be adequately scoped through early pre-application engagement to assist and inform the validation process.</p> <p>(v) Officers acknowledge that many new school applications come forward on new growth sites that already have the benefit of outline planning permission. However, as these new schools are usually progressed as standalone Regulation 3 applications, rather than through the outline planning permission as reserved matters. It is essential that the application is self-reliant and contains appropriate evidence. Once again transport assessment colleagues are clear that they do not wish to require unnecessary information, but they owe it to the public to ensure any application involving significant intensification is supported by its own evidence clearly setting out what the impact would be. And, how it would be addressed. Nonetheless, if the data of an associated Masterplan application is of suitable detail and remains valid then it could be drawn upon in the new school TA. It is not impossible for such data to form part of the new planning application. The key is once again down to early pre-application discussions to be able to agree the level of detail required on a case by case basis. Time may have elapsed, and circumstances and proposals may have changed since the granting of a previous permission. It is important that the information submitted relates specifically to the application being made.</p> <p>(vi) On the basis that the LVL guidance is seeking a minimum level of information for new school applications, officers do not consider it necessary or appropriate to make a distinction between those that are already granted an outline permission and those that have not. It is not unreasonable to expect that new school planning applications (regardless of whether they are on a new growth site or not) are able to provide sufficient information within a TA to be able to highlight the relevant data and conclusions in respect of the proposed development. TAs do not explicitly need to use primary data, if valid secondary data is available, which would therefore allow for Regulation 3 applications to use information from the outline consent where this is still relevant; but irrespective of this all new schools will need to be able to submit a TA. Therefore, no amendments are proposed.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (14 of 24)	<p>Section 13 Parking and Access Arrangements - No objection is raised in relation to the need for Parking and Access Arrangements to be provided with applications. However, the supporting text needs re-wording, which provides a duplication with the requirements set out in respect of a Transport Assessment or Statement. It is recommended that the following sentence be deleted from item 13 of the LVL:</p> <p><i>Applications, which if permitted, would lead to an increase in traffic, including an increase in capacity/floorspace which could potentially lead to an increase in traffic.</i></p>	<p>Whilst officers acknowledge that the same defining text is included in Section 12 (Transport Assessment or Statement) and in Section 13 (Parking and Access Arrangements) they require different information to be submitted. It is therefore entirely reasonable that the types of application that require this information are set out in both sections, with the latter specifically seeking to understand the parking and access arrangements.</p>	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (15 of 24)	<p>Section 13a Construction Environmental and Traffic Management Plan - No objection is raised in relation to the requirements for the provision of Construction Management Plans where appropriate. However, it is considered important that the wording for this section is amended to specifically exclude mobile classrooms, which are modular in nature, constructed off-site and do not involve any major construction works on the site</p>	<p>The concern raised in relation to Section 13A (Construction Environmental and Traffic Management Plan) was shared with the Highways Development Manager. As a result of these discussions planning officers are content that this information is required for all construction projects that may adversely affect highway safety or amenity of occupiers of nearby properties, which could include mobile classrooms that are often craned into site. Whilst the level of detail may be less than larger projects, nonetheless such matters need to be fully considered to ensure that the highway safety and management is understood and where necessary controlled by planning condition to avoid adverse effects on highway safety or residential amenity. Officers strongly recommend early pre-application discussions as a way of scoping the level of detail required. This guidance is for all development types and does not relate to just one form of development.</p>	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (16 of 24)	<p>Section 14 Travel Plans - No objection is raised in relation to the need for school Travel Plans. For flexibility, accounting for the urgency of some of the temporary mobile classroom applications, it is considered that in some cases the LVL should allow this to be dealt with by way of suitable worded planning condition, prior to the occupation of development. It has been particularly challenging during the Covid-19 pandemic for schools to keep Travel Plans up to date, particularly given that car sharing or use of some modes of public transport is not supported for health reasons. Therefore, the use of planning conditions would provide flexibility in this regard. This approach would be proportionate and reasonable having regard to the tests set out in</p>	<p>Whilst the challenges around the current COVID-19 pandemic are accepted, the purpose of the Local Validation Requirements is to ‘front-load’ the planning system and cover all types of development over a two-year period. The broadening of any existing travel plan to include new temporary accommodation is not considered onerous. Whilst a planning condition may be appropriate in some instances to allow more accurate information on travel patterns to be understood, a discussion about numbers and principles is necessary to inform and support the transport assessment undertaken as part of Section 12 above. Insufficient detail provided in a travel plan is likely to lead to further consultation and inefficient chasing of outstanding information. A separate application is required to discharge a condition. This</p>	No – no action required.

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

		<p>national policy. In addition, as noted in our response to LVL item requirement 12, a single classroom application is not considered to create 'significant' traffic movements, and it is our view that it is these applications that should allow for greater flexibility in terms of whether a Travel Plan is required for submission with the application.</p> <p>Based on the above the following recommended changes are proposed to the LVL:</p> <p><i>All developments including waste developments that are likely to generate a significant increase in vehicle movements (OTHER THAN FOR SITES WHICH CAN DEMONSTRATE VERY LIMITED STAFFING LEVELS AND VISITOR NUMBERS). This includes school development involving a net increase of three or more classrooms, temporary or permanent (90 pupils) For smaller school applications for a one or two classroom increase, the need for a Travel Plan can be dealt with by way of a suitably worded prior to occupation condition.</i></p> <p><i>Where the school has a Travel Plan, the application should be accompanied by an updated version that takes into account the school population when developed. Where existing data is not available, for example in relation to modes of transport for new school proposals where there are no children attending the school, outline travel plans may be accepted. These should be linked to a transport assessment or statement.</i></p>	<p>increases the pressure upon specialists to respond to additional consultations. It is more efficient to address the information, whenever possible, at the time of the planning application. The recommended change would not be appropriate for a wide range of schemes, including complex and sensitive waste schemes. As such this cannot be supported by planning officers.</p>	
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (17 of 24)	Section 15 Noise and or Vibration Assessment - No objection is raised in respect of the requirements for Noise and Vibration Assessments.	No objection acknowledged and welcomed.	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (18 of 24)	Section 16 Lighting Assessment - No objection is raised in respect of the requirements for lighting assessments. However, the extent of these for temporary mobile buildings, which have external safety lighting above each door (usually three per building), needs to be clarified. Will a data sheet for the lights be acceptable?	This statement and question about mobile classrooms are not directly relevant to the local validation list requirements, which are not drafted to specifically relate to one form of development. It can be asked and answered outside of the context of this report, as it is more properly suited to a pre-application for a specific development.	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital	Section 17 Air Quality Assessment - No objection is raised in respect of the requirements for Air Quality	Planning officers acknowledge that the reference to '? Hectares' in the consultation document is a typographical	Yes – The typographical error of '?' should be replaced with '2'.

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

	<p>Strategy Manager (19 of 24)</p>	<p>Assessments. However, reference is made to an above threshold hectare requirement for the need for Air Quality Assessments for sites with a size of above ‘? Hectares.’ ‘? Hectares’ needs to be clearly defined. Objection would be raised if the site area where an assessment is required is less than 10 hectares. The size of a site is arbitrary in respect of air quality matters and it is questioned why a site area should be used at all. For example, schools are not likely to have an adverse impact on local air quality regardless of the size of their playing fields.</p>	<p>error that should have said ‘2 Hectares’, for which we can only apologise. Whilst we appreciate that this clarification will have triggered an objection based on it being less than 10 hectares, it should be noted that the glossary definition is as follows:</p> <p><i>‘Large scale major development</i> <i>For dwellings, a large scale major development is one where the number of residential units to be constructed is 200 or more. Where the number of residential units to be constructed is not given in the application a site area of 4 hectares or more should be used as the definition of a large scale major development. For all other uses a large scale major development is one where the floor space to be built is 10,000m² or more, or where the site area is 2 hectares or more.’</i></p> <p>From reading Policy LP36 (Air Quality) of the Huntingdonshire District Council Local Plan (2019) and the supporting paragraphs, it is evident to planning officers that information should be proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal and the level of concern about air quality. Schools are sensitive to poor air quality and whilst it is appreciated that in many cases these school sites are provided as part of the large growth developments, they still have the potential to generate omissions to air. It is acknowledged that the site area will include playing fields and open space that should not increase such emissions. Nonetheless given this is part of the adopted Development Plan for Huntingdonshire, it is necessary to be able to demonstrate that this validation requirement has been met, proportionate to the development in question.</p> <p>Given that it is likely that new school developments within Huntingdonshire would trigger an air quality impact assessment based on the school site area, officers would strongly encourage early pre-application discussions with the District Council officers to scope the level of detail required for relevant proposals.</p>	
<p>3.9</p>	<p>County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (20 of 24)</p>	<p>Section 18 Contaminated Land Assessment - No objection is raised in relation to the Contaminated Land Assessment criteria. However, clarification on the extent of this for temporary mobile buildings is required.</p>	<p>This question about mobile classrooms is not directly relevant to the local validation list requirements, which are not drafted to specifically relate to one form of development. It can be asked and answered outside of the context of this report, as it is more properly suited to a pre-application for a specific development.</p>	<p>No – no action required.</p>

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (21 of 24)	Section 19 Waste Audit and Management Strategy - No objection is raised in relation to the Waste Audit and Management Strategy criteria.	No objection acknowledged and welcomed.	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (22 of 24)	Section 20 Open Space/Playing Field Assessment - No objection is raised in relation to the Open Space / Playing Field Assessment criteria, although in a number of instances this can be dealt with within the Planning Statement.	Planning officers acknowledge that there may be some instances where only minor implications are likely that could mean that it is appropriate to include the information as part of the Planning Statement rather than as a standalone assessment. This is something that can be agreed and scoped as part of pre-application discussions that would allow a discussion to take place.	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (23 of 24)	Section 21 Information in support of applications for the storage, treatment and disposal of waste - No objection is raised.	No objection acknowledged and welcomed.	No – no action required.
3.9	County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (24 of 24)	Section 22 Plans and Drawings - Whilst this provides a duplication to guidance contained within national policy, no objection is raised to this criterion on the basis that it provides helpful wayfinding and clarification for applicants.	No objection acknowledged and welcomed. Planning officers have made it clear what is being sought in addition to the national requirements. And do not consider it a duplication. As suggested, it is a useful clarification.	No – no action required.
3.10	St Ives Town Council	Noted the information provided and confirmed that they had no additional comments to make.	Planning officers welcomed the response and the confirmation that St Ives Town Council had no additional comments to make.	No – no action required.
3.11	Wisbech Town Council	Confirmed that the Local Validation List was considered by the Planning and Community Infrastructure Committee at Wisbech Town Council on 15 February 2021, and that Members of the committee decided that Wisbech Town Council had no comments to make.	Planning officers welcomed the response and the confirmation that Wisbech Town Council had no comments to make.	No – no action required.
3.12	Anglian Water Services Limited (comment 1 of 3)	Section 5 Statement of sustainable design and construction - reference is made to all non-housing developments providing a water conservation strategy as part of the planning application. The relevant policy in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan is not intended to apply to all non-housing development. Focus is upon BREEAM. The BREEAM standard is not applicable to minerals and waste for example. It should be made clear that this requirement does not apply to operational buildings which have no water supply or welfare facilities.	It is agreed that Policy CC/4 (Water Efficiency) of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) is designed for proposals for non-residential development that relate to the BREEAM standards. It is therefore reasonable to emphasise that there may be instances where such a requirement is not practicable e.g. for operational buildings that do not contain water supply or welfare facilities.	Yes – Amendments have been made to demonstrate that in South Cambridgeshire a Water Conservation Strategy is to be submitted for all non-residential development, unless demonstrated not practicable. For example, for operational buildings that do not contain water supply or welfare facilities. This is in line with the intentions of the policy to be able to demonstrate a minimum water efficiency standard equivalent to the BREEAM standard for 2 credits for water use levels. It will provide appropriate guidance and avoid 'non-residential development' being interpreted wider than intended.

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

3.12	Anglian Water Services Limited (comment 2 of 3)	Reference is made to proposals providing a foul drainage strategy including when development is being designed to connect to a public sewer as a means of disposing of treated effluent. And a separate requirement for an assessment of dry weather flows at the receiving water recycling centre exists. Clarity is needed to identify which planning applications should provide a foul drainage strategy and what the strategy should include. The text as drafted covers all development. However, this is not necessary or relevant to Anglian Water applications for work to our water recycling network and sites. Furthermore, the risk of flooding downstream from water recycling centres is managed by the Environment Agency as part of the environmental permitting process. As such, there should not be a separate requirement to provide an assessment of dry weather flows at the receiving water recycling centre. The preparation of a foul drainage strategy should appear as a separate requirement to the Statement of sustainable design and construction (to follow surface water drainage strategy). Where there is a requirement for a connection(s) to the public sewerage network Anglian Water would expect a foul drainage strategy to be submitted proportionate to the proposed development including the location of connection points, means of conveyance (gravity/pumped), discharge rates and details of any pre application discussions with Anglian Water. Applicants can seek confirmation from Anglian Water as to whether there is capacity available within the public sewerage network and at the receiving Water Recycling Centre to serve the development as part of our pre-application service.	<p>Planning officers acknowledge that Anglian Water's own development is likely to be covered by permitting requirements by the Environment Agency, and would not seek to duplicate the permitting requirements, in line with NPPF paragraph 183. Furthermore, it is agreed that whilst the Statement of Sustainable Design and Construction has been used to include foul drainage proposals to ensure that it is considered as part of the design process. It does make sense to move it alongside 7A for surface water drainage. Although it is agreed that the foul drainage strategy should be moved to a separate section, it is not considered onerous for applicants to demonstrate how such measures are controlled through the permitting regime as part of a planning application.</p> <p>Planning officers acknowledge that the Local Validation List guidance would benefit from further clarification on when a foul water strategy would be required and what it should include., This should be proportionate to the proposed development and should also encourage pre-application discussions with Anglian Water. The proposed changes and the move to section 7A were discussed with officers in the Lead Local Flood Authority considering their experience of the recent flood events that had impacted on foul water systems.</p>	Yes – The guidance on foul drainage strategies has been updated and moved to section 7A to state 'A foul drainage strategy that is proportionate to the proposed development should be submitted when assessing the design implications of any new development, including when the development is being designed to connect to a public sewer as a means of disposing of treated effluent. The foul drainage strategy should include, but not be limited to, the location of connection points, means of conveyance (gravity/pumped), discharge rates and details of any pre-application discussions undertaken with the relevant provider. Applicants can seek confirmation from Anglian Water as to whether there is capacity available within the public sewerage network and at the receiving Water Recycling Centre to serve the development as part of their pre-application service. Also, an assessment of dry weather flows should also be submitted. This is needed to avoid the risk of increased flooding elsewhere because of additional flows into the receiving watercourse, unless in instances when development is being proposed to connect to the public foul sewer, it can be demonstrated that this is unnecessary for example if it is adequately controlled through a separate permitting regime e.g. Water Recycling Centre development.
3.12	Anglian Water Services Limited (comment 3 of 3)	Section 7A. Surface Water Strategy – reference is made to the submission of a surface water strategy for all waste planning applications, including those related to Anglian Water's Water Recycling Centres. However, there will be circumstances in which the use of SuDs will not be feasible for waste management uses. For example, impermeable hardstanding is required for water recycling centres by environmental legislation. Reference is made to the requirement to provide a surface water strategy being dependent upon the scale and nature of the proposal. It would be helpful if this was clarified to explain that a strategy would not be required in all	Planning officers acknowledge that there will be instances where the scale and type of operation will dictate where the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage System would not be feasible. This issue was also acknowledged as part of the hearings and the main modifications accepted by the independent Inspector for the emerging Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Planning officers agree that it would be helpful to ensure that this guidance aligns with the response given to the emerging plan. However, the issue of surface water drainage must be considered for all development. So, whilst the example of small scale development given by Anglian Water would trigger a	Yes (in part) – Section 7A has been amended to align with Main Modification 40 proposed to the emerging Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The new text will now read 'The scope of the surface water drainage strategy is dependent on the nature, scale and location of the development and should include taking into account any relevant significant impacts on local infrastructure and the incorporation of Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) wherever feasible to address the risk of surface water and sewer

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

		cases and any information provided would be proportionate to the scale of development proposed. For example, where a kiosk is to be installed on an existing Water Recycling Centre site, Anglian Water would not expect to provide a surface water strategy.	submission, this would be proportionate to the proposal to demonstrate that it would not be a problem. The proposed changes were discussed with officers in the Lead Local Flood Authority to ensure that they were aware of the points raised by Anglian Water.	flooding and provide wider environmental benefits including biodiversity net gain and water quality. The County Council's Flood and Water Team's advice should be followed. Visit our website for more Flood and Water information. '
3.13	Biffa Waste Services (comment 1 of 2)	Section 5 (Statement of sustainable design and construction) states that developments that fall within the Cambridgeshire and Huntingdon areas will be subject to a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) (Full or Rapid) if the developments floor space is between 1000 and 10,000 m2. If the development falls within Fenland, then area all major developments will require a HIA. The implementation of a HIA is not mentioned in the NPPF. However, the PPG does state the following: - 'A Health Impact Assessment is a useful tool to use where there are expected to be significant impacts.' The importance of a HI Assessment is recognised. However, many applications for major development that include large floor space areas, especially in the waste sector, will have already been supported by numerous environmental assessments prior to submission e.g. noise, dust, air quality and vibration, biodiversity and ecological surveys. Most applications in the waste sector operate under an approved Environmental Permit. It is important that use of a HIA does not duplicate the efforts of other assessments and recognises that the development may already be considered acceptable based on previous assessment. A HIA may not be required. Attention is drawn to paragraph 183 of the NPPF relating to avoiding duplication in circumstances when other legislation applies.	Planning officers welcome the comments from Biffa Waste Services and fully accept the requirements of NPPF paragraph 183 in the need to avoid duplicating regulatory processes. And, for the focus to be on whether the proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions that are subject to separate pollution control regimes. Officers also acknowledge that there will be instances where the requirements of a HIA are already included in other environmental processes e.g. a chapter or topic in an Environmental Impact Assessment. Nonetheless, ensure that waste management needs avoid harm to human health and to address amenity, an appropriate assessment is not considered unreasonable. The consideration and control of amenity issues, such as noise, do genuinely cross over between the different regulators. This is not a duplication when they are seeking to control different aspects of this impact. Given the adopted development policies at district level and their alignment with Policy 18 (Amenity Considerations) of the emerging Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan, it is not considered inappropriate for waste management needs, for this level of detail to be provided as requested. Where the HIA requirement is met through other studies this can be signposted within an application and during pre-application discussion this can be scoped and agreed in advance of assessments being procured.	No – no action required under this section (planning officers acknowledge that a new section (5A) is being proposed for this HIA requirement as set out in County Council Education Capital Strategy Manager (5 of 24) above.
3.13	Biffa Waste (comment 2 of 2)	2. Section 11 (Landscape and biodiversity enhancement management scheme) states that the County Council will seek the aftercare of restored landfill sites in the interests of nature conservation for at least 10 years. A site by site basis is supported by the Planning Practice Guidance and the Cambridge and Peterborough minerals and Waste Plan 2011 The PPG also states that mineral planning authority should seek to ensure that the operator provides an outline strategy of commitments for the 5-year aftercare period (or longer if agreed between the	Planning officers acknowledge that the published guidance for soft landscaping and biodiversity management plans currently in the Local Validation List (June 2019) refers to ' <u>seek the aftercare</u> of restored landfill sites in the interests of nature conservation for at least 10 years' (<u>our emphasis</u>). This is an aspirational target based on existing waste restoration schemes. Such time periods are not considered unreasonable, especially considering that longer restoration periods are now also being sought in relation to County Council schemes. Recently some aftercare management periods have been agreed to up to 25 years. Planning officers are	Yes – Section 11 bullet point 3 amended under the 'What information is required?' heading, to state 'Information to set out the proposed restoration, after-use and aftercare arrangements for all waste management proposals which are likely to be temporary in nature (and secured if necessary, by a legal agreement). The County Council will seek to ensure that the restoration of waste sites is done progressively to ensure that restoration can be achieved at the earliest opportunity. Agreement of the after use of restored

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

		<p>applicant and the mineral planning authority). The 10 years of aftercare for landfill sites should not be enforced as a standard practice rule but should be discussed on a site by site basis and agreed between the operator and planning authority.</p>	<p>also mindful of the requirements of Policy 19 (Restoration and Aftercare) of the emerging Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan that has recently been assessed by an independent Inspector. The supporting guidance laid out in paragraph 6.13 of the submission plan refers consideration on a case by case basis when aftercare arrangements will be discussed that have the potential to extend to 10 years or more. Planning officers consider that it is appropriate to amend this guidance to align with the emerging waste policy, acknowledging that there will be instances where more than ten years will be necessary.</p>	<p>temporary waste management sites will be considered on a case by case basis, as should the aftercare arrangements (with aftercare potentially extending to 10 years or more).'</p>
3.14	<p>Little Gransden Parish Council (comment 1 of 3)</p>	<p>Under the heading of the Flood Risk / Assessment, it should request information on the following: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • who is responsible for the management of runoff water / rainwater and riparian responsibilities (Council or landowner)? • the enforcement actions that need to be invoked if the landowner fails their responsibility. • As the topography of land in villages changes from building and developments, it is important to assess the impact of building up areas on high grounds on the flow of the resultant runoff water to the lower grounds. • Drains and gullies do not withstand to the unprecedented volume of rain that we are now having due to climate change (there is a typical example of this situation in Little Gransden village). 	<p>The Local validation List Requirements can only require the information that is necessary to process a planning application and cannot require information for the purposes of other legislation.</p> <p>In relation to Flood and Water matters, already included under the 'where to look for further assistance' section for Section 7A is Cambridgeshire County Council's Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document (July 2016). This document provides further advice and guidance on the flooding related issues raised. The other legal responsibilities such as ownership and enforcement are outside of the scope of the Local Validation List Requirements.</p>	<p>No – no action required.</p>
3.14	<p>Little Gransden Parish Council (comment 2 of 3)</p>	<p>Under transport, the Council is urged to add questions on the heavy traffic that building, and development brings to rural villages. In particular: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • small corners and staggered crossroads that were not designed for 21st century two-car family needs and the constant traffic by large construction vehicles / delivery vans. • please take into account that some planning applications are being submitted in relation to land and property that is beyond the Council's adopted roads and not fit to 	<p>Sections 12 and 13A already require consideration of additional vehicle movements. This includes the construction phase of proposals. The consideration of road networks and their suitability is part of the local planning authority's assessment of the application in consultation with the Highway Authority.</p> <p>The adoption of footpaths relates to separate legislation, which is outside of the scope of both the Local Validation List Requirements and the planning legislation.</p>	<p>No – no action required.</p>

Appendix 1. Summary of Consultation Responses: -

		<p>accommodate heavy construction vehicles during the building phase.</p> <p>Questions need to be added to identify and highlight whether such footpaths need to be first adopted by the council? Otherwise conditions are set for the applicants to remedy all damages during the building phase and the subsequent management of these paths.</p>		
3.14	Little Gransden Parish Council (comment 3 of 3)	NB. The new format is more user friendly and compatible with device and tablet use.	Welcome feedback.	No – no action required.
3.15	Huntingdonshire District Council – Environmental Health Team	Confirmed that they had taken a look at the documents in relation to Environmental Health matters such as land contamination, noise, vibration, air quality, light, CEMPs, etc and that they have no objection to taking these new validation requirements forward for the next two years.	Planning officers welcome the response and confirmation received that Huntingdonshire District Council's Environmental Health Team endorse the new validation requirements for the next two years.	No – no action required.