

Appendix B – External Consultations

Parish Councils

Cottenham Parish Council

Questions arising from Cottenham PC:

- What provision of recreation services supplementary to local services, could Cottenham benefit from?
- What provision of transport, commuter, and leisure routes for non-motorised users could Cottenham benefit from?
- Transport routes for motorised users - considerations:
 - Road access – no direct access from Oakington, or Longstanton, to Northstowe in Phase 2 re: the development framework document.
 - Mitigation of traffic impacts – Section 106 traffic monitoring.
- Haulage routes - potential concerns:
 - Reiterate the need for adherence to agreed preferred haulage routes guidance.
- Drainage - potential concerns:
 - Flood mitigation – Cottenham Lode is in Flood Zone 3.
 - Potential concerns – delivery of the attenuation pond timing, sufficient water holding capacity, telemetry failure events.
 - Current flooding locations according to the Flooding Memories study.
 - Leisure and wildlife amenity of lakes and swales – a positive opportunity.
- A14 considerations and impacts potentially, alongside the Northstowe Phase 2 Development: haulage routes and traffic capacity on local roads. Concerns..?

Recommendations from Cottenham PC:

Transport:

- Stress the importance of construction traffic keeping to route agreements during the extended construction phase
- Stress the importance to local communities on a firm decision being made regarding the closure and maintenance status of Longstanton Road, the old airfield road
 - Suggestion has been made that a raising bollard might be an option
 - If the road is to be used, it may impact on traffic volumes through Oakington, and potentially through Cottenham.
 - And the current road surface has been deemed unsuitable for that level of traffic;
- Stress the importance of the Northstowe permanent and temporary monitoring traffic data recording sites, in particular to evaluate impacts on local traffic

- Stress the health and economic benefits of cycle access to Northstowe by a safe route, to encourage commuters, youth, horse riders, and local walking groups
 - support for cycle infrastructure improvements from King Street to the guided busway, and then beyond and across the CGB 'raised' horse crossing to Rampton Drift.

Drainage:

- Stress the importance of early delivery of the attenuation ponds, and flood mitigation measures:
 - The importance that the maintenance and condition of the raised banks of the Cottenham Lode are inspected regularly during the construction phase for Northstowe, and any unexpected flood events resolved and mitigated.
- The attenuation ponds, water parks, and incorporated SUDS features are seen as positive flood mitigation measures, and the earliest feasible delivery is supported.
- Greater detail to be included in relation to flood risk specific to Cottenham and the Cottenham Lode.
- Uncontrolled Flow in the higher catchment at Bar Hill, Oakington, Girton and Histon all of which will be taking increased development with rapid run off in varying degrees.
- Secondary flow from Northstowe via Reynolds Brook entering the Lode via a gravity control flap in the Rampton side Lode bank. Whilst the Old West IDB will negotiate payment for pumping excess water when Lode levels are high the PC should seek assurance that Old West IDB has the pumping capacity to deal with flooding in the interim period until Reynolds Brook is?or may be ? superseded as a surface water drain in Northstowe Phase 3. In short, based upon the flooding in 2001 / 2003 when properties in Rampton were flooded any failures in this system could threaten Cottenham.
- To this the controlled main discharge from the Northstowe reservoirs is added directly to Beck Brook. Highlight potential telemetry failure which could lead to overtopping of the Lode bank at Rampton. Cottenham Lode discharge to the Old West is NOT CONTROLLED. Any failure of high level flood banking or of either of the two under lode low level culverts at Broad Lane and Smithy Fen will threaten Cottenham residents. If the containment at Northstowe has water above the surrounding land then it will come under the Reservoirs Act
- Should ask for robust downstream Flood Risk Assessments including Breach Modelling and guarantees that any required betterment downstream in the IDB catchment and EA main river is adequately funded by S106 payments.
- The drainage issues are in hand, as long as the telemetry works and the maintenance after the system is delivered is appropriate. The maintenance needs to cover outside of the immediate area such as maintenance of the flood defence 'levees' along Cottenham Lode. There should be a process, and accountability for remediation and error checking

Histon and Impington Parish Council

Objections fall under three headings;

Retail:

- The scheme does not allow for major changes in consumer behaviour that are happening.

- The scale of provision is significantly higher than required by the development itself and will therefore put the viability of other centres at risk.
- Large amounts of free parking will attract shoppers from a wide area.

Affordable Housing:

- 20% affordable housing is too low, it should be 40%. Low levels of affordable housing will affect the ability of new low paid workers to live in the area and will harm businesses.

Transport & Traffic:

- The airfield road must be physically closed and as soon as possible.
- The overall traffic plan is unacceptable because no information has been given on queue lengths at junctions in Histon & Impington that would permit a validity test of the model; no consideration has been made with regard to the impact of excessive queue lengths at the Histon & Impington junctions; the modelling basis makes a false assumption (ie that the total number of jobs in South Cambridgeshire is fixed) and therefore is likely to be an underestimate.

Longstanton Parish Council

- The bridleway crossing the Guided Bus from Rampton Road is dangerous. This needs investigating.
- The town centre needs to be in place at the beginning of the development to eliminate the first several thousand homes being 'dormitory' residences.
- Town square is too small.
- Lack of green space in town centre. This space should not have sport provision.
- Lack of car parking consideration on the town centre. Nothing to show that adaption for growth has been considered e.g. car parks that can become multi-storey
- Car parking needs to be adequate at recreation grounds.
- No provision for burials.
- No provision for landmark buildings in the town centre.
- Commuters from Northstowe using the Southern Access Road will have trouble joining the B1050 as traffic flows from Willingham. Need clarification on how pedestrians and agriculture will share the bridge on Wilsons Road.
- No provision for care homes or lifetime homes. The 5% of shared housing seems to be of a better standard than the private housing.
- The conservation area that belongs to Longstanton should not be included in the plans and it distorts the amount of green space Northstowe actually has.
- Very few green spaces in Northstowe.
- Unacceptable for cars and buses to share busway.
- Should be minimum of 2.5 car parking spaces per house. National average for car ownership is 2 cars per household with 16% having 3 cars. This area has a higher than average car per home average with over 35.4% of homes having 2 or more cars (2011 Census – ONS).
- Any turbines should be located to the NE of Northstowe
- Maximum number of roofs should face south to support solar panels.
- Environmental standards should exceed the minimum standard.
- Established trees, especially around Rampton Drift should be maintained.

- Increasing building heights in town centre should be explored to reduce density around the outskirts of the town.
- Buildings adjacent Rampton Drift should not exceed 2 storeys in height.
- Minimum room sizes condition required. Reject the under occupancy argument.
- No provision for a hotel.
- Clarification is needed in respect to access to Longstanton throughout the construction process and the routes for Rampton Drift.
- Rampton Drift sewers to be connected to the Northstowe sewer network.
- Confirmation that Rampton Drift will have street lighting once classified as a road.
- Residents need to have assurance that flooding protection has been considered for Rampton Drift.
- Consideration needs to be given for the effect the construction. Need to consider working out from Rampton Drift.
- The green spaces of Rampton Drift need to be maintained by Northstowe.
- As with Northstowe, Rampton Drift needs to have fibre broadband installed.
- Plans of the town centre need to be more detailed in order that the residents of Rampton Drift will have some idea of its impact.
- Need better consultation on the requirements of the town centre and what should be included.
- Supermarkets should be towards the outskirts of the town to minimise traffic in the town centre.
- Clarification of the scheme to bring homes in Rampton Drift up to the environmental standards expected in Northstowe.
- There is a clear lack of green space and separation around Rampton Drift.
- The currently unadopted road in Rampton Drift needs to become adopted and maintained along with the others.
- What is being put in place to help reduce the impact construction will have on Rampton Drift residents?

Longstanton Parish Council 2nd Response:

- A community space is needed where people can meet, facilities for older children, teenagers young adults.
- Money should be made available for Longstanton to provide its duty of care to its new residents.

Oakington & Westwick Parish Council

Comments fall under numerous headings:

Transport:

- Of the three scenarios for Phase 2, the 'Do something 1' scenario is preferred.
- Support the closure of the Airfield Road to normal vehicular traffic. Needs to be strict control with a physical barrier.
- Should be an allowance of two parking spaces per property to follow the Local Plan recommendation and to minimise the wide scale erratic and dangerous parking prevalent at Orchard Park.

- The description of amenities and facilities in Oakington is incorrect. There is a village store and sub-post office, and there is no Crossways Hairdressers, and there is a public house.
- Description of the Citi 6 bus schedule is incorrect, it runs weekdays from 0700 to about 1830, not 2300. The Citi 5 hourly evening service diverts through the western end of Oakington between 1900 and 2300.
- The traffic model appears to be deficient. There are obvious discrepancies (for example the assertion that closure of the Airfield Road in DS1 will increase traffic at the Longstanton Road/Dry Drayton Road junction in Oakington).

Flooding & Drainage:

- The additional attenuation ponds each side of Dry Drayton Road should be implemented as part of the phase 2 design, and not delayed until phase 3.
- The two 2014 flood events in Oakington and Westwick need to be further considered when determining the drainage strategy for Northstowe. Any development causing water back up or reduced flow in the Beck Brook downstream from Westwick needs to be avoided.
- The failsafe position should be no discharge from Northstowe attenuation ponds into Beck Brook.

Framework Travel Plan:

- The same mistakes in Oakington retail outlets and bus service times exist here as commented in the transport section.
- Do not believe a target of 0% bus use within Northstowe by 2031 is sensible if the bus services are properly deployed.
- We have long pressed for a vehicle turning point at the Oakington Station Road/CGB junction. If designed correctly to allow for Citi 6 buses and other vehicles to turn it might receive our support.

Construction:

- Concerns that work on the Southern Access Road (West) and particularly the roundabout near Longstanton Road will be disruptive for residents nearby.
- The area of the Southern Access Road (West) and particularly the roundabout near Longstanton Road are in the one area of Phase 2 that drains towards Oakington. Provision of adequate drainage and water attenuation should be a condition.

Waste:

- The UWS (Underground Waste System) should be used.

Health:

- Provision of counselling support for residents during the construction and early occupation phases needs to be robust, pro-active and capable of expansion until the town matures.

Utilities:

- There appear to be requirements for major expansion of utilities. The parish requests that disruption should be minimised with local roads not closed during such works.

Environment:

- Suitable measures should be put in place to prevent rat-running through local villages, and particularly across the Airfield Road, when works to the B1050 occur.
- The Southern Access Road (West) should be built as a dual carriage way initially, rather than built single and widened later as it will reduce costs and would be less disruptive.
- The potential noise and negative visual impact from the Southern Access Road (West) should be reduced by suitable tree and hedgerow planting.
- It is stated that for a number of local roads in the nearby villages that 'this route already experiences high traffic volumes and some HGV traffic and as

such users of this route would be used to these traffic flows.’ The parish does not believe that this constitutes justification for planning to maintain or increase such traffic levels.

Rampton Parish Council

- Design and Access Statement:
Concern was expressed about the inadequacy of 1.5 car spaces per residential unit, particularly where housing density will be highest.
- Environmental Statement:
There were no immediately contentious items. In common with other similar documents and statements it was suggested that all parties – planners, developers and builders agree to some items being auditable so the approved planning documents have a degree of mandatory compliance for ‘desirable common sense’ items.
- Arboricultural reports:
The reports were considered thorough with as many trees as practicable being retained.
- Construction Environmental Management Plan
In the dust and inspection proposals there is no mention of the busway and cycle route requiring special consideration. The dust management plan should limit dust generation during commuting hours (or provide adequate dust suppression spraying). Other items mentioned were the lack of inclusion of amphibians and reptiles in section 6.4 which only specifically mentioned mammals and birds, and the apparent lack of consultation with neighbouring villages when unexploded ordnance is being detonated on site.
- Economic Development Strategy
The Parish Council feel there should be more consultation with local businesses. The “forum” process that is linked with Northstowe development should also involve local businesses.
- Energy Strategy
The issue of wind power (16 medium or 5 large turbines) must be resolved *before* the main development starts..
The assertion in the Energy review that Heat Pumps are a ‘rejected’ option seems flawed. It is accepted that air sourced heat pumps can be noisy and increase possible neighbour conflicts, but ground sourced heat pumps (GSHP) must be considered as usable.
The assumptions about the area of roof top solar PV assumes the same (26%) area usage on both residential and commercial property. As much of the commercial property could have flat roof area the percentage value should be higher.
- Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.
The final proposals presented should contain descriptions of an auditable drainage system maintenance programme both in and downstream from Northstowe.
- Framework Travel Plan / Transport Assessment.
The Parish Council wish to see an upgrade to commuter cycleway standards for the whole Cottenham/Rampton/Northstowe route.
The Busway crossing point into Northstowe at the end of Reynolds Drove should be flattened and be given a request bus stop similar to the one at Fenstanton Lakes.
The flattening of the crossing should also include the provision of access restrictors for anything other than cycles.
Cycle rack stations should be equipped with suitable charging points.
The assumptions about travel options seem to imply a reduction in the number of cycle journeys.

- Health Impact Assessment
The Parish Council fully support the early provision of a Community Development worker
- Stakeholder and Community Engagement
There is no mention of security or policing. Good open views and the absence of concealed areas that encourage loitering and/or crime must be built into the design fabric. The recent request that the floor areas of houses be allowed to drop below the recommended guidelines suggest an element of 'building on the cheap'. All houses should be built with adequate security measures as standard.
- Sustainability Statement
It is important that some (not all!) of the sustainability aspirations (and others) are made auditable, and marked as such in the final proposals.
- Town Centre Strategy (incl retail assessment)
The proposals are interesting, but rely heavily on the developments ability to attract suitable businesses.
- Utilities report
Would like to see the main electricity supplies going into the development underground rather than on pylons/post.
- Waste Strategy
Cost cutting may result in the higher density areas of the town having refuse bins as permanent pavement litter.

Swavesey Parish Council

- Future maintenance of attenuation ponds and swales:
The Council expressed its concerns over proposals for Anglian Water to maintain these ponds and swales. A question was also raised as to how funds for the maintenance in the future are to be raised.
- Southern access road, from Hattons Rd B1050 into Northstowe. Surface water run-off from this road would be managed at a 1:100 year event flood risk.
The Council is concerned that this is not a high enough capacity. Concern was also raised that the water flow west, from the new road, would flow into existing drainage ditches alongside the existing Longstanton Bypass and onwards in to the Swavesey catchment at a much faster rate. How is this flow to be managed to ensure it does not cause additional problems through the Swavesey catchment?
- Ramper Road. Ramper Road has always suffered from rat-running to avoid the A14. Ramper Road is only just wide enough for two-way traffic and not in a condition to take an increase in traffic use. Could measures be considered to ensure that Ramper Road and roads through Swavesey and Over and not adversely affected by Northstowe development?

Swavesey Parish Council 2nd Response:

- Between 12-19th January 2015, a Police traffic monitor was installed on Ramper Road, in the residential section in Swavesey:

Ramper Rd from 12th January – 19th January

- Total number of vehicles passing through the check (East & West)
8,541
- Vehicles detected at 30-39 MPH 3,052

- Vehicles detected at 40-49 MPH 119
 - Vehicles detected at 50-59 MPH 1
 - Fastest speed 58 MPH
 - Goods vehicles detected 427 none over ACPO
 - Vehicles exceeding ACPO limit for prosecution (limit+10%+2mph) 36 mph 3,001
 - Ratio of speeding vehicles over ACPO limit 35.13%
- Also, in December there were a number of accidents around the Utton's Drove junction, where there is a sharp bend.
 - The Council is very concerned that the Northstowe development will have a serious impact on Ramper Road and the level of traffic it takes.

Willingham Parish Council

- - Recommend refusal because of increased use of B1050. Regulating the traffic lights at the Over Road/Berrycrofts/High Street/Station Road crossroads is too simplistic.

Statutory and Other Consultations

Anglian Water

- A high level option has been identified to connect the proposed development site to the Water Recycling Centre at Uttons Drove via a to-be-constructed pumping station and rising main. This can be delivered under section 98 of the Water Industry Act. To ensure that the detail for this option can be defined and implemented Anglian Water request that an appropriate condition is imposed on the planning permission. The wording of the condition should ensure that the development is not commenced until a strategy is submitted and agreed, and that there is no occupation until the strategy has been implemented.

Water Recycling Centre

- The receiving Water Recycling Centre has capacity to treat the phase two proposal for 3,500 dwellings and associated uses. This capacity is dependent on necessary discharge consents to accommodate additional flow being permitted.

Surface Water Network

- Anglian Water have held discussions with the applicant and their developers on the adoption of surface water SUDS infrastructure. There is not yet a formal agreement in place.
- Anglian Water request that an appropriately worded condition is imposed to ensure that the development is not commenced until a strategy is submitted and agreed, and that there is no occupation until the strategy has been implemented.

Cambridge Cycling Campaign

- Object because the scheme does not meet the requirements of the Department for Transport:
1. *Permeability of Private Motor-Vehicles*
 - The grid layout with has no restraint on permeability of motor-vehicles. The proposal encourages car traffic to rat-run through residential secondary streets.
 2. *Insufficient Width of Cycle Routes*
 - Primary Streets
 - The cycle routes are of insufficient width. The cycle lanes on primary routes will narrow from 2.1m on phase 1 to 2m in Phase 2. The effective width of the cycle track is reduced in reality by 0.5m because people would not be able to cycle next to the water feature. A cycle lane needs to be 2.5m without any obstructions within 0.5m of this space. The space allocated to the primary streets is sufficiently wide enough to accommodate such widths of cycle lanes and all other features required except the water features.
 - The transport assessment states that the primary roads will be 7.3m in width but the design and access statement suggests 6.1m.
 - Secondary Streets
 - Some secondary streets have been shown as having bicycle routes. In contravention of Department for Transport guidance these are shown as single bi-directional lane.
 - It is questioned where the car parking would be provided on secondary streets.
 - A cycle lane that has an effective width of just 0.5m, and in the 'dooring zone' of the parked cars cannot be considered acceptable.
 - Tertiary Streets
 - There are concerns that on-street parking which is not shown will eat into the pedestrian space. If 3m of space is provided for pedestrian movements then this should not be reduced to less than 1m by anti-social parking. More detail is needed as to how anti-social parking of private cars will be managed and controlled.
 - Busways
 - There is insufficient detail of the bus stops and how they would be designed, both in terms of pedestrians crossing the cycleway and in terms of the provision of cycle parking at these stops.
 - Greenways
 - It is not understood how the DfT's guidance for the minimum width of 3m for a bi-directional cycle track that are non shared with pedestrians has become a 2m wide shared use space for people cycling and people walking. There should be a minimum of 3m of cycle track and 2m of pedestrian footpath that are segregated both in space and in levels and surface materials.
 3. *Lack of Connectivity with Wider Region*
 - The proposed plans for linking the development to the outside world are lacking in clarity.

- There is concern that bicycle routes are categorised into three different types: commuter routes; leisure routes and quiet roads. It isn't understood why there is the need for such classification as everyone should be encouraged to cycle. There is no traffic assessment of the roads or streets within or outside of Northstowe that would support such a classification. It is recommended that such an assessment is performed to replace the arbitrary classification that has been used.

4. Too many conflicts between people walking and people cycling

- There are many places where it is assumed that those not in cars can successfully share the same space.
- Within the town centre there appears to be no bicycle infrastructure at all. All access to the town centre appears to be using secondary streets of unknown design and therefore it is assumed that there would be no bicycle infrastructure.

5. Very low cycle parking provision

Residential

- Whilst the plans suggest that 1.5 car parking spaces will be provided per dwelling, there is no equivalent statement for bicycle parking spaces. The only statement given is that there will be a 'minimum 1 secure space to be provided, within the curtilage where possible.' Clarification is needed on this point.
- The 3,500 houses will provide 4,420 secure car parking spaces and 857 unallocated car parking spaces, there is no similar breakdown for secure bicycle parking and on-street bicycle parking.
- The standard cycle parking provision, according to the developer is one space per residence. If each bedroom of a five bedroom house had one person in then this would allow each person in that house to have one fifth of a bicycle.
- Assuming one person per bedroom, secure bicycle parking provision should be over 10,000 and not the 5,867 proposed. On the assumption that a couple will live in a master bedroom this number would need to be closer to 13,000.

On Street Cycle Parking

- The provision of bicycle parking on all streets with the same absolute number of spaces as car parking must be provided within this planning application.
- Officer Response:
- This has been raised with the applicant and a response is awaited.

Education

- The ambition of 30% of primary school and 60% of secondary school children cycling to school is exceptionally low. Space for secure cycle parking for students should be provided on a one per student basis.
- There is no secure cycle parking for teachers or other staff at schools.

Town Centre

- The town centre is said to provide 57,500 m² of retail space. Give that cycle parking would be provided at one secure space for each 25m² this equates to 2,300 bicycle parking spaces. Such a large number of spaces would require more than just on-street bicycle parking. Structures similar to the Cambridge railway multi-storey cycle parking structure should be used. The developer is

only proposing one space for each 50m² of retail space which is against policy.

Other facilities

- Many facilities are being planned within the development and many don't mention secure bicycle parking eg) the sports hub and water park. Additional text is required to describe the level of secure provision.

Car Clubs / Car Sharing Schemes

- There is no mention of car clubs or car sharing schemes.

Policy TI/3 Parking Provision

- Conditions should be placed on the development eg) buildings cannot be occupied until the levels of secure cycle parking have been proven to have been provided, both on-street and within the curtilage of the buildings, and that no town centre buildings can be occupied until secure parking is provided and can be used that meets the requirements of the local policies.

6. Excessively high design speeds for roads

- The design speed for the primary roads is stated to be 30 mph which is too high for a primarily residential development with housing on both sides of the street. Such a scenario will encourage people to drive instead of walk/cycle to their destination. The primary roads should have a design speed of 20 mph.
- The secondary streets should provide only 5.5m of space for motor vehicles and should have a design speed of 20mph.

7. Unsafe designs for the access road

- There are concerns about the design of the southern access road. These concerns are around the route into the developments, and the junctions with the Airport Road, Wilson's Road, the B1050 and the Phase 1 Cycleway.

Route into the development

- The volume of traffic on the secondary road out of Northstowe will be such that bicycle traffic will be intimidated and significantly delayed. The delays to the bus traffic may have a highly detrimental effect on the use of the bus. It is requested that the eastern primary road in this area is routed either out via Phase 1 only or via the line for the eastern primary road set out for Phase 3.
- There are concerns that the western primary road will dump all its traffic on the secondary road. It is requested that the western primary road is fully built at this time and that the secondary road is used as the haul road.
- There are concerns about how the bicycle traffic would be routed through this junction in the future. Large roundabouts, as proposed here should not be expecting bicycle traffic to join the main flow of motor vehicle traffic to negotiate the junction. A long term solution is that this roundabout is built slightly higher than ground level such that a bicycle underpass can be built.

Airport Road Junction

- The main southern access road appears to be four lanes wide at its junction with the existing Airport Road. It is unacceptable that a major bicycle route should be given only a Pegasus crossing and not a toucan crossing or similar. It is not understood how somebody on a bicycle travelling north would be able to cross over this road.

- There are concerns that the 'bus only access' ramps from the access road will be illegally used by ordinary motor vehicles.
- Given that the transport assessment does not propose any buses travelling along this road, it is questioned why such a junction is needed in the first place. It is therefore requested that this junction is removed.
- Given that the access road will have significant flows of traffic there are concerns that any signalised crossing at this point will prioritise the movement of motorised vehicles over sustainable modes of transport. It is requested that this junction is converted into a grade separated junction that allows bicycle and equestrian traffic through at ground level and that the road goes up and over the cycle route 24 without disruption.

Wilson's Road Junction

- The provision of a 'straighter' Wilson's Road is welcomed. If this route is considered as a serious cycle route then it must be properly surfaced. Details are requested of the design of Wilson's Road as a cross-section.

B1050 Junction

- On the assumption that the junction would not be signalised the cycleway should cross at ninety degrees to the flow of traffic without any sharp corners just before or just after.
- The bicycle crossing of the side of the road is too close to the junction. Therefore the bicycle crossing point should be moved back far enough that all vehicles will be able to stop in the distance between the roundabout and that crossing point. The bicycle crossing point should have a central refuge area that allows for the queuing of bicycle traffic waiting to cross the other lane. This should be a minimum of 2.5m long and 4m wide and protected with kerbs.

Phase 1 Cycleway Junction

- The drawings that show the B1050 junction with the southern access road do not show any details about the Phase 1 cycleway along the B1050. It has been mentioned that this route is being provided, yet according to the proposed planning application, this cycleway will be removed from the junction and terminated at communications town.
- On the assumption that this cycleway will be drawn onto the diagram when plans are amended it would have to be questioned how this cycleway will be able to access the proposed 4m wide cycleway being provided by the A14 improvements. Any proposed solution should either be completely signalised or grade separated.

Access to New Close Farm, Business Park

- It is requested that provision is made for non-motorised users to access New Close Farm Business Park.

8. Additional Considerations

- During all stages of this development temporary road closures should privilege pedestrians and cyclists over motor vehicles. Cyclists should never be required to dismount at an obstruction.

Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council (CEC)

- The CEC is interested in the possibility of shared space.

- There are usually no major obstacles in the way of sharing more widely with other Christian groupings.
- A church-managed community centre would be a possibility. Such land could be offered at market value with a bidding process. If this were to become a more definite suggestion there would be an interest in pursuing it.
- The other major faith groups (those who are involved with the Faith Reference Group for NW Cambridge) have been informed about the proposal for Northstowe. Responses have been received from three of them (Ba'h'ai, Buddhism and Judaism) who have all expressed some interest but have made no specific suggestions.
- Sharing buildings presents major difficulties for some faith groups and that overcoming some of these difficulties.

Cambridge Meridian Education Trust (CMET)

- Proposed area set aside for the schools is inadequate
- Schools should share facilities for economies of scale
- The adjacent sports hub should share facilities with the school.
- A S106 agreement is needed to establish facilities including a subsidy to ensure sustainability for the community sports provision in the early years of establishing the new community.
- There is a Lack of consistency between documents as to what facilities will be provided where.
- Schools should not be constrained to two-storeys.
- The sports fields may be prone to flooding.
- The secondary school should be an exemplar building that lends itself to teaching about the latest sustainable technologies (this should be in the S106).
- Clarity is needed on which facilities could be co-located with the school eg what will the leisure (10,000m²), health, community, fitness centre (6000m²) and youth facilities (2000m²) be?
- Where will indoor sports be located (ie swimming pool, 8 court sports hall, fitness suite, squash courts and indoor bowls)? Can they be co-located with the secondary school?
- Where will cultural facilities for the education uses that the planning statement refers to be located? Would like funding for a 400 seat theatre venue with high-quality projection facilities, gig venue, art gallery, and dance studio in the S106 agreement. Subsidy to ensure the sustainability of this provision should be included in the S106 agreement alongside a commitment to fund and Arts and Community Development Manager.
- Proposed parking for the schools is inadequate. Parking provision should not encroach on the 12Ha allocated to the secondary school.
- The drop-off / pick up zones should be separate from the parking area.
- Require guaranteed access for primary and secondary curriculum to education zone at the water park.
- NEAP on edge of schools site should be explored about how to integrate it with the sports hub.
- The developer should commit to offering apprenticeships in all areas of the build as part of the S106 including a post for the management of this.
- The developer should offer guaranteed job interviews to local unemployed people.
- The schools area should be included in the public art strategy and there should be S106 funding for the project management of this type of activity.

- Clarification is needed as to where pedestrian crossings will be placed and commitment is needed to safety of students.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary

- Part 5 DAS (page 89) indicative drawings are poor because they show rear gardens of terraced plots backing onto the fronts of terraced house. Block design with active frontages providing good surveillance of public spaces and through routes should be encouraged.
- Page 133 of DAS shows houses with alleyways at the back. This should be avoided.
- The layouts on page 135 are much better.

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service

- Adequate provision should be made for fire hydrants either by way of a s106 agreement or planning condition.
- Access and facilities for the Fire Service should be provided in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document B5, Section 16.
- An increase in call volume and emergency incidents will result from road networks in and around the new development along with increased volume on the major networks providing access to it.
- There is not capacity to deal with the estimated need. Attendance times to the location would be from existing stations located at Cambridge and Cottenham for the first response calls. The risk profile for the new development is likely to require a higher level of response which is not achievable from existing locations, and would impact on the services ability to maintain existing risk cover to Cambridge and the surrounding areas.
- Consideration will be required for the deployment of additional resources during the construction phase in order to provide adequate emergency cover and response capability.
- Provision of a fire station for use by on-call staff is needed. The station will need to include a garage space for a fire engine. Cost of construction is £640,000. If alternative training facilities can be readily accessed the site could be reduced in size with a build cost of £507,000.
- The fire engine will need to be housed in the garage space 24/7. Crews will need to attend the station as a minimum of one evening of 3 hours per week. Access and attendance will then be dependent on call frequency to the local area.
- In order to mobilise the fire engine a minimum of 4 staff must be available within 5 minutes of the fire station. The optimum crew is 5 personnel. In order to achieve this across 24/7 365 days of the year approximately 12-15 new staff members would be required. All of these would be new staff who would require recruitment, selection and base training. Using an equivalent size station and expected training need and call rate, the annual staffing/running costs would be approximately £140,000.
- The training, management and supervision of the new station would be integrated into existing staff structures.
- The first 12 months would require an additional resource to coordinate and support new staff, whilst providing enhanced cover in the area, awaiting a fully functional crew and station. This resource could be based at nearby

Cottenham or in temporary accommodation on site. The approximate cost would be £45,000.

- Using existing resources from existing CFRS locations will not provide a response service which fits within the current expected target response times as stated within the county Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP).
- It is important that new housing is well-designed. CFRS requirements for new developments in general are set out in the guidance note 'Building Safe - designing out fire'.
- Sprinkler systems are exceptionally effective through their ability to control a fire before it develops to life threatening proportions. This is the **number one preferred option**
- Without the sprinkler provision, an emergency response capability would be required within the community. The problem with this option is that it doesn't reduce the risk level it just provides an emergency response facility to tackle the risk. This has far less impact and relies on CFRS being able to recruit, retain and fund equipment and personnel to operate such a facility. This cannot be guaranteed. It is estimated that the facility would be required once 2000 phase 2 properties are occupied. This would be added to the occupancies of phase one and the surrounding villages, thereby lifting the area into a higher risk profile area.

Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum

- The way in which the development fits into the wider landscape is unclear.
- Not much attention has been paid to ensuring the future occupants will be able to access the wider region.
- There appears to be only one main road that will join up with the existing road past Noon Folly and onto the A14. Although there is a proposed new road to the South West to link to the A14 it may not be complete for several years and should have a cycle lane alongside for accessing the neighbouring villages over the A14.
- Adequate arrangements for access and crossings to the development on the other side of the main through route by the Longstanton Park and Ride should be included.
- The amount of green space is less than previously proposed. Children need local green spaces rather than drainage areas etc. Green areas should be distributed between and adjacent to the residential areas they support. If it's necessary to take a 20 minute walk to a green space the route should be separated from the traffic by a wide verge/bank.
- There needs to be all-users level access over the guided busway towards Rampton
- Welcome the proposed bridleway leading off the road to Rampton.
- The longstanding issue of travellers on the Aldreth Causeway should be addressed to make using the route to and from Aldreth feasible.
- The best leisure journeys will be towards Swavesey and the RSPB reserve at Fen Drayton.
- The cycle network is on the road from Longstanton to Swavesey which will not be pleasant.
- The airfield road could become a useful within-town exercise-promoting cycle route or dog walking/jogging track.
- A booklet of walks and rides around Northstowe should be produced and included in promotional material.
- Any reclassified footpaths should be of appropriate width.

- The existing public right of way routes should be maintained, reclassifying them to bridleway from footpath where possible to enhance usability by riders/cyclists as well as walkers.
- Safe through access should be maintained for horse riders and cyclists between Longstanton and Oakington who currently use the airfield road.
- A circular perimeter natural boundary with perimeter bridleway/cycleway should be created, similar to that at Cambourne. The circular route should be in addition to the guided busway bridleway.
- The town should have a green border in between its houses/built environment and the busway. There is no need to build right up to the edge of the busway, park and green space is proposed in this area.
- Where surface improvements such as hard surfacing are carried out on bridleways for cyclists, a soft regularly-mown grass or cinder-type surface should be kept alongside too, for enjoyment by walkers and riders.
- With regard to riders, the views of Keeble Cottage Equestrian Centre, Charlotte's Riding Stables in Oakington and the livery yard at the Longstanton end of Rampton Drift public bridleway/byway should also be sought.
- The old airfield road at Oakington should be made a Right of Way and should be designated a bridleway.

CTC right to ride network

- Objections concern the following unacceptable elements of the proposed design:
 1. The proposed grid network of roads is too permeable for motor vehicles. In particular, the design should limit the number of roads that cross and/or connect to the central busway spine.
 2. The secondary road sections show a carriageway that is too wide, which reinforces their inappropriate use as through roads for motor vehicles.
 3. The standard of cycle provision is too low. It fails to align with the planned cycle provision in Phase 1 and it is unacceptable for Phase 2 provision to be built to a lower quality than Phase 1.
- In general, it appears that the Design and Access Statement favours journeys by cars over other modes. This is also reflected in the detailed design: the proposed road network will allow cars to travel at 30mph along an unrestricted and fully connected grid network of roads while providing a poorer quality of provision for cycling than is proposed for Phase 1.
 - All of the roads, including all the primary roads, should be designed as 20mph roads in line with national guidelines for urban roads.
 - All of the secondary roads should be designed as no through routes for motor vehicles to minimise vehicle movements on these roads. These roads can be designed for mixed use where cycles safely share the carriageway with motor vehicles.

OBJECTION 1:

The internal road design is too permeable for motor vehicles.

The following changes are essential:

1. There should be no through routes for motor vehicles on any of the secondary cross routes, while remaining fully permeable for cycling and walking.
2. Motor vehicle permeability should be limited to the two primary access roads. Plus at most one or two primary cross route between the western and eastern primary roads.

OBJECTION 2:

The primary road alignment and the associated cycle path provision alongside the primary roads should be more consistent with Phase 1. The following changes are essential:

1. The primary road alignment should reduce the length of straight alignment. These roads should be designed as 20mph residential roads and this requires the alignment to be changed to include multiple horizontal deviations and other more effective speed reduction measures.
2. Segregated cycle paths are needed on both sides of the primary roads. The Phase 2 primary road cycle paths must be at least 2.5m wide. This is wider than Phase 1 to reflect the more central location where higher levels of cycling are expected.
3. An additional width of 0.5m should be added on any sections where the cycle path is adjacent to a vertical barrier.
4. The detailed design of the primary road cycle paths should align to the design for Phase 1.

OBJECTION 3:

The secondary road design is inappropriate. The carriageway section is too wide and none of these roads should be a through route for motor vehicles.

The following changes are essential:

1. All of the secondary roads should have a narrower carriageway and should be designed for low vehicle speeds and for low numbers of vehicle movements.
2. There should be no through routes for motor vehicles along any of the secondary roads. There must be no connection to the central busway spine and no through motor traffic on any of these secondary roads.
3. A bidirectional cycle path on one side only is not acceptable for any of the secondary roads. The secondary route can be redesigned as a shared space and no segregated cycle paths are needed. But, if segregated cycle paths are included, there should be a cycle path on both sides each with a minimum width of 2.1m to provide continuity with the primary road cycle paths.

OBJECTION 4:

The central busway cycle path design is poorly designed and inconsistent with Phase 1.

1. The cycle path width should be increased to at least 3.5m and ideally to 4m. This is wider than the corresponding path in Phase 1 to reflect the more central location.
2. An additional width of 0.5m should also be provided on any sections where the cycle path is adjacent to a vertical barrier.
3. The cycle path should be located on the same side of the busway for the whole of the Northstowe development. It is understood that the west/south side will be used for Phase 1.
4. An additional cycle path of similar quality should also be added to connect between this busway cycle path and the NCN24 cycle route along Longstanton Road.

This connection is needed to provide an alternative direct cycle route to Cambridge (an alternative to the Guided Busway bridleway).

OBJECTION 5:

The primary road connections to the southern access road are unacceptable and inconsistent with Phase 3.

The plans indicate that there will be a total of 3 primary access roads that link to the southern access road. Only the central access road will be built initially but all 3 are planned at a later stage. There is a suggestion that the initial central road will be

closed at some point in the future but this creates an unacceptable conflict in the short term and has the potential to maintain this conflict in the future.

The following changes are essential:

1. The primary connection to the southern access road should be along one of the two long term alignments
2. The proposed addition of a third (central) primary access road is unacceptable - even as an interim step - and it must be removed.
3. If part of that third (central alignment) primary road is retained for providing access, it must be converted into a secondary street with no through connection to the central busway for motor vehicles while (of course) retaining full permeability for cycles and pedestrians.

OBJECTION 6:

The junction/ crossing between the southern access road and Longstanton Road must be redesigned to provide a safer and more convenient crossing for cyclists using NCN24.

- The proposed crossing design is potentially dangerous and unacceptable. In part, this problem is related to objection 5 where the third central primary access road creates this dangerous crossing. However, a similar crossing will still be needed to cross the other realigned access roads and a better junction design is needed.
- Separately, there should be a good quality cycle route added to provide a direct desire-line connection between the central busway cycle path and Longstanton Road. The redesigned junction must support this alternative cycle route.

OBJECTION 7:

The proposals for additional cycle routes outside of the Northstowe site are too limited in scope. The plans include some welcome elements outside of the development but the proposed new routes are too limited in scope and there are some undesirable gaps.

The following changes are essential:

1. The proposed cycle path alongside the new southern access road is welcome but the proposed width of 3m is the minimum for this location. The cycle path should be separated from the carriageway by a verge with a width of at least 1m and ideally 2m. This verge should include some light and sound screening.
2. The outline of new cycle routes north of the guided busway should be more detailed. This development should be expected to fund the completion of a new cycle path between the villages of Rampton and Willingham. This development should also fund some widening and general improvements to the existing cycle path between Rampton and Cottenham.
3. The development should also include improvement to the byway/bridleway connection between Northstowe and Rampton to provide access to these new cycle routes.

Cambridge Water

- Cambridge Water currently has available water resources to supply the Northstowe development overall, however the existing network will require reinforcement when certain trigger points are reached:
0-3000 dwellings: no network reinforcement, local off-site and on site mains required only.

- 3001+ dwellings: Coton booster upgrade and trunk main reinforcement, reinforcement to be completed and commissioned before the 3001st connection is made.

English Heritage

- No objection subject to condition.
- The applicant has correctly identified the heritage assets, both designated and undesignated.
- In respect of the undesignated heritage assets it is welcomed that the proposal aims to retain the Officer's Mess, The Guardhouse and the Water Tower as this enables future residents/visitors to understand the history of the site.
- In respect of designated heritage assets, namely the Oakington pillboxes, it is noted that the proposal will result in some change to their setting but that they will remain in an essentially open landscape. These changes will not result in significant levels of harm to their significance and their interlocking fields of fire will be discernible.
- The development site boundaries incorporate part of the designated Longstanton Conservation Area. It is important that the reserved matters proposals preserve and enhance the character and appearance of this space. A condition is required to requiring the treatment of this part of the Green Separation to retain the areas existing character and appearance.

Environment Agency

Development and Flood risk

- The surface water drainage scheme submitted is in line with those agreed under the strategic drainage scheme and is in accordance with the policies of the Northstowe Area Action Plan (NAAP). The EA have no principle objections concerning Phase 2 of Northstowe, although further information regarding the detailed drainage design would be required prior to the commencement of works onsite. It should be noted at this time (November 2014) that the Webbs Hole Sluice Pumping station and the Land Drainage Solution (LDS) have yet to be completed. It is essential that these are completed prior to the habitation of Northstowe as the foul drainage system is reliant upon this work being completed. Planning conditions are required. The first condition regards ensuring the completion of the Land Drainage Solution (LDS) within the Swavesey Drain system. The LDS shall include the installation of a pumping station, to the prior agreed specifications of the local planning authority, at Webb's Hole Sluice. A further condition requires the submission of a detailed surface water drainage strategy for the application site prior to commencement of that Development Phase to which the drainage relates. A third condition requires a detailed scheme for the future responsibilities for the management of the surface water drainage.

Groundwater & Contaminated (GW&CL)

- This site is partly located above a Principal Aquifer, WFD groundwater body, WFD drinking water protected area and is adjacent to a surface water course. It is considered that the previous military airfield and

barracks land use is potentially contaminative. The site is considered to be of high sensitivity and could present potential pollutant/contaminant linkages to controlled waters. Potential contamination risk to the Principal Aquifer from current or historic contamination in areas of the proposed Phase 2 development overlying the Principal Aquifer should be addressed. The EA consider that planning permission could be granted providing conditions are implemented. Without these conditions, the proposed development on this site poses an unacceptable risk to the environment and the EA would wish to object to the application. The first of these conditions relates to provision of a remediation strategy and provision of a remediation strategy if contamination is identified.

Area Environmental Planning (AEP)

- Water Quality/wastewater. The condition mentioned under the development and flood risk section with regard to ensuring the completion of the Land Drainage Solution (LDS) within the Swavesey Drain system is needed to ensure adequate infrastructure. The scheme shall have reference to how the drainage pipe-work and infrastructure shall be monitored during implementation, fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority. It is important for the efficient and effective operation of drainage systems – both on-site and in the wider catchment of the Utton's Drove wastewater treatment works - that clean and foul drainage remains separate.
- Waste. The application has presented a comprehensive Waste Management Strategy for the proposed Phase 2 development at Northstowe. The Waste Strategy has presented an excellent approach to the management of waste from the construction through to the operational phases.
- Water resources.

The EA could not find a reference to a specific Water Cycle Strategy (WCS), however the targets mentioned above would comply with what we expect to see in a WCS.

The development lies within the area traditionally supplied by Cambridge Water Company. It is assumed that water will be supplied using existing sources and under existing abstraction licence permissions. The planners should seek advice from the water company to find out whether this is the case, or whether a new source needs to be developed or a new abstraction licence is sought. The Agency may not be able to recommend a new or increased abstraction licence where water resources are fully committed to existing abstraction and the environment.

It is assumed that new houses will be constructed with water meters fitted. Other water saving measures that we wish to see incorporated include low flush toilets, low flow showerheads, water butts for gardens etc. The Environment Agency also supports the idea of greywater recycling as it

has the potential to reduce water consumption in the average household by up to 35%.

- Fisheries, Biodiversity & Geomorphology (FBG)

Any wetlands or waterbodies proposed as part of the development should be designed and managed in such a way as to positively contribute to the nature conservation value of the sites. Measures should include establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged. The EA requires four conditions. One condition will require a scheme to be agreed to ensure that the bat populations found on site are protected whilst another conditions will be needed to protect the badger population on site. The other two conditions require a scheme to be agreed to ensure that the lizard and grass snake populations found on site are protected and a scheme to be agreed to ensure that the bird populations found on site are protected.

Environment Management (EM)

The key documents, from the E&M perspective, namely the Drainage Strategy and the Outline Site-wide Construction Environmental Management Plan, appear to present a considered and thorough approach to managing the risks of pollution from the construction phase and the longer-term surface and foul drainage solutions. The EA would not have any objections. In order to deliver it will be important to secure full agreement with the sewerage undertaker regarding the foul water drainage design, capacity and permitting, as well as approval from our colleagues regarding SUDs and contaminated land issues. The EA requires a condition to ensure the implementation of an approved Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Highways Agency

- No objection subject to condition:

No part of the proposed development beyond that referred to as sub-phase B in section 7.7 of the Northstowe Phase 2 Transport Assessment Main Report (dated August 2014) shall commence prior to the opening of (i) the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme; and (ii) the widening of Hattons Road to dual carriageway between its junctions with the A14 at Bar Hill the proposed Northstowe southern access route.

Reason(s) for the direction given at b), c) or d) overleaf and the period of time for a direction at e) when directing that the application is not granted for a specified period:

To ensure the safe and efficient operation of the A14 Trunk Road

HSE

- The proposed development site lies within the consultation distance of the former Home Office Immigration Reception Centre at Oakington Barracks, Longstanton, which is a major hazard site by virtue of the quantity of LPG held on site. The Immigration Reception centre closed in 2010 and hazardous substances are no longer present on the site. HSE withdraws the consultation distance unless SCDC advises that this site does currently hold hazardous substances consent under the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992, as amended. If there is an existing hazardous substances consent for this site then SCDC should consider formally revoking it. On the assumption that the consultation distance is withdrawn there will be no need for SCDC to consult HSE on any developments in its vicinity including those associated with the Northstowe development.

Longstanton & District Heritage Society

- Applicant should make a firm commitment to providing a building and funding for a heritage centre and café in the former Guardroom. Developer contributions should be used to maintain this facility for the duration of the building works via a S106 agreement.
- There needs to be some acknowledgement of the LDHS archives and heritage protection for these.
- Require a town park with a war memorial.
- Former Station HQ should be retained.
- Longstanton Conservation Area should not be urbanised at all and should remain as natural as possible.
- Welcome the retention of the Officers Mess, the Guardroom and water towers.
- Welcome the uses for the Listed pillboxes.
- Welcome the applicant's acknowledgement that not all archaeological sites have been identified and that watching briefs will be put in place.
- Impact of the development on the residents and village of Longstanton has not been adequately addressed.
- Funding should be provided for the refurbishment of St Michael's Church.
- Longstanton conservation area paddocks should be formerly designated as green separation.
- Concerned about the high level of development on land that lies between Rampton Road and the Phase 1 area. Additional planting should be provided along its route.
- Extent of sports pitches is a concern. They should be removed and replaced with informal green space.
- Landscaping in the areas of the pillboxes and along the boundary with Phase 3 is insufficient.
- Green separation adjacent to Long Lane is insufficient.
- Insufficient green corridors to allow wildlife and walkers to cross the town without coming into contact with cyclists
- Landscaping of the heritage core area and town centre is insufficient especially as there is no town parkin either the town centre or adjacent to the heritage core.
- Insufficient green separation between land designated for residential areas and parts of the conservation area including Long Lane.
- Proposed density of 35-40 per hectare is too high for land adjacent to Long Lane.

- Density of 61 dph for the Station HQ site is a clear indication that it will not be retained.
- Character of Longstanton paddocks should be retained and cycle tracks should not go through them.
- Public access to Longstanton paddocks should be carefully controlled.
- Important for the disabled, dogwalkers and those with young children to have access to informal open space without having to avoid cyclists.
- Long Lane should be redesignated as a footpath or bridleway (footpath preferable because of the damage horses cause in wet weather).
- There should be no street lights erected along Long Lane because it will harm the conservation area.
- Object to the closure of the track that runs from Rampton Road to the Guided Busway because it is an historic route which, like Long Lane, plays a vital role in maintaining some of the historic character of Longstanton.
- The plans don't show a safe and disability friendly crossing point of the GBW.
- The provision of a 5 storey building on the site of the Station HQ is not in keeping with the surrounding area and would detract from the conservation area. Building of 5-6 storeys should be restricted to the town centre.

National Grid

- National Grid has identified that it has apparatus in the vicinity of the enquiry which may be affected by the activities specified. National Grid should be informed as soon as possible about the decision the Local Planning Authority is likely to make regarding this application. Due to the presence of National Grid apparatus in proximity to the specified area, the contractor should contact National Grid before any works are carried out to ensure that the National Grid's apparatus is not affected by any of the proposed works. This assessment solely relates to National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) and National Grid Gas plc (NGG) apparatus.

Natural England

- Areas allocated to informal green space are relatively modest in extent compared to the amount of housing.
- The developer should compensate for loss of farmland bird habitat by having off-site creation.
- At least 3 of the greenways should be informal to allow for wildlife habitation
- Natural England ANGSt (accessible natural green space standards) need to ensure: 1) the larger greenways of 50m or more should be included as natural green space to ensure the majority of dwellings are within 300m of a green space of at least 2ha although some housing in the town centre would be 300m from a green space 2) The proposal does not meet the requirement to have a minimum of 1ha of Local Nature Reserve (LNR) per 1000 population.

Natural England additional comments:

- In response to RSPB's recommendations improved facilities at Fen Drayton reserve would contribute significantly to increasing the capacity of the site to accommodate visitors and thereby contribute to delivery of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and improved compliance with the Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt). The requested contribution to provide management to benefit farmland birds would target a number of species which cannot readily be accommodated within the development site.

- There are five tiers to the ANGSt standard. Phase 2 could largely meet the lower two tiers of the standard through on site green provision.
- The proposal would need to rely on off-site green spaces to meet the higher tiers (availability of 100ha and 500ha sites). The Northstowe site will meet the 500ha element of the standard through proximity to the Fen Drayton site. Furthermore, as Northstowe is just over 5km from Fen Drayton it is also close to meeting the 100ha part of the standard.
- Whilst Northstowe achieves a relatively high level of compliance with the size and distance criteria in ANGSt it is notable that this is heavily reliant on Fen Drayton as there are no other similarly large sites in close proximity.
- Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy: Both SCDC and CCC were partners on the Green Infrastructure Forum. Both Northstowe itself and Fen Drayton are included in the strategy as Target Areas. Fen Drayton is recognised in the strategy as a gateway to accessible high quality countryside. The objectives for Fen Drayton are to achieve improvements to habitats, public access, visitor facilities and community engagement.

NHS

- For Phase 1 GP services will be provided from the existing Longstanton surgery which will have to be expanded whilst children's services would be located for the first 5 years at the first Northstowe primary school.
- A new health facility is needed for Phase 2, probably in the town centre area.
- Objection to current phasing proposals because there is a need for health infrastructure to be implemented earlier.
- Need a health building with a minimum floor space of 1740 m2 and an option for expansion of 1000m2.
- Further detail needed on parking for health facilities.
- Developer contribution needed to mitigate provision of health infrastructure and establishment of health services in Northstowe.

Old West Internal Drainage Board

- The Board finds the application conditionally acceptable, and is supportive of the planning conditions relating to drainage matters that have been presented by the Environment Agency.
- The Board has suggested informatives regarding drainage.

RSPB

- No objection providing sufficient mitigation can be identified to address potentially significant impacts on sites of nature conservation interest.
- Concerns regarding:
 1. Lack of analysis regarding impacts on Ouse Washes Special Protection Area (SPA) and other site with regard to changes in hydrological nature of the area
 2. Lack of analysis regarding likely increases in recreational pressures on sites of nature conservation (SNCI) in the surrounding area
 3. Potential need for a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) with regard to points 1 and 2
 4. Level of off-site mitigation and enhancement of an appropriate scale to adequately deal with the impact on farmland birds
 5. Lack of detail regarding the cumulative impact on farmland bird species and increased pressure on SNCIs

Sport England

- Object at present due to lack of outdoor space provision and out of date facility strategy.
 - The Original Sports facility strategy for Northstowe 2008 has not been reviewed. An updated strategy needs to be approved following consultation with Sport England and other stakeholders.
 - Lack of detail on types of facility that will be provided in each hub.
 - Provision of outdoor sport space at 10.66 ha is well below requirement of 14.4 ha. It is stated that additional provision could be brought forward in Phase 3 if sport provision is not meeting demand. Sport England reject this approach because additional provision could not be guaranteed.
 - Indoor sports. The original 2008 strategy highlighted the need for the following facilities to meet demand from the new population:
 - 8 court sports hall
 - 6 lane 25m swimming pool
 - Health and fitness suites
 - 2 squash courts

It was proposed that the indoor community sports facilities would be provided as a 'dual use' facility at the proposed secondary school with detailed management arrangements to be agreed at a later date. Sport England needs confirmation that the broad outline of proposed sports facilities will remain. It was also proposed that one of the full size AGP's would be provided at the school site and a further full size AGP at the central sports hub. Other areas that need reviewing are the provision of multi-use games areas, bowling greens and youth facilities such as skate parks and BMX tracks.

Sport England consultation with National Governing Bodies of Sport (NGB's):

FA (Football): No response received

ECB (Cricket): - Swavesey Village College is the education establishment that will be linked initially and which needs much improved cricket facilities to cater for both the internal programmes they run and the partnership they have established with Over CC.

- Ultimately two cricket pitches would be needed but this is a long term plan.
- There is a need for provision on the development which caters for junior cricket developed in partnership with the (new) schools in particular and supported by the local club.
- The game of cricket is changing to a shorter format with less emphasis on clubs and more on teams who look for venues to hire. The current plan would not appear to serve that sort of opportunity.

RFU (Rugby Union)

- The RFU would prefer to see investment prioritised into existing clubs in the area to increase capacity.

England Hockey – No comments.

Swavesey & District Bridleways Association

- Maintain existing public right of way routes, reclassifying them to bridleway from footpath.

- Maintain safe through access for horse riders and cyclists between Longstanton and Oakington
- Create a perimeter natural boundary with perimeter bridleway/cycleway, similar to that at Cambourne for enjoyment of all. The circular route should be in addition to the guided busway bridleway.
- The town should have a green border inbetween its houses/built environment and the busway to give a nicer environment for everyone to be in.
- Where surface improvements such as hard surfacing are carried out on bridleways for cyclists, a soft regularly-mown grass or cinder-type surface should be kept alongside too for enjoyment by riders and walkers.

Swavesey Internal Drainage Board

- The IDB objects because the application is premature. The IDB will continue to oppose any development which will increase the rate of run-off and volume of treated effluent discharge into the Swavesey Drain system until the outstanding issues have been resolved. The main concern is about the increased rate of surface water and the increased volume of treated effluent discharging into Swavesey Drain or its associated tributaries. These watercourse are either main rivers, under the control of the Environment Agency, or Award Drains, under the control of South Cambridgeshire District Council. None of them are under the Board's jurisdiction. They form part of a 'higher level' drainage system that borders and bisects the Board's area, placing it at risk if they were to breach or overtop. These systems can influence the Boards' operation, as the Swavesey Drain system approaches capacity during relatively low rainfall events, and restricts the operation of its pumping facility, and has previously and continues to cause flooding in the area due to overtopping of the adjacent flood defence embankments particularly when Webbs Hole Sluice becomes 'tide locked' by high water levels downstream.
- The western section of the Southern Access Road (West) is within the catchment of Longstanton Brook and other tributaries of Swavesey Drain. It is noted that the stated rate of discharge from the associated balancing ponds is 1 l/s/ha, which is considered to be below the current Greenfield rate of run-off, regulated by a Hydrobrake. However, given that the lowest rate achievable using such a device is 4-5 l/s it is uncertain how this will be achieved when the largest catchment appears to be below 4ha. The use of such devices are potential maintenance issues that will require regular attention.
- No final decision on the provision of conveyance through Mare Fen, how this conveyance will be maintained, if provided, or installation of the required pump at Webbs Hole has been made. It is imperative that a hydraulic model of Swavesey Drain and associated tributaries that includes these additional discharges is undertaken before planning permission is granted by SCDC.
- A drainage strategy must be included to demonstrate that suitable consideration has been given to ensure surface water drainage treated effluent disposal can be accommodated within the site, and that issues of ownership and maintenance are addressed.
- The discharge of surface water treated effluent from developments should be designed to contribute to an improvement in water quality in the receiving water course or aquifer in accordance with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive.

- All proposals should have regard to the guidance and byelaws of the relevant Internal Drainage Board.
- The development must not have a detrimental effect on existing flood defences or inhibit flood control and maintenance work.
- The requirements under the Land Drainage Act must be complied with before any work is commenced on site.

Swavesey Internal Drainage Board (additional comments)

Agree with the thrust of the following condition:

'The proposed development (Northstowe Phase 2) shall not be occupied until such time the Land Drainage Solution (LDS) within the Swavesey Drain system is completed, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The LDS shall include the installation of a pumping station, to the prior agreed specifications of the local planning authority, at Webb's Hole Sluice, unless otherwise approved in writing by our respective authorities. Reason: To prevent the exacerbation of flooding and pollution in the water environment by ensuring the satisfactory disposal of treated foul water drainage from, and to ensure the integrity of, the Utton's Drove Sewage Treatment Works in accordance with Policies NE/10 and NE/11 of the adopted Local Development Framework.'

However, the IDB states that it is necessary for the completion of the LDS to include embankment works through Mare Fen, which formed part of the original proposals. This work is necessary to enable the Swavesey Drain to be maintained and to ensure that conveyance in the channel is retained. Without these works the LDS would be undermined. It is unclear to the Board on whom the costs of the Mare Fen works would fall.

Wildlife Trust

- Not commenting as unlikely anything meaningful by way of biodiversity enhancement can be achieved. The development is not sustainable from a natural point of view.

Wildlife Trust 2nd Response

- When the housing allocation was determined by the planning inspector the number of dwellings was increased and proposals for strategic green infrastructure provision on or adjacent to the site were removed. The planning inspector argued that as Fen Drayton nature reserve was a short bus-ride away on the guided busway that this could act as de-facto strategic green infrastructure for Northstowe. As such it is imperative that the developers as part of the phase 2 application make a significant contribution to upgrade visitor infrastructure at Fen Drayton to provide for visitors.
- It is essential that off-site biodiversity mitigation measures to address the further loss of farmland bird habitat and the impacts on a range of priority bird species are provided.