

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

t: 01954 713000

f: 01954 713149

www.scambs.gov.uk



Friday 10 June 2022

To: Chair – Councillor Henry Batchelor
Vice-Chair – Councillor Peter Fane
All Members of the Planning Committee - Councillors Ariel Cahn,
Dr. Martin Cahn, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins,
William Jackson-Wood, Peter Sandford, Heather Williams and
Dr. Richard Williams

Quorum: 3

Substitutes Councillors Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Bunty Waters,
if needed: Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Brian Milnes,
Richard Stobart, Paul Bearpark and Helene Leeming

Dear Councillor

You are invited to attend the next meeting of **Planning Committee**, which will be held in the **Council Chamber, First Floor** on **Thursday, 16 June 2022 at 10.00 a.m.** **A weblink to enable members of the press and public to listen to the proceedings will be published on the relevant page of the Council's website , normally, at least 24 hours before the meeting.**

Members are respectfully reminded that when substituting on committees, subcommittees, and outside or joint bodies, Democratic Services must be advised of the substitution ***in advance of*** the meeting. It is not possible to accept a substitute once the meeting has started. Council Standing Order 4.3 refers.

Yours faithfully
Liz Watts
Chief Executive

The Council is committed to improving, for all members of the community, access to its agendas and minutes. We try to take all circumstances into account but, if you have any specific needs, please let us know, and we will do what we can to help you.

Supplementary Agenda

7. **S/2553/16/CONDQ - Land Off Horseheath Road, Linton**
Submission of details required by condition 12 (Foul water drainage) of outline planning permission S/2553/16/OL

Pages
1 - 6

Exclusion of Press and Public

The law allows Councils to consider a limited range of issues in private session without members of the Press and public being present. Typically, such issues relate to personal details, financial and business affairs, legal privilege and so on. In every case, the public interest in excluding the Press and Public from the meeting room must outweigh the public interest in having the information disclosed to them. The following statement will be proposed, seconded and voted upon.

"I propose that the Press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following item number(s) in accordance with Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that, if present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act."

If exempt (confidential) information has been provided as part of the agenda, the Press and public will not be able to view it. There will be an explanation on the website however as to why the information is exempt.

Notes

- (1) Some development control matters in this Agenda where the periods of consultation and representation may not have quite expired are reported to Committee to save time in the decision making process. Decisions on these applications will only be made at the end of the consultation periods after taking into account all material representations made within the full consultation period. The final decisions may be delegated to the Corporate Manager (Planning and Sustainable Communities).
- (2) The Council considers every planning application on its merits and in the context of national, regional and local planning policy. As part of the Council's customer service standards, Councillors and officers aim to put customers first, deliver outstanding service and provide easy access to services and information. At all times, we will treat customers with respect and will be polite, patient and honest. The Council is also committed to treat everyone fairly and justly, and to promote equality. This applies to all residents and customers, planning applicants and those people against whom the Council is taking, or proposing to take, planning enforcement action. More details can be found on the Council's website under 'Council and Democracy'.

Agenda Item 7



Planning Committee Date	16 June 2022
Report to	South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee
Lead Officer	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
Reference	S/2553/16/CONDQ
Site	Land Off Horseheath Road
Ward / Parish	Linton/Linton
Proposal	Submission of details required by condition 12 (Foul water drainage) of outline planning permission S/2553/16/OL for 42 dwellings and allotments (not less than 0.45 hectares)
Applicant	Croudace Homes
Presenting Officer	Stephen Kelly/Karen Pell-Coggins
Reason Reported to Committee	The proposed drainage solution crosses Council owned land for which an easement has been granted
Member Site Visit Date	N/A
Key Issues	1. Foul water drainage 2. Neighbour amenity
Recommendation	APPROVE

1.0 Update to report

Paragraph 6.1 Consultations

1.1 Linton Parish Council – Objects to the application. Comments as follows:

-

The details submitted to discharge Condition 12 are identical to those refused by the SCDC Planning Committee on 13th April 2022. This is unsurprising given that the scheme presented was implemented “at risk” before approval of this pre-commencement condition was granted and several houses are now occupied on the development site.

LPC concerns are for both the residents moving onto the site, with regard to the maintenance issues and associated costs of the scheme proposed, and for residents immediately downstream of the connection on Lonsdale due to the existing foul sewer flooding experience that is not acknowledged by Anglian Water and that will be exacerbated by this development.

The foul water drainage scheme will not be adopted by Anglian Water and they have made no technical assessment of the “on-site” scheme. LPC do not believe that the scheme is adoptable for the reasons presented in the April 13th Committee Meeting.

It appears that the Sustainable Drainage Engineer responding as the “Drainage Consultant” has not sought to clarify why there are discrepancies between the drawings and calculations presented.

A request was made by LPC in September 2021 to understand these issues in the network. It is material that the LLFA and Capita acted on the same concerns raised regarding the surface water scheme, but no statutory body has, to date, explained the inconsistencies in the foul scheme. The following response was received from Croudace in October 2021 (via Stephen Kelly):

- i) The foul water drainage network shown on drawing 035-032G corresponds with the MicroDrainage calculations that have been submitted.
- ii) We have used MicroDrainage to check the minimum gradients required in the new foul sewers to provide sufficient flow capacity and the minimum self-cleansing velocity. For small networks such as this it is usually (but not always) the case that the self-cleansing velocity is the limiting factor rather than the flow capacity. MicroDrainage checks both.
- iii) The actual gradients of the sewers are generally steeper than the minimum gradients, so the network that is being constructed as per drawing 035-032G will have a greater capacity than the MicroDrainage model. This is a conservative design methodology and it does not imply that the drawings are inaccurate. We usually build spare capacity in to our drainage designs to allow for unforeseen problem during construction. This is just a sensible design approach.

Our concerns centre on the following:

- No pipes have been numbered on drawing 035-032G, only manhole numbers, and
- No manhole numbers are presented in the MicroDrainage calculations, only pipe numbers.

Given the statement in point 2. above – that the calculations check the minimum gradients required for the system to be self-cleaning, LPC would like to raise particular issues with the following:

Pipe 6.005 that we believe runs between manhole F18a and F19 has been presented in the calculations with a diameter of 150mm. This pipe appears to have a diameter of 100mm in the drawings and runs with a gradient of 1 in 102. If this pipe has been constructed as per the drawings as stated in point 3. above, then this is much shallower than the Building Regs requirement of a 1 in 80 gradient for effective self-cleansing in a pipe of 100mm diameter.

In the drawing, pipe 10.001 that we believe runs between F32 and F34 has a gradient of 1 in 103 (instead of the 1 in 41.4 modelled) – again, this is much shallower than the required 1 in 80 gradient for a 100mm diameter pipe.

Four other pipes run with shallower gradients in the drawing than those modelled implying a reduction in the self-cleansing velocity at these points in the network.

Pipes that run with exceptionally steep gradients can also cause problems for foul only sewers as the liquids ‘out-run’ the solids, leaving them in the pipes and eventually resulting in blockages. Pipe 4.002 (between F9 and F9a) is a particular concern with a gradient on the drawings of 1 in 5.6 – much steeper than the 1 in 77.7 shown in the calculations (and, indeed, much steeper than personal experience with Building Control shows is wise and the 1 in 10 starting gradient on any Building Control graphs).

There are many other pipes in this scheme that have a very different gradient in the model compared with the gradient in the drawings (Please see the Table 1 below for the pipes referred to in the comments).

If the pipes do not self-clean effectively, they risk blockages and expense for the future residents of this site. As most of the sewage pipes run through private garden space, identifying and rectifying problems has the potential to be inconvenient and risks individual residents being on the receiving end of and responsible for problems caused by others “upstream”.

The sharp bends in the rising main present another concern to LPC (and were one of the main concerns of the SCDC Planning Committee Councillors with experience of problems caused by similar looking networks). Any rising main presented for adoption would “as far as

practicable be laid in straight lines ... and where bends are used they should be of long radius" (Sewers for adoption guidance). This is to both minimise the risk of blockage, and to ensure that if a blockage occurs, standard equipment can be used to resolve the issue as quickly and easily as possible.

In addition, the pumping station and part of the rising main are much closer to the nearest habitable buildings than recommended, so any blockages or issues with the pump will result in nuisance to the nearest homeowners.

As the pumps have been blocked twice with less than ¼ of the site occupied in the last 4 months, LPC have major concerns about the long-term operation of this scheme and particularly the potential additional costs to residents for its maintenance.

We are not reassured by the discovery of the pipe between F36 and F37 that had not been properly connected despite Croudace asserting that Building Control have raised no concerns with the system – what testing had been done? And what sign-off given?

The foul sewer that this site pumps into connects to the parlous Bartlow Road sewer. Anglian Water assert that this is a "foul only" sewer; yet the experience of residents in the village is that, even in moderate rainfall, surface water enters this sewer in large volumes (much greater than the 25% "seepage" allowed in Anglian Water calculations).

The picture below (Image 1) shows the state of a garden on Finchams Close at the low point of the sewer that runs down from Bartlow Road. This garden is immediately to the south of the point at which the Lonsdale sewer joins the network. The water in this picture had risen very quickly into the garden from the foul sewer manhole – it is a mixture of foul water and surface water that had entered the Bartlow Road foul sewer within the first 30 minutes of the rainfall on 20th July 2021. This was reported to Anglian Water on 20th July and an incident number was given to the resident.

Foul flooding incidents in a number of other village properties were also reported to both Anglian Water and LPC during this flood event. To date, no action has been taken by Anglian Water regarding any of the issues raised and, of much greater concern, Anglian Water has not provided the LLFA with any of the information relating to the flooding from the foul network for their Flood Investigation report for the July 20th event. Unless the parlous situation of our foul sewers is at least recognised, nothing will be done to rectify the problems and residents will continue to be put at risk.

- 1.2 Further information is being sought from the applicants with regards to the comments from the Parish Council. These will be reported verbally at the meeting.

Background Papers:

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework SPDs

This page is left blank intentionally.