

APPENDIX 6

Schedule of Scrutiny and Overview Committee comments and responses

The table below summarises comments made by Scrutiny and Overview Committee Members at and following the meeting on 14 August 2018 and includes an officer response and where appropriate includes proposed changes to the SPD, which will be reflected in the updated SPD to be considered by Cabinet on the 5th September. In addition to the points listed below a large number of comments have been made in regard to typographical errors and proposed punctuation changes to the SPD. In the interests of clarity and brevity these are not recorded below but will be incorporated into the consultation version of the SPD.

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
1	The document lacks focus, is woolly and too aspirational.. Too many examples of use of the word 'should' rather than 'shall'.	<p>It is right that the SPD should be aspirational for the new town and aim for excellence.</p> <p>This Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is not a plan in itself. It provides further guidance on the policies of the new statutory Local Plan and most especially policy SS/5 allocating the Waterbeach New Town. It is important to recognise that as a matter of law the SPD cannot make new planning policy or to go further than the policies of the new Local Plan as would be the case if it were to be 'harder-edged' and more specific than the Local Plan itself. The Local Plan has been subject to multiple rounds of public consultation and an intensive examination process, which means that after adoption, planning decisions should normally be made in accordance with it. The provisions of the SPD gain weight because they are consistent with the</p>	The SPD consultation material will provide more context about the status and role of the SPD, and how it must supplement and add detail to the policies of the Local Plan.

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
		Local Plan and a requirement of it.	
2	The site has two landowners and Members need to be clear how a comprehensive development can be achieved and risks mitigated.	Local Plan policy SS/5 for the new town requires the comprehensive development of the site as a whole. Supplemented by the SPD this will allow this Council to carefully assess planning applications for the site to ensure that this is achieved. Key aspects that are necessary to ensure a comprehensive and seamless development are included in the SPD and will be secured through legally enforceable planning obligation agreements.	No change.
3	The Strategic Development Objectives at pages 32-33 of the SPD provide vague aspirational statements, not specific targets and should be more hard edged.	The Strategic Development Objectives are purposefully high level and aspirational. They introduce matters which are then covered in more detail elsewhere in the SPD.	No change.
4	Need to learn from the lessons of Cambourne and ensure appropriate enforceability of key provisions.	Officers are continually learning from past experience both locally and from further afield. The SPD will become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and in attendant negotiations and will influence the content of the legally enforceable planning obligation agreement. It supplements the statutory Local Plan policy against which planning applications will be determined.	No change.
5	The consultation materials should include more about the context set by the policies of the new Local Plan and the emerging transport proposals of the Combined Authority	Agreed. This has always been the intention of officers and would be in accordance with our normal practice.	The full text of Policy SS/5 on the new town will be included as an appendix to the SPD (linked to reference to the policy in section 1.2 on page 5). The SPD consultation documentation will

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
			include more context on the new Local Plan . It will also provide more context on the emerging transport proposals of the Combined Authority. We will take care to ensure that the public are aware that this contextual material is not subject to comment through this SPD consultation.
6	The SPD is long and complex so an executive summary should be provided.	Agreed.	The consultation documentation will include an executive summary.
7	The document is too long and should be shorter.	Noted. Officers will consider if this general comment in relation to future SPDs.	When considering the outcome of consultation on the SPD, and the wording changes flowing from this officers will also consider if any editorial changes are possible to reduce the length of the document.
8	The keys of the maps could be improved.	Officers will consider the need to improve the keys whilst recognising that the SPD needs to be read as a whole.	Make any necessary changes to the keys of the maps.
9	Is it the intention to also prepare a Master Plan?	No, it is not best practice to for an SPD to go to the level of detail of a Master Plan for a strategic development which will take decades to build out after development has commenced. The SPD provides for the submission of Master Plans for individual areas such as for the town centre as part of planning applications.	No change.
10	The Vision Statement uses overly inflated language which is not specific enough for example 'well-designed buildings'.	The SPD sets out guidance on such matters as design but this is only part of the story. This Council already has a District Design Guide SPD	No change.

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
		and Local Plan policies concerning design quality. These will inform the preparation of design codes for different parts of the development of the site which will provide specific guidance.	
11	The SPD should require high standards of building insulation to reduce carbon emissions.	The SPD provides guidance consistent with the emerging Local Plan.	No change.
12	If the NW Cambridge underground bin storage and collection scheme is a success it should be used across this site.	The SPD takes a pragmatic approach at page 123 to seek such provision in higher density areas and to provide for conventional collections in lower density housing areas.	No change.
13	The SPD should require water re-use and grey water recycling.	The SPD follows policy CC/4 in the emerging Local Plan which promotes water efficiency and water-sensitive design (page 108).	No change.
14	Special attention needs to be given to pedestrian and cycle access to the station.	Noted. The SPD at page 85 makes clear that the station should be easily accessible on foot and by bike.	No change.
15	Detailed comments on the use of Dutch-style roundabouts (which give priority to pedestrians and cyclists) , the use of zebra crossings and traffic calming measures.	Noted. These concern matters of detail which it would not be appropriate to include in the SPD and which are secured through the planning application process in conjunction with the Highway Authority as appropriate.	No change.
16	Concerns about the ultimate housing capacity of the site given that the new Local Plan refers to approximately 8,000 to 9,000 homes whereas planning applications have been submitted for 11,000 homes. The more homes are permitted the higher the building	The capacity of the site will be determined through a design-led process consistent with policy SS/5 of the new Local Plan. The SPD recognises the situation where the Council is in receipt of two live planning applications totalling 11,000 dwellings and considers the infrastructure	No changes to the text of the SPD. The key to figure 30 needs to provide an explanation for the asterisks marked on the Station and Town Centre areas which relates to the paragraph running over from page 68

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
	heights. The wording of the SPD should require the building storey heights shown on Figure 30 (page 69) to be adhered to.	and land take implications to help inform the determination of those applications. However, the SPD is clear that it makes no comment on the suitability of that level of development and the applications will be determined against the Local Plan (page 66). Guidance on appropriate building heights is set out on pages 68-69 of the SPD and the great majority of the site will be developed with buildings of no more than 2-3 storeys in height. Such guidance will be both a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and will guide the preparation of the site masterplans, parameter plans, and design coding that will be especially important for the Station District and Town Centre where the highest building heights are envisaged.	and page 69 concerning the possibility for one taller building in each such area.
17	Prefer use of the words target or milestone rather than 'fix' on page 5 of the SPD.	Noted. This can be considered through the consultation process.	No change.
18	On page 7 of the SPD an explanation needs to be given of what is meant by green and blue infrastructure.	Agreed.	In section 4 at line 2 on page 7 of the SPD add the following words in brackets as follows: green (green space) and blue (water) The section heading at 5.6 SPD page 101 'Blue Infrastructure' will be changed to ' Sustainable Drainage ' to better reflect its content.
19	On page 7 of the SPD in section 5 replace	Agreed.	On page 7 of the SPD in section 5

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
	<p>“...there are opportunities to help shape the arrangement of movement, built form and green infrastructure”</p> <p>With “...there are opportunities to design routes, buildings and green spaces...”</p>		<p>replace “...there are opportunities to help shape the arrangement of movement, built form and green infrastructure”</p> <p>With “...there are opportunities to design routes, buildings and green spaces...”</p>
20	<p>At page 101 of the SPD there is a reference to a missing bridge on the cycle route between Waterbeach Village and south of the River Cam. The site of this bridge should be identified.</p>	<p>Noted. This is the proposed bridge over the River Cam to Ditton Meadows plans for which are well advanced to be delivered by the Greater Cambridge Partnership as part of the Chisholm Trail.</p> <p>The SPD acknowledges the importance of cycle links between the new town and Cambridge, and as described at page 88 of the SPD including a new link adjacent to the rail corridor between Waterbeach and Cambridge.</p>	<p>On page 73 of the SPD, 3rd row identify that the missing bridge is across the River Cam to Ditton Meadows.</p>
21	<p>Requests that the developers erect flagpoles along the edge of the major development site to help people understand the sites relationship with Denny Abbey when viewed from the Abbey.</p>	<p>Noted. The developers will be asked to erect such flags along the edge of the Major Development Site boundary as requested.</p>	<p>No change. If the developers agree to erect such flags in time for the SPD consultation this will be reflected in the consultation documentation. If they are erected during the consultation this will be publicised on our website.</p>
22	<p>Concerned that access to the new railway station for existing village residents will be via Cody Road which is narrow, used by parked cars and is the main access to the Doctor’s</p>	<p>Noted. It is proposed that this be reviewed in the light of comments received on the consultation but always bearing in mind the need to establish convenient and appropriate access arrangements</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
	Surgery and a bus route.	between the existing village and the relocated station.	
23	Seeks reassurance that no built development will be allowed on land north of the major development site boundary.	Agreed. This is a clear requirement of policy SS/5 in the new Local Plan, the line is clearly marked on the SPD maps as the northern limit of built development.	For clarity, on page 35 of the SPD on the 6th line of the 'Spatial Framework Plan' paragraph add the words at the end ' , particularly in regard to the policy requirement to contain built development south of the Major Development Site boundary.
24	Section 5 'Movement and Place' should make more references to bus travel into Cambridge.	The SPD includes numerous references to the importance of public transport both rail and bus based.	No change.
25	Figure 32 (SPD page 84), suggest a new cycle way from Clayhithe Bridge Waterbeach to Horningsea, east of the River Cam (B1047) – to link with the recently upgraded connection from Horningsea to Fen Ditton and Cambridge.	Figure 32 does not extend far enough south to indicate the proposed connection. Policy SS/5 of the new Local Plan clearly requires the provision of good quality cycle links to nearby villages	Add an additional strategic cycle connection arrow from Clayhithe Road towards Horningsea.
26	Transport Hub – clarify if this is expected to be adjacent to the new railway station.	Yes, this is the only location where integration could be provided between rail and other modes.	No change.
27	Requests Environment Agency views about air quality along the A10 and also in regard to the proposed energy from waste plant.	The Environment Agency will be consulted on the SPD and will submit appropriate comments in relation to the provisions of the SPD.	No change.
28	Requests Environment Agency views about potable water supply to the new town.	The Environment Agency did not raise issues about the supply of potable water to the new town in relation to the Local Plan. They will be consulted on the SPD and will submit appropriate comments in relation to the provisions of the SPD.	No change.

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
		Cambridge Water are responsible for the provision of potable water and are obligated to meet demand arising from the development with the developers meeting the cost.	
29	Raises concerns about the capacity of the existing water recycling centre on site at page 125 of the SPD. Existing works inadequate. New works required (page 126).	Anglian Water will be consulted on the SPD to ensure provision of a new facility at an appropriate point in the development and are obligated to meet demand with appropriate capacity.	No change.
30	In regard to the energy from waste plant local residents are concerned that this should not result in a substantial increase in lorry movements on the A10.	The energy centre is not a requirement of the SPD or located on site. It is the subject of a current planning application which will be determined by Cambridgeshire County Council.	No change.
31	Glad to see that Denny Abbey landscaping will be installed at an early stage.	Noted.	No change.
32	In regard to the Consultation Statement (Scrutiny Report agenda from page 191), please add reference to the fact that in addition four meetings had been held with SCDC Officers and representatives of the surrounding parish councils (15 August, 11 October and 21 December 2017) as well as the Waterbeach Community Forum on 14 March 2018 to which residents from all the villages were invited.	Agreed.	The Consultation Statement will be amended to add reference to these meetings.
33	In regard to the proposed list of consultees (Scrutiny agenda page 199 add to the consultee list: English Heritage, Timothy	Agreed.	The consultee schedule will be so amended.

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
	Cockerill English Heritage is responsible for the commercial enterprise at Denny Abbey as well as property and buildings maintenance and is different to Historic England.		
34	<p>General: Any 'covering letter' needs to state how consultees are expected to respond.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no reference to the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study, now in the hands of the Combined Authority. It would be helpful if there was some statement about how this application will be affected by that study and how the study will be affected by this SPD. <p>Please add more reference to how this development will appear in the landscape, what it will look like viewed from the surrounding area.</p> <p>How will the site be managed long term?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How will local government be administered? What will happen to Waterbeach Parish Council? Will there be a Town Council for Waterbeach 	<p>Agreed. This has always been the intention of officers and would be in accordance with our normal practice.</p> <p>The SPD requires the provision of an appropriate setting for Denny Abbey and strategic green areas to provide appropriate edge treatments. The SPD vision requires the new town to integrate and enhance the local landscape.</p> <p>These important issues are not for resolution through the SPD but by other decision making processes over time.</p>	<p>The SPD consultation documentation will include more context on the new Local Plan and include the full text of Policy SS/5 on the new town. It will also provide more context on the emerging transport proposals of the Combined Authority. Taking care to ensure that the public are aware that this contextual material is not subject to comment through this SPD consultation.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
	New Town? Is there any way we can control/limit who buys (how many of) the new properties, to avoid large holdings in the hands of distant landlords with no interest in the local community?	Such controls are not within the ambit of the planning system as it currently exists.	No change.
35	As well as providing an executive summary the consultation documentation should provide pointers to key content concerning transport, schools and landscape and any matters on which we would most value public comment.	Noted and agreed.	The consultation documentation will provide an executive summary, point towards key areas of public interest and seek to identify matters on which we would most value public comment.
36	The SPD should identify the role of SCDC at this stage and make clear who will be responsible for the delivery of the new town.	Noted. The SPD does clearly set out what the role of the SPD is from page 5 and section 6 explains who will be responsible for delivery. Key points concerning the delivery of physical and social infrastructure will be secured through a legally enforceable planning obligation agreement.	No change.
37	The SPD should provide more details on phasing of the build out using diagrams.	Section 6.4 of the SPD concerns phasing including a diagram and includes as much detail as can reasonably be expected at this stage of what will be a long and complex build out process.	No change.
38	Could the SPD describe what the new town will be like in 5, 10, 15 and 20 years time?	This is part of the purpose of section 3 'Vision' which describes a place which is successful, prosperous, green and well connected (amongst other attributes).	No change.

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
		But the realisation of these aspirations will depend upon the pace of delivery which in turn will be affected by other factors such as the national and local economy and population growth.	
39	Provide an explanation of the s106 planning obligation arrangements and how this will be implemented.	This is covered from page 147 of the SPD which provides as much detail as possible at this early stage in the delivery process.	No change.
40	Has SCDC considered creating a Waterbeach Development Corporation to deliver the site?	This is not a matter within the scope of the SPD.	No change.
41	In regard to the Special Educational Needs school (SEN) could the location of this away from other schools be reconsidered? Co-location has benefits for SEN school children and for those without special needs.	<p>The SPD notes that the proposed location near the A10 corridor will assist the school serve its wider than normal catchment area given that most children will arrive either by private or school transport. It also states that the co-location of the SEN with a primary school can be considered.</p> <p>This matter can be reconsidered in light of consultation responses including any from prospective operators and the Education Authority.</p>	No change.
42	In regard to early years provision how has the estimate of required provision at 20-39 places per 100 homes worked out? Does this adequately cater for those who cannot use pre-schools as they only run in term time meaning space is needed for a commercial nursery provider.	These estimates are those provided by the Education Authority who have developed a model for new settlements which has learned lessons from the experience at Cambourne where child generation rates were much higher than expected. The County Council as Education Authority will be a consultee on the SPD and	No change.

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
		regard will also be had to other relevant consultation responses.	
43	Is the reference to the provision of a swimming pool realistic given the costs of provision and operation?	It is right that the residents of the new town and surrounding villages should eventually benefit from the provision of a swimming pool if such provision is viable given the other claims to the planning obligations possible on the site. On this basis the SPD should continue to refer to a swimming pool.	No change.
44	<p>As well as providing an executive summary the consultation documentation should provide more context about why South Cambridgeshire has an obligation to provide new housing and what the consequences are if we fail to maintain a future housing supply and deliver at expected rates.</p> <p>It also needs to explain that road, rail, bus and other infrastructure will be fit for purposes and delivered as the new town is built.</p>	Agreed.	The consultation documentation will provide this broader context and explanation.
45	<p>As an ordinary member of the public, I'd like the summary to cover (in an easily digestible way) the following:</p> <p>Why we need to build houses and why Waterbeach is a good place to build some of the new houses.</p> <p>How infrastructure will be improved. Traffic, parking, cycling, public transport etc will be at</p>	Agreed.	The consultation documentation will seek to provide this material in an easily digestible way.

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
	the front of the readers' minds. Is the housing mix right? Are the town amenities right? Is there anything missing? What's the impact on Waterbeach village and the wider area? Why will it be good to live in Waterbeach new town?		
46	It is not clear whether any alternatives to the policies set out in the document were ever considered or, if they were, why they were rejected. As it stands, the document represents a fait accompli, leaving very little scope for challenge or comment from those being consulted. It would have been helpful to have a set of questions to provide more focus to the consultation process.	<p>The SPD supplements policy SS/5 in the new Local Plan which has been under examination since March 2014. In the run-up to submission of the Local Plan for examination the Council considered and consulted upon a number of alternative options to accommodate future growth. These included further urban extensions to Cambridge on land to be released from the Green Belt, alternative new town locations and options to accommodate more growth in our more sustainable villages. The process also considered the nature and requirements of the new town itself including in regard to its scale, capacity and site extent.</p> <p>:</p> <p>The examination of the Local Plan itself has been long and intensive and has considered alternatives. Hearings on policy SS/5 for the Waterbeach New Town included consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site capacity and extent • On-site employment • The loss of agricultural land 	No change, except that the consultation documentation will seek to provide more of this strategic context and point towards key areas of public interest and seek to identify matters on which we would most value public comment.

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport mitigations • Landscape impacts • Impact on heritage assets including Denny Abbey • Possible retail impacts on the existing village shops • Impacts on ecology and biodiversity • The railway station relocation and flood risks • Foul water drainage. <p>The inclusion of the site in the new Local Plan by the Inspector which is anticipated means that the plan is sound and is justified as 'the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives'.</p>	
47	<p>Some aspects of the language used appear to weaken SCDC's position. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on page 6 of the document (34 of the pack) the second full paragraph states "...SCDC will seek to lead and facilitate a shared way of working between the promotes/developers of the site in order to ensure timely delivery..." This form of words tends to weaken the resolve of SCDC to lead the project. Why not say "SCDC will lead and facilitate a shared way of working..." a format that gives SCDC a more positive role. If the original drafting was intended to give SCDC a 	<p>Agreed. Officers will consider if the wording of the SPD can be made more positive whilst remaining supplementary to the policies of the new Local Plan especially policy SS/5.</p>	<p>Officers will consider if the wording of the SPD can be made more positive whilst remaining supplementary to the policies of the new Local Plan especially policy SS/5/, including in relation to the two examples provided.</p>

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
	<p>leading role in the process the reference to "seeking" comes across as superfluous drafting that does not add to the meaning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Another example is at the top of page 7 "The site is extensive and falls into two separate ownerships, and the Council considers that overall sustainable development and delivery can only be achieved through the comprehensive planned development of a single integrated new town. Why say that the Council considers? Is there an alternative approach? To tighten up the language and to stamp SCDC's authority on the process why not say "The site is extensive,,.ownerships. Sustainable development and delivery can only be achieved,,,"? 		
48	In section 4, page 7 of the SPD what does "key place making benefits" mean?	This simply means taking advantage of existing green spaces and water in the development and layout of the site. Although a designers jargon it has the advantage of brevity.	No change.
49	Generally concerned about the use of planning jargon which does not assist the lay-readers' understanding.	Agree that the SPD uses planning jargon in places but to some extent this is unavoidable given its formal nature and its future use as a material consideration in the determination of	No change.

	Comment	Officer response	Proposed change to the SPD / for inclusion in the SPD consultation documentation
		planning applications. That said officers will bear this comment in mind in response to the consultation on this SPD and when starting to bring forward future SPDs.	
50	The document overall has a mixture of elements that are referred to as "should" and those which are referred to as "will" this creates uncertainty. For example, page 39 of the SPD states "temporary and community spaces/facilities should be provided..." whereas the references to business, retail etc are preceded with "will". The should, in the former statement suggests an option for this not to happen when, in fact, these elements would be quite important in allowing the community to function properly early on.	In general the language used in the SPD in regard to 'will', and 'should' is intentional and is intended to denote a difference between 'must-haves' and other 'asks'. In general where the Local Plan policy SS/5 is definitive words such as 'will provide' are appropriate, however where the plan policy is not so definitive or silent on a proposal use of the word 'should' is appropriate. The practicality and viability of such provision will vary from site to site across the new town and lessons will be learned as it is built out.	No change.
51	Page 43 of the SPD deals with education but it isn't clear when the educational provision will be available. This has knock-on effects for existing provision and whether there will be sufficient school places or whether the timing could result in a reduction in pupil numbers at existing sites e.g. Cottenham Village College.	The dwellings number triggers for the provision of new schools is set out in the table at pages 131 and 132 of the SPD. Advice will taken from the Education Authority who are well aware of the need not to affect the stability of existing schools such as Cottenham Village College.	No change.