

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

13 May 2019

**AUTHOR/S:** Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development for  
Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

---

**Application Number:** S/0559/17/OL

**Parish(es):** Waterbeach, Landbeach

**Proposal:** Outline application for up to 6,500 dwellings (including up to 600 residential institutional units), business, retail, community, leisure and sports uses; a hotel; schools; green open spaces including parks, ecological areas and woodlands; principal new accesses from the A10 and other points of access; associated infrastructure, groundworks and demolition; with all matters reserved except for the first primary junction from the A10 and construction access from Denny End Road.

**Site address:** Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield Site, Waterbeach, Cambridgeshire

**Applicant(s):** Secretary of State for Defence and Urban & Civic Plc (U&C)

**Recommendation:** Delegated approval

**Key material considerations:** Principle of development  
Land use and parameters  
Housing provision  
Economic impacts  
Social and community infrastructure  
Education  
Transport  
Environmental impacts  
Financial Viability and S106 Obligations

**Committee Site Visit:** Yes

**Departure Application:** No

**Presenting Officer:** Andrew Winter, Principal Planning Officer

**Application brought to**

**Committee because:** Largescale, major development

**Date by which decision due:** 31 October 2018

**Members will visit the site on 7 May 2019**

### **Executive Summary**

1. The application site area is located immediately north of Waterbeach village and approximately 5 kilometres from the Cambridge Science Park. The site is in large part previously developed land, comprising a mixture of buildings and structures associated with its former military use, both as a barracks and as an airfield. The first military presence was the Royal Air Force station built in 1940, with the Barracks built from 1966 when the airfield was transferred to the Army, becoming the base for 39 Engineer Regiment and later 25 Engineer Regiment - both part of 12 (Air Support) Engineer Group. Military use ceased in March 2013.
2. The proposed development is located on a strategic allocation in the adopted local plan for Waterbeach New Town. This is allocated as Policy SS/6, which proposes approximately 8000-9000 homes. The eastern part of the strategic site is subject to a separate outline application (S/2075/18/OL) made by RLW Estates for 4,500 dwellings. The Council has produced a Supplementary Planning Document to guide comprehensive development of the strategic site, which follows engagement with key members, the local community, both land promoters, technical consultees and other stakeholders.
3. This proposal, as amended, seeks permission for up to 6,500 dwellings (including up to 600 residential institutional units), business, retail, community, leisure and sports uses; a hotel; schools; green open spaces including parks, ecological areas and woodlands; principal new accesses from the A10 and other points of access; associated infrastructure, groundworks and demolition; with all matters reserved except for the first primary junction from the A10 and construction access from Denny End Road.
4. The submitted parameter plan includes key spatial fixes, such as the location of the schools, town centre and movement corridors along with development heights and open space which are submitted for approval along with a detailed A10 northern access and early delivery plan. The proposed parameters of development demonstrate that the site can appropriately accommodate the development, make effective use of land and maintain the exceptional historical landscape context of the site. Whilst concern has been raised in relation to height, massing and density, the proposals are considered to align with Policy SS/6 objectives in creating a new town of high quality development responding to local character whilst also having its own identity (as guided by the new town SPD).
5. The development would deliver a significant number of new homes in a sustainable location, helping to maintain the Council's five year housing land supply and deliver much needed affordable homes. The proposal includes a

minimum of 30% affordable housing (1950 homes), which is reflective of the costly infrastructure required to deliver a sustainable new town. However, a viability review mechanism is proposed to ensure any improvement to the scheme's viability is captured at each phase and converted to additional affordable housing to meet housing needs and deliver a diverse and balanced community in accordance with the social objectives of sustainable development. These objectives would be further met by the delivery of a wide range of community facilities in the form of a new secondary school, three primary schools, four community centres, a new healthcare facility, sports, retail and an early community support fund.

6. National Planning Policy places a clear emphasis on the importance of economic growth and delivering economic benefits as a key component of sustainable development. The proposal would generate a substantial level of job creation at the site with an estimated 800-1000 construction jobs per year and 6000 jobs on or adjoining the site. Generation of skills and enterprise would be further facilitated through a Jobs Brokerage Scheme to be secured by S106 agreement.
7. The proposed early, scheme-led transport mitigation package begins the process of implementing the Ely to Cambridge A10 corridor solution and prioritising sustainable travel modes. To this end the proposal is accompanied by a substantial S106 package of sustainable travel interventions to support a first phase of 1,600 units and build the foundations of a broad-based and more sustainable transport solution for the whole corridor. Contributions are also made towards the A10 strategic solutions to unlock future phases through a 'monitor and manage' approach. As such, the development would be able to successfully mitigate its highway impacts and promote sustainable travel.
8. In terms of environmental impacts, the development would contribute to a net gain in biodiversity, prudent use of natural resources and measures to minimise waste and pollution. Mitigation and adaptation to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy would be facilitated through the proposed site-wide sustainability strategies to fulfil the Policy SS/6 objective of demonstrating excellence in sustainable development.
9. Overall, the proposed development would bring significant public benefits that accord with the three strands of sustainable development set out in the NPPF. Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, the policies in the NPPF, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for approval subject to planning conditions and a S106 Obligation.

## Site Description

10. The application site area is 293 hectares and is located immediately north of Waterbeach village and approximately 5 kilometres from the Cambridge Science Park.
11. The site is in large part previously developed land, comprising a mixture of buildings and structures associated with its former military use, both as a barracks and as an airfield. The first military presence was the Royal Air Force station built in 1940, operating under Bomber Command, and then transferred after the Second World War to Transport Command. The Barracks was built from 1966 when the airfield was transferred to the Army, becoming the base for 39 Engineer Regiment and later 25 Engineer Regiment - both part of 12 (Air Support) Engineer Group. Military use ceased in March 2013.
12. The main existing access into the site is via the main gatehouse entrance off Denny End Road. There is a second access off Denny End Road, west of Stirling House, close to the junction with the A10. The Cambridge Research Park roundabout on the A10 is within the application site boundary and already includes a fourth spur providing for potential access into the site.
13. The site includes disused residential blocks, offices, hangars, workshops and other structures associated with military use. Substantial areas of hardstanding also exist, including what remains of the runways, taxiways and an internal road network. The buildings and structures are located within a landscape framework which includes formal lawns and ornamental planting (mainly within the Barracks) and areas of more informal grassland, tree planting, woodland blocks and amenity space, including a former golf course, now largely naturalised. There is a lake and number of smaller water bodies within the application boundary. To the north of the airfield, within the application boundary, is an area given over to arable production.
14. The site is broadly flat, mostly within 3m-6m above ordnance datum (AOD), although there is a high spot of circa 10.5m (a mound north of the lake). To the west of the site is the A10 Ely Road, and Waterbeach village is to the south. Further south and west of the A10 lies the village of Landbeach. Cambridge Research Park (part of the Cambridge Compass Enterprise Zone), is located beyond the A10 to the west of the northerly part of the site and further north beyond this lies Cambridge Waste Management Park. A small cluster of business uses (Sunrise Business Park) adjoins the western boundary of the site, east of the A10 and accessed off Flint Lane.
15. Denny Abbey and the Farmland Museum are located to the north and west of the site, along with the hamlet of Chittering. Waterbeach Waste Management Park is located 0.4 kilometres to the west of Denny Abbey. This is a waste transfer station (operated by Amey) for the collection and sorting of waste and has a direct vehicular access from a dedicated roundabout on the A10.
16. Open farmland is located immediately to the east, beyond which is the London Kings Lynn Railway line (which at its closest point is less than half a kilometre

from the application site boundary) and the River Cam floodplain (the River at its closest point is around 1 kilometre from the application site boundary). The land to the east is controlled by RLW Estates Ltd and is also promoted for development within the context of Policy SS/6.

### **Relevant Planning History**

17. **S/1274/15/FL** - Planning permission granted for the change of use of the existing Squash Courts, Sports Hall and Tennis Courts from Sui Generis to D2 and the Museum building from Sui Generis to D1 on a temporary basis lasting 5 years (to 2020).
18. **S/1305/15/FL** - Planning Permission granted for the conversion and change of use of the former Control Tower, now implemented to provide office and meeting space
19. **S/2770/16/FL** – Planning permission granted for change of use of land within the Barracks Area (excluded from the Application Site) for the expansion of Waterbeach Cemetery
20. **S/3204/16/FL** - Planning permission granted for conversion of barrack blocks to be used as C2 residential accommodation for Papworth hospital staff, comprising 235 bed spaces.
21. **S/3247/16/VC** - Removal of the time restriction condition relating to community uses (sports hall, museum building, tennis courts and squash courts) was granted. The facilities can now be used indefinitely.
22. **S/3372/17/CW** – Construction and development of a Waste Recovery Facility at Waterbeach Waste Management Park, Ely Road, Waterbeach, CB25 9PQ (refused and planning appeal lodged)
23. **S/0791/18/FL** – Relocated railway station comprising platforms, pedestrian bridges, access road, pedestrian and cycle routes, car and cycle parking, with other associated facilities and infrastructure (resolution to grant subject to S106 Agreement – see Planning Committee 12 September 2018)
24. **S/2075/18/OL** – Planning application for the eastern half of the new town for up to 4500 dwellings by RLW Estates – awaiting determination

### **Site Constraints**

25. The site lies, for the large part, within the lowest defined flood risk area (Flood Zone 1 - less than 1 in 1,000 annual risk). A small area in the north-west adjacent to the A10 roundabout is within Flood Zone 2 (between 1 in 1000 and 1 in 100 annual risk).
26. There are no designated heritage assets within the site. The barracks buildings and air hangars are non-designated heritage assets

Scheduled Monuments are located within 2km of the application site at: Denny Abbey (less than 0.5 km to the north), the site of Waterbeach Abbey (to the south) and Car Dyke (sections to the north of the application site but not the Car Dyke drain within the site). There are five listed buildings (all Grade II) to the north and west but outside the Scheduled Denny Abbey area. There are other non-designated heritage assets within 2km of the site including Waterbeach Conservation Area.

27. There are no Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) RAMSAR Sites or Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) within 2 km of the site. Cam Washes SSSI lies approximately 2.7 km north east of the site. Wicken Fen SSSI, SAC and Ramsar site is about 4.7 km to the north east and Stow Cum Quy SSSI is about 3.3 km to the north east of the Site.
28. A Water Treatment Centre lies to the east of the former Barracks area, accessed from Bannold Road/Bannold Drove.
29. No public rights of way immediately adjoin or cross the application site. Bannold Drove (public byway) lies approximately 400m from the nearest point of the application site boundary to the east.

### **Description of Proposal**

30. The Barracks and Airfield is owned by the Ministry of Defence. Urban and Civic (U&C) are a strategic development company appointed by the MOD (via the Defence Infrastructure Organisation [DIO]) as development managers to bring forward the application site for development. The only other land within the application boundary not owned by the MOD is necessary to allow for the creation of new access points. This land (which is highway land) is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.
31. The submitted revised 'Development Specification' (May 2018) includes a full description of the proposed development as follows:
  - a) Up to 6,500 dwellings including uses in Class C3 and including up to 600 units of residential institution use (Class C2 use).
  - b) Up to 16,500 sqm of retail uses (Class A1/A2/A3/A4/A5 uses) in total of which no single outlet will be larger than 4,000 sqm.
  - c) Up to 15,000 sqm of employment uses comprising offices, research and development and light industrial only (Class B1, a, b and c uses).
  - d) Three Primary Schools incorporating pre-school provision (Class D1 use) on sites of not more than 3 hectares at each school site (up to 9 hectares in total), and adjoining land of up to 1 hectare at two primary schools safeguarded for potential expansion (2 hectares in total).
  - e) Secondary School for up to eight forms of entry (Class D1 use) on a site

- area of no more than 8.5 hectares and adjoining land of up to 3 hectares
- f) safeguarded for potential expansion.
  - g) Land of at least 1.7 hectares safeguarded for Special School (Class D1 use).
  - h) Up to 9,000 sqm in total of community uses (Class D1 use) to include: multi-purpose community centres, health care, nurseries, library use, places of worship, museum and other community purposes.
  - i) Up to 7,000 sqm for health and fitness, gym and other cultural and recreational uses (Class D2 use).
  - j) Up to 4,000 sqm for hotel accommodation (Class C1 use).
  - k) Open spaces and other landscaped areas (including parks, play areas, playing fields, multi-use games areas, weather protected structures, skateboard park, public art, all weather pitches and associated floodlighting, woodlands, wildlife habitat areas, managed grassland, allotments, community orchards, burial space, Denny Abbey buffer area, formal/informal open space, ancillary maintenance buildings and pavilions and associated lighting).
  - l) Access roads including two access points to the A10, construction/bus only access to Denny End Road and 'locally managed access only' to Denny End Road with associated street lighting and street furniture.
  - m) Pedestrian, cycle, vehicle and bus routes, including plazas, dedicated busway and bus stops with associated street lighting and street furniture.
  - n) Park and Ride facilities (sui generis use).
  - o) Vehicular and cycle parking including electric vehicle charging points.
  - p) Two energy centres on sites of up to 1,000 sqm each (sui generis), including storage area (up to 0.4 hectares in total).
  - q) Community waste management facilities (sui generis).
  - r) Provision and/or upgrade/diversion of services including water, sewerage, telecommunications, electricity and gas and related service media, renewable energy infrastructure including combined heat and power networks and apparatus including pumping stations, substations and pressure regulators.
  - s) Drainage works including foul drainage infrastructure, Sustainable Drainage Systems and ground and surface water attenuation features.
  - t) Demolition of all existing buildings and structures.

- u) Ground works including ground remodelling where necessary.
  - v) Boundary treatments including construction hoardings.
32. The application is submitted in outline with only the matter of access from the A10 roundabout at Cambridge Research Park to be determined in detail at this stage (drawing 30509/2003/SK12). Matters of appearance, landscaping, scale and layout are all reserved for future determination.
33. A development of this kind is complex, large scale and long term and requires a degree of flexibility at outline stage. To facilitate this, the applicant proposes a 'Three Tier' approval process that follows the granting of outline permission as follows:

**Tier 1 Approval Stage** - relates to matters that can be addressed through site wide strategies or more conventional pre-commencement approvals, dealt with through the use of planning conditions in advance of key phases coming forward.

**Tier 2 Approval Stage** - involves the approval of the definition of the next Key Phase, including appropriate specification and justification, and then a 'Key Phase Framework Submission' that details the design and delivery framework for subsequent reserved matters applications. Critical elements are likely to comprise:

- Design Code/Guide,
- Delivery Plan (including triggers for provision of infrastructure linked to the S106 agreement)
- Housing Mix
- Viability Review
- Transport Assessment
- Construction Environmental Management Plan
- Any necessary supplements to the Outline application strategies to address phase wide issues (for example drainage).

**Tier 3 Approval** – submission of reserved matters applications within the approved Key Phase

34. The applicant, as amended, has submitted the following plans for determination in this application (see **Appendices A-F**):
- 1330 GA 010001 Rev 02- Application site plan
  - 1330 GA 0 5 - Existing Features Plan (topographical)
  - 1330 GA 010002 Rev 17- Development Parameter Plan
  - 1330 GA 010004 - Masterplan (Illustrative)
  - 30509/2003/SK12- CRP A10 junction access detail: general arrangement plan
  - 1330 GA 010003 Rev 02- Early Delivery Plan

35. A masterplan is submitted for illustrative purposes only (drawing 1330 GA 010004) and in this regard identifies one way in which the scheme may eventually come forward. Officers have therefore only considered this plan insofar as it is indicative and is not a determinative layout.
36. The submitted Legal Obligations Note sets out the applicant's approach and legal framework for mitigating the impact of development.
37. The scale of development and its potential environmental impacts have been assessed as falling within the remit of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2011. Therefore, the application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) containing chapters and appendices on: Socio Economics, Landscape and Visual Effects, Ecology, Cultural Heritage, Agricultural Circumstances and Soil Resources, Transport, Air Quality, Noise and Vibration, Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage and Ground Conditions.
38. An EIA scoping opinion was submitted to the Council on 13 June 2016 under the 2011 EIA Regulations and the application submitted before 16 May 2017. Therefore, whilst new EIA regulations came into force in 2017, the former 2011 EIA regulations continue to apply as advised by national planning guidance (060 Reference ID: 4-060-20170728 060 Revision date: 28 07 2017).
39. Environmental Statement Addendums 2018 have been submitted in response to the Local Planning Authority's Regulation 22 request for further information. Having assessed the submitted application officers are satisfied that the Environmental Statement and other additional information provided complies with the above 2011 Regulations and that sufficient information has been provided to assess the environmental impact of the proposal.
40. The application is also accompanied by the following supporting information:
  - Planning Statement
  - Development Specification and Spatial Principles
  - Design and Access Statement
  - Transport Assessment
  - Framework Travel Plan
  - Planning and Delivery Statement
  - Employment Statement
  - Town Centre Uses Assessment
  - Sustainability Strategy
  - Energy Statement
  - Waste Management Strategy
  - Water Conservation Strategy
  - Community Facilities Statement
  - Sports & Recreation Statement
  - Green Infrastructure Strategy
  - Health Impact Assessment
  - Statement of Community Involvement

- Arboricultural Statement
- Utilities & Physical Infrastructure Report
- Phase One Design Strategy

### **Amendments to Application**

41. Submitted amendments and additional information were received on **14 May 2018** reflecting changes to the proposed development as follows:
- A change to the northern boundary of the built development area, establishing a wider green buffer to the south of Denny Abbey, consistent with comments received from Historic England and adopted Local Plan Policy SS/6. Tree planting within this buffer will filter views (a single tree belt is no longer proposed.)
  - A larger amenity/sports provision at the southern edge of the site and immediately north of Denny End Road, for the benefit of existing village and new residents.
  - Retention of an area of woodland to the west of the lake, in which no built development will occur. This lies within a larger woodland block where some low-density development can be accommodated.
  - Changes to spatial principles to ensure: (i) flexibility over the existing barracks access; (ii) further safeguards to assess the potential reuse of barracks buildings; (iii) reference to east west green links and a perimeter leisure route; and (iv) play space accessible within 450m of every home.
  - Primary movement routes across the site are now shown on the parameter plan to indicate broadly the location of the key linkages from the A10 junctions to the boundary in the east and to the principal centre.
  - Safeguarding of land for a special school within the application site.
  - Revised primary school locations to reflect more detailed work on design and access. The first primary school would be delivered before the first new homes are occupied and would be a prominent feature at the northern gateway to the site.
  - A reduction in the maximum heights permissible in areas immediately adjoining residential properties at the southern boundary (to be no more than two storeys).
  - An increase in heights applied for along the western boundary, where there is open aspect towards the A10, and the eastern boundary to align with potential development on land to the east (RLW site).
  - Through discussions with Cambridgeshire County Council Highways, a number of minor design changes have been made to the access from

the A10 / Cambridge Research Park roundabout. The primary change relates to the Toucan crossing south of the junction where a single stage crossing rather than a stagger is now proposed. This reduces road widening and avoids culverting Car Dyke.

42. Several of the other application documents have been superseded and replaced or have been supplemented with new information to reflect these changes as follows:
- Parameter Plan (1330 GA 010002 Rev 15)
  - Preferred A10 Roundabout and Signalised Crossing Layout (30509/2003/SK12)
  - Early Delivery Plan (1330 GA 010003 Rev 02)
  - Illustrative Masterplan (1330 GA 010004 Rev 02)
  - Illustrative Site Sections (1330 GA 010008 Rev 01 and 1330 GA 010009 Rev 01)
  - Biodiversity Strategy
  - Community Facilities Statement Addendum
  - ES Chapters (including Appendices): 4 (Socio-Economic Effects); 5 (Landscape); 6 (Ecology); 7 (Cultural Heritage); 9 (Transport); 10 (Air Quality); 11 (Noise and Vibration); 12 (Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage);
  - ES Addendum Non-Technical Summary
  - Green Infrastructure Strategy Addendum
  - Health Impact Assessment Addendum
  - Low Emissions Strategy
  - Phase One Design Strategy (Withdrawn)
  - Planning and Delivery Statement Addendum
  - Revised Development Specification
  - Revised Framework Travel Plan
  - Revised Sports & Recreation Statement
  - Revised Transport Assessment
  - Revised Utilities and Physical Infrastructure Report
43. Supplementary Environmental Statement information was submitted on **2 October 2018** relating to the following:
- a) Air Quality (Odour)  
Additional odour surveys have been undertaken by Silsoe Odours Ltd.
  - b) Ecology Technical Note  
An additional technical note has been prepared by Bradley Murphy Design in relation to Wicken Fen and Cam Washes.
  - c) Updated Ecology Surveys in relation to: Ecological Phase 1 Habitat Report; Water Vole and Otter Report; Invertebrate Survey; Great Crested Newts; Breeding Bird Report; Badger Report; Bat Reports; and Reptile Report.
44. Supporting documents and amended information was submitted on **10 October 2018** in relation to the following:

- a) Physical Infrastructure Report – updated information on future Water Recycling Centre
  - b) Development Specification – amendment to Spatial Principles 9 and 10
  - c) Green Infrastructure Strategy – updated biodiversity impact calculations
  - d) Sustainability Strategy Addendum – revised and updated table 5.3 on targets, objectives and strategies
  - e) Design and Access Statement Supplement Revision (supersedes May 2018 version) – amendment to Design Principles DP7, DP12 and DP33
  - f) Parameter Plan – Minor amendments (for clarity) to key and primary route notation (1330 GA 010002 Rev 16)
  - g) Transport Assessment addendum – (i) paramics modelling addendum and (ii) report summarizing responses on technical queries issued by County Council
45. An amended Parameter Plan (1330 GA 010002 Rev 17) was submitted on **27 March 2019** incorporating changes to the annotation of the middle link road and the illustration of a northern primary route to more closely align with the spatial framework of Waterbeach New Town SPD.

#### **Pre-application engagement and departure of the application from the local plan**

46. The development of the strategic site was discussed at the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel in June 2016 in relation to the preparation of the Waterbeach Development Framework Document (DFD): a forerunner to the Waterbeach New Town SPD. This was a joint promoter led initiative and defined essential structuring elements across the strategic site. The draft DFD was also reviewed by the District Council and amendments were provided. However, work on the final DFD stopped and the Council took the view that a Supplementary Planning Document would best supplement the Emerging Local Plan policy for Waterbeach.
47. For clarity, at the time of submission of the outline application (February 2017) the proposed application site was not allocated for development within the adopted Local Development Framework and represented a departure from the Plan. However, the proposal was submitted in anticipation of the adoption of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission - March 2014. Policy SS/5 of the submitted Local Plan proposed the development of approximately 8000-9000 homes at Waterbeach New Town. The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan was adopted in September 2018, and the policy was renumbered SS/6.

#### **National Policy & Guidance**

48. National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF)
49. National Planning Practice Guidance

**Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan  
Core Strategy DPD, 2011 and Site Specific Proposals DPD, 2012**

50. RECAP Waste Management Plan Design Guide – Adopted February 2012

**South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018**

51. All policies

**South Cambridgeshire Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):**

52. Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – adopted November 2016
53. Waterbeach New Town SPD – Adopted February 2019
54. South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework SPDs

**Consultation – Parish Councils  
Cottenham Parish Council**

Comments on Original Application

55. Planning conditions suggested: construction traffic routing; flood risk; phasing re A10/railway; risk of traffic using B1059 to avoid A10

Comments on Amended Application

56. Recommends refusal. Whilst the principle of the development of a brownfield site is supported, it would appear premature to determine until the A10 outcome is known. Currently only one access is shown which is inadequate for a site of this size. Strong concerns regarding traffic heading west and diverting through Cottenham. A safe cycle route between Cottenham and Waterbeach would be acceptable in principle. Surface water treatment is inadequate.

**Fen Ditton Parish Council**

Comments on Original Application

57. Agree need for new homes and site would contribute to this significantly
58. Major concern regarding increased traffic along B1047 – can only be considered once A10 study is known
59. Relocation station is considered critical – need to engage Network Rail Control Period 6 now to avoid significant delay

Comments on Amended Application

60. The amended proposals do not directly address concerns of a predicted 40% increase in traffic through Fen Ditton along the B1047 (Ely to Cambridge Transport Study A10 Corridor Survey, 2018). A portion of S106 contributions should be directed to mitigate road traffic in Fen Ditton.

## **Histon and Impington Parish Council**

### Comments on Original Application

61. Noting A10 Strategy Study due by August and application outline, at this time agreed to not respond to application

## **Horningsea Parish Council**

### Comments on Original Application

- 62.
- a) Impact of through traffic on Horningsea
  - b) Lack of detail on second access
  - c) Adverse ecological impacts from high density and pollution on bat dependent on flying insect and light depend biota
  - d) Lack of adequate public transport provision and need for more details on detailed cycle routes
  - e) Applications for both parts of the SS/5 site need to be considered jointly
  - f) Heights and density appropriate for Fenland Location
  - g) Unsustainable quantum of housing distant from growing areas of Cambridge in south and east

### Comments on Amended Application

63. Recommends refusal. Application is still premature given the status of both the Local Plan and Ely to Cambridge Corridor (A10) Study final recommendations. Integration of the two development sites needs further clarity and be governed by the SPD. Further detailed comments are made on:
- a) Housing, building density and population
  - b) Site access
  - c) Transport strategy and interventions
  - d) Public transport provision
  - e) Monitor and manage approach

## **Landbeach Parish Council**

### Comments on Original Application

- 64.
- a) Oppose consideration of the application in advance of the A10 corridor study and RLW proposals, but not development at barracks and airfield site in principle
  - b) Object to proposal to use Landbeach High St as a bus corridor because it would restrict Landbeach residents travel options, impact on conservation area, cyclists and air pollution
  - c) Object to height of the highest buildings (8) – inappropriate for a Fenland edge
  - d) No account is made of views and vistas
  - e) Do not agree that the first 1600 transport measures would work
  - f) Concerns regarding the A10 corridor study process – lack of consultation

- g) Concerns that the wider development will become a London commuter town once relocated train station in place

#### Comments on Amended Application

65. Recommend refusal on grounds that the Parish Council has not seen any mitigation for the A10 impacts.

#### **Lode Parish Council**

##### Comments on Original Application

- 66.
- a) Visual impact – the proposal is an urban and high-rise suburban nature and unless mitigated by landscaping will spoil the open landscape as seen from parts of Lode parish near the river
  - b) Light and noise pollution
  - c) Concern of traffic to already congested A10 causing more traffic to use A142 and B1102. A10 needs improving before start of development
  - d) Support for train station relocation with hope that cycle link between Fen Road in Lode and Bannold Road in Waterbeach can be facilitated
  - e) Flood risk – development must not increase existing flows into River Cam
  - f) Net energy demand for the buildings should be met using solar panels and ground/air source heat pumps

#### **Milton Parish Council**

##### Comments on Original Application

- 67.
- a) Not compliant with DP/1 and DP/02
  - b) Object to on landscape grounds – fen edge character
  - c) Negative impact on Denny Abbey listed buildings from high buildings
  - d) Negative effect on Car Dyke – southern access
  - e) Min. of 2 car parking spaces per plot should be provided
  - f) Concerns over ground stability/geology to support this scale of development
  - g) Premature ahead of the overall site coming forward
  - h) Lack of connectivity between the two portions
  - i) Concern over lack of cemetery space
  - j) Concerned about the amount of green spaces being provided
  - k) A10 transport strategy for the application needs to be considered
  - l) Interconnectivity between villages needs too be planned for in any A10 changes
  - m) Concerns that waste water and P&R site will be located off site
  - n) Lack of employment proposed
  - o) Concerned that ecology and biodiversity have not been given sufficient consideration
  - p) Concerns over timing ahead of Local Plan and SPD. MPC would like to reconsider application at a later stage
  - q) Unsustainable development without new railway station, upgraded A10 and new cycle infrastructure
  - r) Will have detrimental impact on highway safety if started before A10 corridor

improvements

- s) 6,500 new houses too much for this portion of the site – layout and density
- t) Not compliant with 8000-9000 in draft Local Plan (once total site built out)
- u) Not compliant with revised draft Local plan re.northern limit to development
- v) Object to building heights proposed and quantum of development proposed.

#### Comments on Amended Application

68.

Recommend refusal due to:

- a) premature timing of the application with respect to the Local Plan and SPD adoption
- b) unsustainable transport, traffic generation, highway safety. A10 strategy needs resolving first
- c) unsustainable quantum of development – layout, density and height
- d) not compliant with Local Plan (quantum and density of development; Denny Abbey northern boundary revision)
- e) not complaint with Development Control Policies DP1 and DP2
- f) Harmful impacts of proposed 80ft buildings on landscape and Denny Abbey
- g) Harm of proposed southern access to Car Dyke
- h) Parking should be 2 per dwelling to minimise on street parking and street congestion
- i) Need reassurance that geology of areas is capable of support development
- j) Lack of coordination/collaboration between two developers
- k) Lack of connectivity between two development parcels
- l) Lack of specific places of worship and cemetery space
- m)Must be sufficient provision of land for sport, recreation, play etc.
- n) Connectivity between villages
- o) Essential infrastructure
- p) Housing and employment
- q) Ecology and biodiversity

#### **Swaffham Bulbeck Parish Council**

#### Comments on Original Application

69. Concern over the capacity of the road network to cope with scale of development. More details requested on upgrading cycle routes

#### **Swaffham Prior Parish Council**

#### Comments on Original Application

70. The concerns raised regarding infrastructure and the impact on the A10 traffic that is already a major problem, mostly in the rush hour getting into Cambridge but also north. This is expected to have a knock-on effect in the Fen roads, Stretham, Wicken, Soham and as this is an alternative route to Cambridge, Burwell, Swaffham Prior etc. It was also asked if the pollution impact had been considered and a report on the infrastructure and pollution impact was requested by the PC.

## Waterbeach Parish Council

### Comments on Original Application

71. Object to principle of application and scale of development
- a) The application is premature and needs to be co-ordinated with the wider development
  - b) Heights, quantum of development and landscape harm, impact on Fenland character
  - c) Need for additional green space towards southern part of site and enhanced cycle links
  - d) Phase 1 would not be well integrated with the existing community
  - e) Concern of proximity of site to AMEY and adverse odour issues
  - f) Transport strategy is premature in light of unpublished A10 study
  - g) Further information is required in the Transport Assessment to fully address concerns
  - h) Late timescales for the delivery of the new station
  - i) WPC is supportive of the SPD work to be prepared by SCDC.
  - j) WPC would like to be involved in S106 discussions
  - k) Insists on 40% affordable housing provision and priority given to those with a local connection

### Comments on Amended Application

72. Maintains its objection in principle and in detail to the application. The additional information does not address the fundamental issues raised in the previous consultation. In addition, it is noted that there remains no local plan policy to support the new town, no SPD and no substantive outcomes from the Ely to Cambridge transport study.
- a) Objection to scale and height of buildings with respect to the fenland landscape, night time impacts, building heights of 4 storey next to the cemetery and Abbey Place
  - b) Sport England concerns regarding insufficient sports area and inclusion of the lake area within the calculation of POS
  - c) Quantum and location of proposed public open spaces: insufficient adjacent to existing village and in the development itself
  - d) Drainage strategy is unacceptable to drainage consultee. SCDC need to be mindful of Internal Drainage Board response
  - e) Insufficient water supply in the area
  - f) Lack of sustainable transport strategy: including joint travel/traffic plan between U&C and RLW; sufficient consideration for all car users; travel planning for in-commuters to the town; A10/Cambridge Road junction improvements; A10 cycle lane improvements
  - g) No significant development should take place until there have been improvements to the A10
  - h) Cemetery: there should be vehicular access and gateway to cemetery at the back for residents; a degree of separation with buildings and tree screening. Raises concern regarding capacity of the cemetery. Additional land should be made available.

### Further Comments (20 November 2018)

73. The Parish Council maintains its recommendation of refusal for this application. The application should not be determined until the A10 Corridor Study proposals are ratified and funded; until these are in place the viability of the proposed transport mitigation cannot be assessed. It shares Horningsea's concerns regarding traffic using Station Road, Waterbeach and Clayhithe Road. It also shares the concerns of Historic England, English Heritage and Anglian Water. The Parish Council opposes the siting of a water treatment works to the east of the railway and proposes sites to the west of the strategic site should be fully explored.
74. It is clear that changes need to be made to the SPD to reflect the consultation responses and it is inappropriate for a major planning application to be determined until a final version of the SPD has been circulated for further consultation.

### **Wicken Parish Council**

#### Comments on Original Application

75. Object on grounds of traffic and highways safety due to impact on A10 prior to strategic improvements including duelling and Milton interchange revamp

### **Consultation - South Cambridgeshire District Council Consultees**

#### **Affordable Housing Officer**

#### Comments on Original/Amended Application

76. Various affordable housing tenure options have been tested in response to the financial viability review work and the preferred option is for the following tenure mix:
- 30% affordable rent
  - 30% shared ownership
  - 20% rent to buy
  - 20% discounted market sale
77. This offer provides 30% affordable homes over the lifetime of the scheme and will provide 1,950 affordable units. This option includes delaying delivery of the affordable homes by 300 units and will enable the necessary community infrastructure to be in place prior to occupation, providing more support for our more vulnerable residents. We expect the first affordable units to be handed over in year 2 giving a delay of approximately 18 months.

### **Development Officer (Community)**

#### Comments on Original Application

78. Question relationship between new town and village and this will affect new facilities and where they would be best located. Question whether the average household size used by the applicant is reflective of new largescale developments. If a lower estimate is being used the calculations for open space will be too low. Question how the number of community spaces has been calculated. Support the provision of community facilities at primary schools in addition to standalone, multipurpose community centres.
79. Community Development Worker:
- What is U&C timeline for community development worker?
  - SCDC expectation that CDW would be in place well in advance of first occupations
  - Who would CDW be responsible to? Application states in one place that contribution for CDW would come to SCDC, it also states that U&C would lead on community development during the construction phase. Clarification required.
80. Very pleased that existing facilities are being opened up now for existing community. Various questions concerning existing facilities: how long is temporary use for, do facilities meet Sport England guidelines, has a quality assessment been carried out etc. Further work is required in the application to ensure that sports needs are fully addressed in the sports strategy. Community access of facilities at schools must be in addition to SCDC's Open Space SPD requirement. Further work is also required regarding the lake and whether there would be sufficient demand for water sports at the development.
81. Although the U&C application area does not require a full swimming pool, when taken together with the RLW land, nearly six lanes will be required. Space and finances to enable this would be required or alternative discussions to be held re: enhancing other local facilities. Very pleased that existing facilities are being opened up now for the existing community, and welcome the idea of a Community Trust model for management and maintenance of community space. Any new sports facilities should meet Sport England specification

#### Comments on Amended Application

##### a) Community meeting spaces

82. Further justification is sought behind the need for four community centres in terms of their cost effectiveness and ongoing management and maintenance costs. Total build costs of these facilities should include the main hall and ancillary rooms. Parking will be required and at least one of the community centres should have secure outdoor space for pre-school/playgroup activities. A Community Trust or equivalent is the suggested method of management responsibility for the centres, however, an option should be included for the Parish/Town Council to assume this responsibility at some point in the future if they wish and this should be facilitated through the S106 agreement. At least one of the Multi Purpose Community Centres will have a sports focus, this must be built to Sport England standard.

b) Indoor sports

83. Confirmation is required as to whether or not the existing barracks sports facilities will be replaced with new purpose built facilities. If the existing facilities are to remain (i.e. in order not to require new facilities) these should be upgraded to meet current Sport England specifications prior to first occupation. The application is unclear as to the number of studio spaces that will be provided for dance, exercise classes etc.

c) Outdoor sports

84. A strategy for water based sporting activities which takes into account existing facilities in the local area is required. In order for pitches to be used effectively and be sustainable in the future, ancillary facilities will be required.

d) Children's play spaces

85. At least one LEAP should be provided prior to first occupation in a location that is easily accessible to early residents.

e) Local enterprise and community development

- f) A community development worker should be in post prior to first occupation. SCDC expectation would be for the post to be in place for 10 years.

g) Management and maintenance of community facilities

86. A full SPD site wide approach to governance should be explored and decided by the Progress and Delivery Group. In addition a Maintenance and management strategy will be required. Detailed strategies, including implementation plans will be required for Sport, Maintenance & Management and Youth & Play.

## **Drainage Consultant**

### Comments on Original Application

87. Although the proposals have demonstrated that a surface water drainage strategy can be delivered for much of the site, such that flood risk is not increased by the new development, there are fundamental issues that require a commitment from the applicant at this stage and additional information required before the application can be fully supported.

### Comments on Amended Application

88. The additional information has addressed some of the fundamental concerns, however not all have been addressed and may be overcome by suitably worded conditions.

## **Ecology Officer**

### Comments on Original Application

89. The scheme has potential to provide good opportunities for wildlife; however, further clarification and information is required to demonstrate that the proposals will meet UK and EU law and planning policy in relation to biodiversity.

### Comments on Amended Application

90. Surveys have now been completed to a satisfactory standard for an outline application, and no further surveys are necessary at this time.

a) Kingfishers

Concerns were raised on the retention of kingfisher nests within the lake area. The submitted documents state that areas of the lake shore and the islands within the lake are to be protected from human disturbance, which is welcomed. However I believe there remain questions regarding how this will be done, considering the lake forms a focal point for the community and recreational activities are to be encouraged (see the Green Infrastructure Strategy). Therefore, resolution of this situation must come through at the detailed design stage.

b) East-west links

Concern was raised on the lack of strong east-west biodiversity connectivity. The parameter plan, as submitted, does not give clarity as to where these are located, which would be required to ensure that through movement is considered for biodiversity.

c) Connectivity to the wider countryside

This has been dealt with adequately within the submitted documents.

d) Impact to retained and created habitats

This has been dealt with adequately within the submitted documents.

e) General Principles of the EIA Assessment

i) EIA Scoping

Concern was raised that not enough consideration had been given the extent of cumulative impact. The Environmental Statement Chapter 6 Addendum document has provided a re-written section 6.8 (paragraphs 6.8.1 – 6.8.5). The amended section is a more comprehensive evaluation of cumulative effects and does now include the probable granting of the neighbouring permission for a further 4500 dwellings despite no permission existing as yet.

ii) The impact of increased cat population

Disturbance of farmland birds by domestic dogs and cats has been acknowledged within the addendum to paragraph 6.5.125, where it is considered significant at a district level, but of overall minor significance. The risk from domestic pets have been accepted and that mitigation can be found to

reduce the risk to farmland birds. However early delivery of the Northern Park should be facilitated to offset any negative impact to farmland birds during the early phases of development.

f) Legal and Policy Compliance

i) Ecological mitigation, compensation, and enhancement framework

The ability to provide a robust and suitably detailed mitigation and compensation framework at outline stage was highlighted as a key to the delivering a successful plan. The applicant has now submitted both a Green Infrastructure Strategy Addendum to which section 1.2 is an abridged Biodiversity Strategy, and the full Biodiversity Strategy provides explicit detail of how both species and retained habitats will be protected during construction, the process of securing protected species licences as and when they are necessary, and post construction mitigation, habitat creation and compensation.

ii) Net gain in biodiversity

The applicant has submitted the results of a Biodiversity Impact Assessment within section 3.1 of the Green Infrastructure Strategy Addendum. Once clarification of the calculations have been provided further Biodiversity Impact Assessment calculations should be conditioned prior to the commencement of each phase of development, or at set trigger points throughout the lifetime of the development. These conditions should stipulate a minimum gain in biodiversity of 10%.

g) Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement

A far greater depth of detail has now been submitted regarding the strategy the applicant is taking towards the mitigation hierarchy. Sufficient detail has been provided within the submitted documents and any outstanding issues can be dealt with through the discharge of conditions and at detailed design stage.

## **Economic Development Officer**

### Comments on Original Application

91. The development of an effective Economic Development Strategy (EDS) will help to ensure that ambitions contained in the Employment Statement are achieved. I would expect the EDS to expand substantially on the analysis and 'enterprise' activities included in the submitted Employment Statement. This should be developed in partnership with key stakeholders including RLW, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Greater Cambridge Partnership and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. I would request that the development of the Strategy takes place early on in the development process so that the timing of the employment development can be calibrated with the arrival of residents.
92. As the Employment Statement suggests, the construction phase of the development has the potential to provide a range of opportunities both for local residents and businesses. I would suggest that a scheme be developed,

submitted separately to the Economic Development Strategy, and prior to any development beginning on-site. The scheme should include, but not be limited to:

- How apprenticeships, training and capacity building will be delivered to support local people into construction (and other) jobs during the delivery phase.
- How local businesses will be supported take advantage of supply chain opportunities during the construction phase.
- How U+I will work with other agencies to deliver these activities.
- How activities will be funded and how any activities and outputs will be monitored

### **Environmental Health Officer (Air Quality)**

#### Comments on Original Application

93. Overall, there are no objections to the proposed development on the basis of impacts to (or from) air quality. However, further effort is required from the applicant to minimise impacts on air quality.

#### Comments on Amended Application

94. The following submitted documents are acceptable in reducing the overall impact of the development on local air quality, subject to implementation of the recommended measures.
- Environmental Statement (ES), Air Quality chapter by David Lock Associates, May 2018
  - Low Emission Strategy (LES), by Peter Brett Associates LLP, May 2018
  - Framework Travel Plan (FTP), by Peter Brett Associates LLP, May 2018
  - Air Quality Technical Note, Primary School Location, October 2018
95. To address any concerns with the future air quality at the proposed northern school location, the following measures should be considered:
- Provision of adequate landscaping along the boundary of school and A10, as recommended in the applicant's Technical Note.
  - Allocation of a maximum distance between the school buildings and the most frequently used playing areas and the A10.

### **Environmental Health Officer (Contaminated Land and Unexploded Ordnance)**

#### Comments on Original Application

96. Satisfied that, further to the information already submitted, the remainder of the investigation and remediation in relation to contamination may be dealt with by way of conditions attached to any planning consent granted.
97. Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) – Recommends that the threat from UXO is initially dealt with on a site wide basis before individual parcels of land are

developed. Whilst this type of work would most effectively be done before site earthworks are commenced, it is particularly important to prevent the need for evacuation of a newly occupied area of the site due to a UXO being discovered on a neighbouring parcel of land during construction work. A condition should be added to this effect.

## **Environmental Health Officer (Noise, Dust and Odour)**

### Comments on Original Application

#### a) Construction noise

98. Recommended conditions: agreement of a site-wide phasing plan and Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for the site-wide earthworks and for individual development parcels at reserved matters

#### b) Noise impact of the A10 road and primary routes through the site

99. Recommended condition and informative for internal noise levels to be mitigated to those levels specified in BS8233 2014 so that levels do not exceed 45dB(A)max for more than 15-20 times per night to ensure sleep is not adversely disturbed. This level is confirmed in the new ProPG: Planning and Noise Guidance 2017, which states "In most circumstances in noise sensitive rooms at night (e.g. bedrooms) good acoustic design can be used so that individual noise events do not normally exceed 45dB L<sub>A</sub>max,F more than 10 times a night."

#### c) Off-site traffic noise impact on local roads

100. The effect of increased vehicle movements on the A10 and Horningsea Road will need to be considered in relation to possible increased noise levels.

#### d) Operational noise impact – non-residential uses

101. Whilst detailed design information with regards to the layout and composition of the proposed development (with regard to non-residential mixed use classes) is not available at this outline stage, particular consideration needs to be given towards the prevention of nuisance that may be caused by incompatible land uses, such as commercial and residential properties being in close proximity.
102. No objection to the use of renewable technologies but if air source heat pumps and or micro-wind turbines are considered then further noise impact assessment and or a noise insulation scheme may be required.

#### e) Odour

103. In order to determine the level of odour mitigation and/or site layout considerations a detailed odour assessment will be required. This odour assessment (in accordance with an agreed methodology) is for assessing the impact of the Amey site on the wider area and should be submitted as part of the planning application.

f) General

104. Due to the scale and nature of the proposed development, the following condition is recommended to confirm adherence to the mitigation measures set out in the Environmental Statement.
105. The development, hereby approved, shall be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures as set out in the Environmental Statement, dated February 2017 (as amended) and its supplementary documents and strategies unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Comments on Amended Application

a) Construction noise

106. Controls on construction noise, dust, building site activities including working and delivery times have previously been recommended. The additional information received is not in connection with these matters.

b) Noise impact of the A10 road and primary routes through the site

c) Operational noise impact – non-residential uses

107. Figures 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4 indicate that in the vast majority of the site it will be possible to achieve the appropriate noise levels both in external amenity areas and indoor rooms. However, it is recognised that residential properties on the western side of the development, facing the A10, will be relying on noise mitigation measures and will need to have windows closed in order to achieve those satisfactory internal noise levels. Therefore alternative/mechanical ventilation will be required. It will also be necessary to carefully consider room/external amenity area layout and orientation in accordance with good acoustic design. One way of covering this aspect is that the process contained within the ProPG Planning and Noise guidance document (May 2017) be followed and an Acoustic Design Statement (ADS) be submitted detailing how good acoustic design has been incorporated throughout the development.
108. As the main source of noise affecting the site is generated by road traffic on the A10, the effects will differ across the development according to topography, screening and distance. It is therefore essential that individual plots are considered at the detailed design stage with regard to specific mitigation requirements that apply. Section 11.6.2 of the addendum confirms this approach. The assessment predicts there will be a negligible impact on existing receptors as a result of increased traffic as a result of the development. Recommend approve, subject to conditions previously recommended.

e) Odour

109. The submitted Supplementary Odour Information by PBA/Silsoe is

agreed in terms of its methodology and reported findings. It should be noted that whilst odour will probably be detectable at some locations on the proposed development, the study indicates this will be very infrequent and at a low level that is not considered significant in EIA terms. In view of the above, it is accepted that odour is not a reason to object to the proposed development.

## **Environmental Health Officer (Public Health)**

### Comments on Original Application

110. No comments

### Comments on Amended Application

111. The submitted Health Impact Assessment Addendum (HIA) is acceptable and the comments raised by public health CCC and SCDC following initial submission have been addressed.

## **Environmental Health Officer (Waste)**

### Comments on Original Application

112. In order to ensure waste is adequately considered at the outline stage and any following reserved matters applications a condition is recommended to agree a Waste Management & Minimisation Strategy.

## **Landscape Officer**

### Comments on Original Application

#### a) Vision

113. It is essential that the proposed Green Infrastructure Strategy is captured in the vision for Waterbeach in the DAS and translates into the spatial and design principles within it.

#### b) Wider Green infrastructure

114. The wider green infrastructure strategy notes the sub-regional Green Infrastructure (GI) such as the Wicken fen Vision area, river cam strategic corridor and river great Ouse strategic corridor etc. However the parameter plan, Spatial Principles and Design Principles do not indicate how links to these landscapes can be achieved and secured as part of this outline.

#### c) Strategic Landscape Components SP9

115. Whilst the outline proposes a good distribution of GI along its western and northern areas, it is more limited towards the east and south which reduces the opportunities for biodiversity links, access and connections to strategic green spaces. It is important that the elements shown within the indicative green

infrastructure strategy (DAS page 119) can be secured through the outline application.

d) Woodland west of the lake SP10

116. The woodland on the western edge of the lake is a defining landscape feature and should be retained. It may be possible to develop the southern part of the hatched area as low density development to establish an authentic identity whilst still retaining a maintaining a woodland character. The parameter plan and DAS should be revised to reflect this.

e) Sports and open space – SP11

117. Number of specific changes requested to spatial principal 11 to clarify recreational/amenity quality of non-strategic open spaces, 450m walking distances for equipped play areas, location of artificial pitches away from sensitive areas and introduction of accessibility criterion for allotments so that any development is close proximity to it and not remotely located.

f) Northern boundary SP14

118. The parameter plan proposes a permeable tree belt of approximately 20m but is graphically represented on the illustrative masterplan as a substantial band of planting along the entire northern boundary. It is considered that the northern boundary should not have a consistent treatment along its entire length and should vary.

g) Water management SP12

119. There is an absence of water drainage features to the east of the lake and to the south of the site as shown in Fig 19 GI strategy. SP12 should be amended to include 'across the entire site' so that the fen landscape character can be achieved.

h) Civic Spaces

120. The spatial principles and parameter plan should include civic spaces because of townscape merit and places where people congregate. Its inclusion would provide certainty of investment and quality.

i) Western and Southern edges

121. Spatial principles should be developed for the western and southern edges of the application site to show how a high quality landscape along the A10 can be achieved and how strategic landscape can integrate with the existing village to the south.

## **Shared Waste Service**

### Comments on original/amended application

122. The development will be required to provide S106 contributions towards refuse vehicles, waste receptacles, cardboard skips and bring banks.

### **Sustainability Officer**

#### Comments on Original Application

123. The Sustainability Strategy needs to be amended to provide more clarity on the measures that could be implemented in relation to the requirement for the development to be an example of excellence in sustainable development and health and wellbeing, and to give greater consideration to climate change adaptation including measures to be implemented to design out overheating. Other measures that could be considered in meeting the requirement for excellence could include the role of modern methods of construction including offsite construction in driving resource efficiency and energy efficiency in new homes and non-residential buildings and consideration of standards such as the WELL Standard or BREEAM Communities. It is also strongly recommend that the role of the cooling hierarchy be considered as part of the Design Code for the site, if one is to be developed, and that for future reserved matters applications, this issue be included within Design Code Compliance Statements or Design and Access Statements to demonstrate how this issue has been designed out.

#### Comments on Amended Application

124. The amended sustainability strategy supplement is now acceptable and responds to the requirements related to exceeding current policy requirements for phase 1 of the development, with the review of the Sustainability Strategy condition enabling a review of targets and amendment as necessary for future phases. With regards to the gas connection, this is something that will need to be picked up for future phases and can be picked up when the Sustainability Strategy is reviewed.

### **Tree Officer**

#### Comments on Original Application

125. No objections to the findings and recommendations of the submitted Arboricultural Statement.

### **Urban Design & Heritage Officer**

#### Comments on Original Application

126. The submitted parameter plans will need to go further and provide certainty on:
- a) A comprehensive approach to the strategic movement network, alignment and hierarchy that includes the site, local subregional links to adjacent destinations, settlements and land uses for all modes.

- b) The hierarchy of centres that incentivises the location and success of the town centre
- c) The distribution of density to assess capacity and visual impact
- d) The co-ordination between the two site boundaries
- e) The biodiversity link, areas of woodlands, the ponds within the Golf Course and low density development in woodland setting.
- f) Align and clarify the nature and uses of the northern development boundary to take account of the proposed local plan.
- g) Limit flexibility of development boundary along the western edge to 10m
- h) Review the development edge along the southern edge to be consistent with the illustrative masterplan

127. Suggested improvements are requested in relation to the following summary list:

- a) Structure of Design & Access Statement
- b) Overall vision
- c) Movement and access
- d) Design of northern edge
- e) Demolition principles
- f) Historic grid pattern
- g) Mixed use centres
- h) Distinctive and walkable neighbourhoods
- i) Density and height
- j) Co-ordination of the eastern edge
- k) Block structure

#### Comments on Amended Application

128. The changes made to the application following extensive dialogue and discussion, stated in page 7 of the DAS Supplement Oct 2018, are welcomed. The following comments relate to outstanding issues some of which can be addressed by way of planning condition.

- a) As the Parameter plan is very broad to allow flexibility, a condition is recommended to ensure that each phase considers a comprehensive approach to movement (all modes), green infrastructure that links with the future phases, RLW land to the east. A condition would also be needed to ensure that future phases, green and grey infrastructure of Urban and Civic Land and RLW land are co-ordinated.
- b) All Design and Spatial Principles within the DAS Supplement should be approved by condition (to inform future design coding).
- c) SP15 of the DAS Supplement: The current wording does not guarantee the retention of the Control Tower which is one of the key buildings of local interest identified by Historic England (June 2018). Suggest rewording to ensure retention of this building.
- d) DP33 of the DAS Supplement: This principle would be in conflict with the Parameter plan as the primary route could link the principal points of access to the lakeside which is a key destination. This has the potential to prejudice the legibility of the route and focus activity towards the lakeside

rather than the town centre. Alternative wording suggested.

- e) Areas hatched around the northwest corner of the lake if developed as typical two storey housing at 22dph could see a lot a vegetation/character lost, hence text needs a principle or extension to the text in the key to maintain a predominantly woodland character.
- f) SP9 (6<sup>th</sup> bullet) of the DAS Supplement does not ensure a continuous east west green link but suggest one that is broken into two: east and west of the lake. A continuous east west green link is desired. Should be reworded.
- g) The changes to DP12 gives some certainty in varying the roofscape and built form within the broad heights established in the parameter plan and are welcome. However, these broad height parameters need to be more site specific and/tested at a reserved matters/design code stage to ensure a varied skyline, townscape and refined massing is delivered. A suitable condition is recommended that requires reserved matters for parcels/buildings to be tested/modelled from key viewpoints for each phase and shows them in the context of existing and permitted reserved matters.

### **Consultation – External**

#### **Amey Waste Management Park**

##### Comments on Original Application

- 129. In summary, subject to suitable design and layout, the close proximity of Waterbeach Waste Management Park (WWMP) and its allocation for Energy from Waste provides the re-development of Waterbeach Barracks with opportunities to capitalise on delivery a sustainable community.
- 130. The comments of the Environment Agency in their response of 18 April 2017 and with regard to odour are considered a fair assessment of the existing permit controls at the WWMP and the ability for the facility and community to co-exist with some residual impacts.

#### **Anglian Water**

##### Comments on Original Application

- 131. No objections to principle of development. The existing Waterbeach Water Recycling Centre does not have capacity to treat all the used water for this development and will require a phasing of solutions to align with the build out rate of the site. This can be agreed via planning condition.
- 132. In terms of the existing Water Recycling Centre there is potential for loss of amenities at sensitive properties within the proposed development due to odour emissions. It is advised that the proposed layout seeks to maintain an effective distance between the treatment works and sensitive accommodation. In addition, it is recommended that an odour dispersion model is produced to establish the range at which the amenity of neighbouring property is likely to be impaired. Sensitive development should be locate a minimum of 15m from pumping stations to ensure nuisances, such as smell and noise, are avoided.

133. The proposed surface water management scheme does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets.

#### Comments on Amended Application

134. Both Anglian Water and the applicant are aware that infrastructure improvements and upgrades are required to serve the development site in full. Detailed modelling work will be undertaken to ensure that the best solution is found and implemented and any mitigation works identified. To enable this to happen effectively Anglian Water requests the use of planning conditions, or other mechanisms, relating to infrastructure improvements and phasing to be attached to the planning permission, if the Council is minded to grant approval.

#### **British Horse Society**

#### Comments on Original/Amended Application

135. Objection. The applicant and the County Council should consult with the BHS to establish routes and standards to provide equestrian access for the development. Cycle Lobby Groups are not qualified to comment on equestrian needs and should not be consulted on matters related to equestrian access. The BHS must be involved from the earliest design stage. Failure to consult would cause a serious breach in the requirement for the County Council to treat all users equally. There is an opportunity in this application to create a forward looking bridleway network.

#### **Cadent (Gas Network)**

#### Comments on Original/Amended Application

136. Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. This may include a legal interest (easements or wayleaves) in the land which restricts activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The applicant must ensure that proposed works do not infringe on Cadent's legal rights and any details of such restrictions should be obtained from the landowner in the first instance. If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the gas apparatus then development should only take place following diversion of this apparatus. The applicant should contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team at the earliest opportunity to discuss proposed diversions of apparatus to avoid any unnecessary delays.

#### **Cambridge Cycling Campaign**

#### Comments on Original Application

137. Objection. The application can be vastly improved by taking our recommendations, and that the outcome will be superior for not only the

residents and neighbours but also for the applicant's business case for the development. Good walking and cycling infrastructure, combined with public transport, produces a sustainable, environmentally-friendly neighbourhood that is more attractive and enjoyable to live in and visit. Major modal shift to cycling and public transport means that much less money has to be spent on the construction and maintenance of massively expensive roads and junctions for what would otherwise be an influx of far too many motor vehicles. The applicant has a blank canvas upon which to paint a picture of a world-class new town that satisfies SCDC policy goals for sustainability while setting an example for the rest of the country.

#### Comments on Amended Application

138. Endorses the objection letter written by Waterbeach Cycling Campaign

#### **Cambridgeshire County Council:**

#### Comments on Original Application

- a) Archaeology
139. Recommend conditions are put in place to ensure the effective management of undesignated heritage assets which may be impacted by the development, including the construction phase.
- b) Education
140. Objection. Insufficient provision (land + contribution) identified for Special Education Needs (SEN) or Post-16; Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) requirement exceeds policy position. Secondary school provision (single site) not sufficient to meet needs of the area. Support – The application parameter plans show the general location of the primary and secondary school which at present broadly conform to the County Council's requirements. These locations will be confirmed as part of the detailed planning stages and following further consultation with the County Council.
- c) Ecology
141. Objection, until application demonstrates appropriate mitigation
- d) Energy
142. Clarifications required in relation to fuel uses.
- e) Highways
143. Objects on highway safety grounds.
- g) Lead Local Flood and Water Authority
144. Object – concerns relating to discharge rates, climate change allowance, existing barrack drainage, and water quality treatment.
- h) Libraries and Lifetime Learning
145. Support subject to s106 agreement

- i) Public Health
- 146. Holding objection until further information submitted and approved in relation to health Impact Assessment.
- j) Sand and Gravel
- 147. Planning condition required.
- k) Transport Assessment
- 148. Holding objection. Insufficient evidence to determine impact on road network. Robust, tested and costed mitigation package not yet provided.
- l) Waste Management
- 149. Support in principle, subject to detailed matters and planning condition.

#### Comments on amended application

- a) Education
- 150. Primary school provision is agreed at a maximum of 11FE. Education officers have challenged the new location of Primary School 1 due to its proximity to the A10. Additional noise modelling has indicated that the location is satisfactory providing appropriate noise mitigation is provided in the form of bunding and acoustic fencing (to be conditioned). The application now includes land of at least 1.7 hectares safeguarded for the special school. This amendment is to be welcomed and overcomes an earlier objection. The County Council is looking to secure a site for a Post 16 facility within the adjoining RLW site.
- b) New Communities
- 151. The County Council sought a commitment for more formal support and community development, especially for those more vulnerable, to ensure all people are fully integrated and welcome in the new community. This will be negotiated and secured through the Section 106 agreement
- c) Energy
- 152. Previous comments still stand.
- e) Highways
- 153. No additional comments
- f) Lead Local Flood and Water Authority
- 154. No objection subject to conditions
- h) Public Health
- 155. The Public Health team has worked with the applicant in the preparation of a revised health impact statement and consequently the holding objection can be withdrawn.

i) Transport Assessment

156. Holding objection. Principle of Monitor and Manage approach and initial mitigation package is agreed. However, further discussion and technical work is required to agree designs/tests of Phase 1 mitigation package. The Highway Authority requests a hold on any further development beyond Phase 1. Any future phase will require a Transport Assessment to be approved by the Local Planning Authority. Further development of the new town will be dependent on this infrastructure being implemented. The Combined Authority is leading work to advance the recommendations of the Ely to Cambridge Study regarding coordinated multi modal strategic solutions. A S106 transport cap towards strategic transport interventions will need to be flexible in terms of how it is spent.

### **Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service**

#### Comments on Original and Amended Application

157. Requests that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants

### **Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum**

#### Comments on Original Application

158. Considers that off-road connections and the creation of new public rights of way should be for all non-motorised users (NMUs) (walking, cycling, horse-riding) and secured through suitable developer finance with the cooperation of the County Council. Developer finance needs to extend to significance infrastructure required to enable the crossing by NMUs of two significant barriers – the main line railway and the River Cam- in particular for a route that connects the northern half of the proposed development (and RLW to the east) with Wicken Fen by a direct route. All crossings of the A10 need to be multi-user to allow a link westwards to Cottenham, Rampton and Willingham and beyond. Planned open spaces within the development should also be kept free from future building construction.

### **Cambridgeshire Past, Present and Future**

#### Comments on Original/Amended Application

159. CambridgePPF remains positive about the principle of development in this area, however, believe there are several critical issues that prohibit the application from being properly assessed and determined. These issues include:
- transport
  - heights of buildings
  - lack of sustainability commitment
  - demolition and removal of waste
  - adoption of Local Plan and SPD needed

- ensuring coherent whole town

## **Cambridge Water**

160. No comments received

## **Cambridgeshire Constabulary**

### Comments on Original Application

161. Request for space within the new town to accommodate new custodial service.

### nended Application

162. Waterbeach new town is no longer on the schedule of preferred sites. Waterbeach will, however, be serviced from a new Police Station (location to be determined) and consideration of a financial contribution would be appreciated on the basis that the development will have both victims and perpetrators of crime requiring police services.

## **Environment Agency**

### Comments on Original Application

163. Whilst the Agency is confident that it will reach a position of non-objection in principle to the proposed development, it wishes to advise of its current concerns. The application is premature in the absence of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Concern is also raised in respect of flood risk and the use of the *Waterbeach model*.

164. No major concerns about the potential to resolve water quality related to wastewater. Provision of foul water capacity in the medium term is a concern until the proposed new wastewater treatment centre is operational. It is essential that monitoring and some form of related triggers are put in place to ensure that foul drainage does not overwhelm the drainage infrastructure and receiving watercourses. The EA considers that by continuing to work together with the developers and Anglian Water that a suitable strategy can be agreed.

165. Development should not be committed ahead of secure water supplies. The location of development should take into consideration the relative availability of existing developed water resources. Every opportunity should be taken to build water efficiency into new development and innovative approaches should be encouraged.

166. The activities at the composting site (Amey Cespa) can give rise to serious amenity such as odour. The operator will need to demonstrate that they have taken all reasonable precautions to mitigate these impacts and ensure the facility and community will co-exist with some residual impacts.

167. Conditions are recommended in relation to the following: site contamination, surface water drainage, piling foundation design, treatment of suspended solids for surface water run-off/dewatering activities and landscape management/ecological enhancement.

#### Comments on Amended Application

168. Recommend deferral of any decision until the critical WRC outline information is included in the Environmental Statement. The new water recycling centre is unassessed and currently has no policy. Considerations include basic information such as in principle siting considerations, design and mitigation prospects. The applicant's preferred location is in Flood Zone 3 (including functional floodplain), which raises potentially highly significant policy constraints and environmental impacts. For this reason a decision should be deferred until the critical WRC outline information is included in the Environmental Statement.
169. There is potentially significant overlap between matters of surface water drainage, which would only be acceptable where the applicant has demonstrated that land is uncontaminated. Other environmental issues, such as site flood risk and contaminated land can be satisfactorily safeguarded by conditions and informatives.

#### Further comments received 17 December 2018

170. Recommends objection as the proposal is not served by adequate or determinate wastewater infrastructure and therefore poses an unacceptable risk to water quality and may increase flood risk to nearby communities. The proposal does not provide an adequate assessment of environmental effects for the preferred wastewater option and in the selection and assessment of alternative fall-back options.
171. The following would help to identify and assess wastewater options in the EIA:
- a) Significant increases to the sequential approach area of search
  - b) Remove unreasonable options
  - c) Assess the preferred option in more detail, and if this cannot be demonstrated to be feasible in technical and policy terms, assess the fall-back option in sufficient detail to satisfy the EIA Regulations. This could be other reasonable options in sustainable locations, bearing in mind surrounding designations and land uses that could be compatible. Where detail is not provided, it is advised that the assessment should be based on cautious 'worst case' approach, as established through the Rochdale MBC Vs Milne (No 2) [2000] judgement.
172. Prior to determining the suitability of any Water Recycling Centre in flood zones 2 and 3, SCDC will need to be mindful that the Council Council has to consider all reasonable alternatives. Section 2.8 of the Physical Infrastructure Report lists some existing sites that the development could pump to. The EA questions whether these are reasonable alternatives as both Cottenham and Uttons Drove (near Bar Hill) are both distant and have fundamental capacity

issues – Cottenham may be closed. Milton WRC (6km away) is the only credible alternative existing WRC presented to date.

173. In terms of the Wicken Fen and Cam Washes impacts, information is likely to be available on the distances that visitors have travelled and this should be used. Potential impacts on Stow cum Quy Fen SSSI should also be considered.

## **East Cambridgeshire District Council**

### Comments on Original Application

174. Holding objection. Application is premature with regard to wider transport implications and the ongoing A10 study. The applicant has failed to consider the proposal for a train station in Soham. The EIA should consider the impact of growth proposed in Soham and East Cambridgeshire (3000 homes in North Ely and the proposed development in Littleport). Where will the park and ride be located and how will this operate?

## **English Heritage Trust**

### Comments on Original/Amended Application

175. Objection due to the following concerns:
- a) Proximity of development to Denny Abbey and increased usage
  - b) Details lacking on landscaping and layout of proposed northern buffer zone
  - c) Security concerns at Denny Abbey site
  - d) Poor highway access at Denny Abbey site from A10; lack of car/cycle parking; and need for new pedestrian links from the new town
  - e) Financial viability of Denny Abbey: costs of access, damage and security
176. These adverse impacts would need appropriate mitigation and to maintain the financial viability of the site. Suggestions for S106 mitigation are recommended in the consultation response.

## **Farmland Museum**

### Comments on Original Application

177. Pleased to see that the principle of reinstating the route of the former causeway connecting Denny Abbey to the village of Waterbeach is incorporated in the plan as a footpath and cycle path. However, unless the whole of SS/6 site comes forward this link may not be possible.
178. The submitted documents do not emphasise the important contribution that Denny Abbey and the Farmland Museum and make as a unique cultural, recreational and educational destination for residents of the new development. The proposed development will put huge pressures on the site's infrastructure

and the current access into the museum and car parking is inadequate to cope with such a large new settlement on its doorstep. The impact of the development needs to be assessed and proposals put forward to address this impact.

## **Highways England**

### Comments on Original Application

179. Recommend that planning permission not be granted for a specified period in order to review the transport assessment work being carried out by the applicant's transport consultants.

### Comments on Amended Application

180. Accepts that the proposed transport interventions set out in ES Chapter 9 are sufficient to mitigate the impact of 1600 dwellings (Key Phase 1) and that they can be considered as the threshold before strategic interventions are required. These measures should be provided prior to first occupation of Phase 1 and the impact monitored to provide confidence the interventions provide for existing demand that is currently not being catered for, and to also mitigate for the forecasted future demand brought about through this early phase. Consequently Highways England recommends conditions to secure the Key Phase 1 transport interventions, monitoring and travel planning and future infrastructure requirements.

## **Historic England**

### Comments on Original Application

181. Objection. The current application is premature given the local plan is still at examination. The limit of built development shown should be set further back from the setting of Denny Abbey. Furthermore, the northern boundary planting should be sufficiently permeable to so that it positively contributes to the setting of Denny Abbey, as approached from the south.
182. The proposed creation of a green buffer on the western boundary of the site to protect the route of the Car Dyke is welcomed, as well as the proposed principles set out in Section 9 of the Design & Access Statement aimed at reflecting the military history of the site and setting higher density and building heights in the centre of the settlement in order to minimise impacts on views of Denny Abbey. The retention of existing buildings which contribute to historic character is supported.

### Comments on Amended Application

183. Consider that the application is premature until the Local Plan and SPD have been determined. However, Historic England supports the amendment to the northern boundary of built development which will contribute towards

minimising the impact of development on Denny Abbey and its setting. Support is also given for the reduction in building heights at the southern edge of development adjacent to the historic village properties to the south. Potential reuse of barracks buildings is encouraged, which Historic England has previously identified as non-designated heritage assets. The use of the historic airfield entrance in the south as a less intensive use for buses and cycles etc. will largely preserve the character of the historic settlement and the conservation area to the south.

184. Concern is raised in relation to the impact of the taller buildings (4-6 storeys) in the open flat landscape. It would be more appropriate to keep to 4-5 storeys as at Northstowe with tall puncturing buildings being limited to six storey.

#### Further comments received on 14 November 2018

185. Concerned at the proposed heights for development, in particular the tall buildings in the open flat landscape may result in an inappropriate level of height and density for what will be a small fen-edge town, not an edge of Cambridge urban expansion. It would be more appropriate to keep to 4-5 storeys with tall puncturing buildings being limited to six storeys. Consider that the application is premature until the SPD have been adopted.

#### **Internal Drainage Board**

##### Comments on Original Application

186. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept any new discharges above the Board's greenfield run-off rate of 1.1 litres / second /ha. New discharges will require the consent of the Board and given the size of the site, this will need to be in the form of a legal agreement.

##### Comments on Amended Application

187. New discharges will require the consent of the Board and given the size of the site, this will need to be in the form of a legal agreement. The main access road from the A10 will require the consent of the Board, as it crosses the IDB's main drain. The existing waste water works are a vital source of water for the Board in the summer, supplying water to irrigators downstream. The Board have been in discussions with Anglian Water and the consultants for the developers on this issue.

#### **Homes England**

188. No comments received

#### **National Planning Casework Unit**

189. No comment to make on the environment statement

#### **National Trust**

##### Comments on Original Application

190. An evaluation of the recreational visits to Wicken Fen and the wider Wicken vision areas such as Burwell Fen must be carried out in the Environmental Statement before potential impacts can be assessed and certainly not dismissed as 'negligible'. As such the Trust wish to counter the assertion within the ES that significant numbers of visitors will not stray beyond a 3km radius.
191. Detailed information should be submitted in order to understand the full details of the key layout, green spaces and infrastructure, with reference to the Wicken Fen Vision area. Additional information is required in terms of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment particularly referencing views to and from Wicken Fen and land within the Wicken Vision, particularly given the proposed height and scale of the development.

#### Comments on Amended Application (including further comments received on 8 Nov 2018)

192. The National Trust data used by the applicant is limited and does not provide a definitive forecast of future visitor numbers to Wicken Fen Vision area. The wider Wicken Fen Vision Area provides significant opportunities for wildlife and lies just 2km from the development site. A precautionary approach should be adopted to the Environmental Assessments and Habitats Regulations Assessment in relation to biodiversity impacts.
193. Monitoring of impacts should be undertaken in the future and further consideration given to the likely cumulative effects of the proposals in combination with adjacent development sites prior to determination. Concern is raised regarding insufficient strategic policy guidance available to ensure that the proposals make appropriate provision for green infrastructure, including a contribution towards off-site provision. The SPD provides a mechanism for addressing this concern.

### **Natural England**

#### Comments on Original Application

194. Whilst Natural England acknowledges that the developed has aspired to safeguard and enhance existing green infrastructure assets within the red-line boundary (including species-rich grassland, wetland and woodland habitat) we have concerns that there is likely to be a residual effect of recreational pressure upon several sites designated for their nature conservation importance after the applicant's mitigation measures have been applied. The unique attraction of these wetland sites, which cannot be replicated in the red-line boundary, is the principle reason for this. In recognition of this, and the need for the application to demonstrate a 'net gain' in biodiversity as required by the NPPF, we describe our understanding of the landscape scale context in which additional off-site biodiversity gain should be directed, and the partners with whom the developer should work to achieve. Further information is required from the developer in order to demonstrate that an appropriate and proportionate 'net gain' in biodiversity can be delivered by the proposed

development within a definable landscape scale context.

#### Comments on Amended Application

195. Determination of the application would be premature. As currently submitted, the application could have potential adverse effect on Wicken Fen SSSI and the Cam Washes SSSI. The following information is required:
- further consideration of recreational pressure impacts to Wicken Fen and the Vision Area
  - detailed assessment of the effects of increased recreational pressure on the sensitive breeding bird notified interest of the Cam Washes SSSI
  - identification of appropriate mitigation measures for the above
  - details to demonstrate foul drainage to serve the strategic site can be implemented without adverse impact to the natural environment, including designated sites.

#### Further comments received 8 November 2018

196. Whilst the additional information provided by the applicant is welcomed there remains an absence of robust evidence to demonstrate that there will not be a significant residual impact through increased recreation pressure to Wicken Fen SSSI, Ramsar Site, the Vision Area and Cam Washes SSSI. In accordance with the requirements of the Conservation (of Habitats and Species Regulations) 2017, as amended (the 'Habitats Regulation') and ecological best practice guidelines, this uncertainty must be addressed through application of the precautionary principle. Consequently adverse impacts should be assumed and mitigation secured to address this.

### **Network Rail**

#### Comments on Original Application

197. There are aspirations to relocate Waterbeach station which will better serve the residents of the wider allocation. In the meantime it is imperative that safe and suitable access can be achieved for all people and movements, which will be generated by the application. Having assessed the likely safety implications which would be likely to occur as a result of increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic on the level crossing in this location, Network Rail recommends that no rail network operator objection be raised subject to the following contributions being provided:

198. Upgrade of level crossing to full barrier object detection - £3,000,000.00  
Levelling and improvements to station access routes - £1,000,000.00

#### Comments on Amended Application

199. No longer requires £3m towards the upgraded level crossing at Waterbeach Station (as this will be delivered by Network Rail) but seeks £500k towards staffing of the level crossing in the interim. This figure assumes starting in mid 2021 and running for about a year and is based on similar cases in the area.

The cost of the additional level crossing security is based on 24/7 cover on a 2 man 8 hour shift. So 3 shifts a day. Plus the hire of welfare facilities

## **NHS England and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CCG**

### Comments on Original Application

200. The development will give rise to a need for additional primary healthcare provision to mitigate its impacts. A financial contribution of £3,785,133 is sought towards the capital cost of a new primary healthcare facility on the application site to serve the town of 10,000 dwellings. The phasing of this mitigation, including appropriate conditions and trigger points should be discussed and agreed with CCG and NHS England during the S106 drafting process.

### Comments on Amended Application

201. The development, together with the adjoining RLW application, would amount to 11,000 homes and require provision of 1,810m<sup>2</sup> of primary care services on the development site. NHS England is willing in principle to discuss colocation as part of a mixed use building. The total capital contribution required from both developments is £4,163,000.

### **Police Architectural Liaison Officer**

202. No comments received

## **RSPB**

### Comments on Original Application

203. Additional information is required to demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity and how coherent ecological networks can be achieved. Also concern that increases in recreational pressure arising from the development could be detrimental to sensitive nationally designated sites (Cam Washes, Upware North Pit and Wicken Fen), and this should be avoided. The RSPB agrees that the proposed site-wide ecological mitigation and management strategy and specific SPD would be appropriate means to set out approaches to address such measures.

204. Further surveys are required to fully assess potential impacts on protected species and habitats. The RSPB strongly encourages incorporation of integrated swift bricks into revised plans for biodiversity enhancements.

## **Smarter Cambridge Transport**

### Comments on Original Application

205. It is premature to determine the application before the Waterbeach New Town SPD has been adopted. The objectives for Connectivity and Transport set out on page 70 of the Design and Access Statement are supported, except the

concept of a 'primary spine' illustrated on page 132. Designing primary vehicle routes through the middle of the new town undermines the ambition to promote walking and cycling and reducing car dependency. The pattern of bus stops illustrated on page 139 cannot be served efficiently and has little practical relevance. The primary movement network should go around the northern perimeter of the development from the Business Park roundabout east to the railway line. All other routes through the new town and into the existing village should be secondary routes for motor vehicles, with priority clearly given to walking, cycling and public transport.

206. A single bus route from the Business Park, via the new station, and back to the A10 through Waterbeach village is more desirable than the multiple routes shown in the plans. The bus route should be an integral design feature from the outset and suggest discriminating between 'express' and 'local' stops.

## **Sport England**

### Comments on Original Application

207. Raises no objection which is considered to meet exception E4 of Sport England's adopted Playing Fields Policy and Planning Policy Objective 3, subject to conditions relating to the development of a sports facilities strategy, community use agreement, site survey and pitch implementation plan.

### Comments on Amended Application

208. No objection but there are concerns regarding the calculation for new provision of formal outdoor sport, as it appears to include the existing lake plus surrounding land and we would welcome further discussion on this issue. Conditions are recommended.

### Further comments (5 Sep 2018)

209. No objection given SCDC policy allows existing bodies of water to be included for formal sports. The reserved matters for the lake area should include details of the proposed enhancements necessary to facilitate both formal and informal sport.

## **Waterbeach Cycling Campaign**

### Comments on Original Application

210. The development of a new town north of Waterbeach is a fantastic opportunity to build on the strong culture of cycling in the region. The region is flat, the weather is mild and is becoming increasingly more densely populated. In these circumstances cycling provides an attractive alternative to travel by car if supported by adequate and well-designed infrastructure. However, the current proposals will fail to take advantage of this opportunity. Without a significant change to the approach this will have implications for many decades to come.

211. Those who benefit most from good cycling infrastructure are the young, poor and those with unhealthy lifestyles. Good cycling infrastructure can also be used by users of mobility scooters which see increasing use as the population ages. Wheelchair users will also benefit. The proliferation of electric bikes will see people travelling further by bike. Outside of the main residential areas horse-riders will also benefit from good road crossings and other infrastructure.
212. The developers and their transport consultants should be considering best practice in the design of infrastructure and copying proven examples such as those in the Netherlands. There is an opportunity for them to benefit from the kudos that would arise from creating a lasting legacy that would be a model for future developments. However, until substantive improvements are made to these proposals the Waterbeach Cycling Campaign will continue to object to them.

### Comments on Amended Application

213. Object to the application as the measures do not go far enough to encourage cycling and walking and put too much emphasis on driving. Object to the current piecemeal approach of different applications being submitted by U&C and RLW. The first phase of the project needs to be built closest to the village, as this will have maximum benefit for new and existing residents.
214. Broadly agree with many of the Strategic Principles set out in the Design and Access Statement but these do not go far enough to promote walking and cycling as the primary modes of transport. Guiding principles should ensure cycling and walking are always quicker than the car. The internal street network should be designed to have 'filtered permeability' with direct routes available for walking and cycling but not cars. Cycle routes should be segregated from footpaths to reduce conflict and schools should be located away from the primary street network with no car parking next to schools.
215. Broadly support cycling measures set out in Section 11 of the Transport Assessment. A10 cycle lane improvement needs to be lit at night and separation provided with the A10 to improve safety. Traffic calming, segregated cycle lanes and 20 mph speed limit are additional measures to be considered through the village. Further review of traffic calming needed throughout village and cycle priority measures. A safe segregated route to Horningsea should be built.
216. Support planning conditions to ensure that walking and cycle routes are prioritised in the new development.

### **Waterbeach District Bridleways Group**

#### Comments on Original/Amended Application

217. Objects on the basis that the proposal:
- obstructs ancient cross links along the causeway that historically were open to

- horse riders
- does not offer any access, routes or safe crossing points for horse riders
- includes green areas, roads and built areas that are prohibitive for horse riders
- lacks mention of horses or equestrian access

218. The proposals should address the above issues and provide multiuser routes and bypasses/bridges throughout.

## **Waterbeach Military Heritage Museum**

### Comments on Original/Amended Application

219. The Trustees of the Waterbeach Military Heritage Museum generally welcome the amendments /additional material submitted by U&C regarding its outline planning application for development at Waterbeach barracks. The specific commitment to providing built space for WMHM is welcome, and should be clearly stated in any planning permission in the S106. More specifically, it should be stipulated that the museum be permitted to continue in its current building adjacent to the Waterbeach village entrance to the barrack area because of the historic value and significance of this building.

## **Wildlife Trust**

### Comments on Original Application

220. It is premature for this application to be determined in the absence of an integrated and coordinated approach to the whole development site across both land ownerships. The SPD which will set out guiding principles for the whole of the Waterbeach development area must be agreed first. In addition, an assessment of whether this development delivers a net gain in biodiversity is still needed, which will require some additional information on a number of topics. If it is not possible to achieve a measurable net gain within the combined development area then provision must be made for off-site habitat creation and enhancement or the development will not be sustainable.

221. All County Wildlife Sites (CWSs) in the ES have been scoped out. However, Beach Ditch and Engine Drain CWS may be directly affected by transport improvements along the A10 and should not be scoped out. In addition the River Cam was not included in the list of CWSs and an assessment of likely impacts on this site is required.

### Comments on Amended Application

222. The Wildlife Trust is satisfied that the proposed development can deliver a net gain in biodiversity and welcome the additional Biodiversity Strategy Document. Cumulative impacts do need to be thoroughly addressed in cooperation with RLW and the SPD for Waterbeach should help with this. Further discussion is also required with Natural England and National Trust to determine appropriate mitigation measures.

223. Previous comments regarding the potential impacts on Beach Ditch and Engine Drain CWS (alongside the A10) from transport improvements still stand. The supplementary report on farmland birds concludes that only low numbers of farmland birds are present and many of these are on the golf course area, which will be retained and enhanced. Therefore there are unlikely to be many displaced pairs and it has been concluded that no further mitigation is needed. The Wildlife Trust would like to liaise with other consultees before coming to a conclusion on this. Overall, it would be premature to determine the application in the absence of the SPD.

### **Consultation - Third Party Representations**

224. During the first consultation period in early 2017 over 100 representations were received. The comments raised in these representations have been grouped under the following themes:

#### Transport – Highway Impacts

- a) Improvements to A10 need to be carried out before development otherwise it would lead to increased traffic and congestion
- b) Lack of belief people would use public transport and bicycles over cars
- c) The A10 transport assessment should factor in additional predictable traffic burden including developments that may deliver later than the proposed initial phases of the Waterbeach development
- d) Exit from the village via Clayhithe is unsuitable for a large increase in traffic volume
- e) Concern about increased traffic (rat-running) through surrounding villages
- f) The A10 should not be used as the "main entry/exit road" towards Cambridge/ Ely from the Waterbeach development. If the Waterbeach development consists of up to 6,500 houses then the developers should pay for an alternative road linking to Cambridge/ Ely/ A14.
- g) Increases in population in fenland towns will result in additional traffic travelling to Cambridge along the A10, which should be factored into A10 study
- h) Duelling the A10 will make little difference to the bottleneck of the A10/A14 junction
- i) The staggered crossroads at the Landbeach/Milton and Landbeach/Bollywood Spice junctions are dangerous and need improvement
- j) Lack of safe infrastructure provision for cyclists/pedestrians travelling north or south along A10 from Waterbeach
- k) Will there be some form of restricted access through Car Dyke Road and Denny End Road (presumably after the Pembroke Ave turn off, to allow traffic to the trading estate)? If so, what form will this restricted access take?
- l) There needs to be a direct vehicle link from the existing village to the new town facilities

#### Transport – Train Station

- a) Existing station could not support existing / proposed development. No

development should take place until the station is able to deal with longer trains and the service frequency has increased between 07.00 and 09.00 and between 15.30 and 18.30

- b) Relocation would deprive existing village of the train station
- c) Parking arrangements at the railway station is a major concern.
- d) Existing problem with commuters parking on street
- e) Increase in traffic, noise and pollution, through Waterbeach village to access station
- f) Congestion and possible gridlock on Station Road
- g) No phase can begin without longer trains at Waterbeach station
- h) Insufficient information in relation to exact timescales and facilities for providing effective and safe commuter facilities for rail users
- i) The Waterbeach to Kings Cross line is already at capacity and cannot be improved without major infrastructure changes
- j) Proposal should provide direct foot and cycle access alongside the railway to ensure journey times for existing village commuters are realistic
- k) No certainty that new station will be delivered. Needs to be tied to development via S106 agreement
- l) Where will extra car parking go for existing station in the interim?

#### Transport Assessment

- a) There is no clear assessment of traffic flow/parking issues within the existing road network in Waterbeach
- b) The safety and traffic requirements of the plan need clearer examination and more practical proposal relating to predicted traffic volume. It cannot be safely predicted that workers will prefer bicycles to cars; provision for bus transport is unclear.
- c) If the basis for the quality of housing has been derived from the figures put forward for traffic movement from U&C, this must be re-visited. Particularly the percentage for car share is totally fictitious and will not be achieved.
- d) Given that the traffic model developed by Peter Brett Associates LLP cannot determine the effects of traffic routing through alternative routes "for example any impacts of re-routing through the villages adjacent to the A10" (application section 9.3.71), what plans are in place to prevent traffic from the new development from turning off the A10, through Waterbeach and Horningsea?
- e) No matter what the transport assessment says about bus/rail/cycle use the main mode of transport from the development will be by car which predominantly will use the A10 to head south
- f) The TA is inconsistent with traffic increase through Horningsea up until 2031 being both 0% and 1%
- g) The data does not appear to reflect the current status on the ground regarding surrounding village roads when the A14 and B1047 are backed up
- h) Insufficient information to demonstrate feasibility of transport mitigation measures for Phase 1
- i) TA assumes most residents will travel to north Cambridge for employment; what about Addenbrookes Hospital? How will

infrastructure be improved for such journeys?

### Transport – Walking & Cycling

- a) The diagrams relating to the proposed cycleways are unclear and seem to cut across agricultural land
- b) Pressure on the Cam footpath/cyclepath via Bates Bite Lock is undesirable unless a metalled surface and separate pedestrian provision were provided
- c) Cycling infrastructure linking Waterbeach to Cambridge needs to be improved and to surrounding villages and along the River Cam
- d) Direct public rights of way (e.g. bridleways) should be sought from the site to Wicken Fen and westwards towards Cottenham, Rampton, Willingham and beyond.
- e) As Mere Way is a bridleway giving lawful rights to walkers, cyclists and horses, there is inherent danger to both the cyclist and horse rider caused by an unsuspecting horse and rider being alarmed by the sudden and silent overtaking of a cycle. Should provision of a segregated horse way be provided alongside that of the bridleway?
- f) Both Cock Fen Lane and Akeman Street should be regarded as single carriage with no designated passing places. These roads are used by cars, vans, agricultural tractors with implements attached, combined harvesters, heavy goods vehicles (including articulated) and coaches (accessing the Coach Park). Neither side of the road has a defined edge and each side is overgrown with long grass, brambles etc. so should a cycle way not be installed?
- g) The road surface in Akeman Street is higher than that of the adjoining ground with the surface water running off uncontrolled either side. The ditches either side have not been maintained and in particular the part running alongside my property which is non-existent and causes deep surface water to form on the lower grass verge and onto my ground.. I would expect that if any upgrading to the road the ditch be reinstated to join that further up
- h) Highways England have recommendations on cycle infrastructure design and as of yet the plans set out by U&C do not come anywhere close to these standards.
- i) There are two sports centres local to Waterbeach, Impington and Bottisham, at present there is no safe cycle route to either; this should be investigated to help ease traffic.
- j) The proposed changes to the 'cycle path' beside the A10 do not meet Highways Agency standards for a path next to a 50 mph road (sec. 6.5.13). As a minimum the path needs to be separated from the road by a verge.
- k) On 9 March 2017 the City Deal and County Council approved funding for Greenways feasibility studies. In particular, the feasibility of possible 'Greenway' from south Waterbeach to Milton Country Park should be examined.
- l) The proposal to create a new cycle way from Denny End Rd to Cottenham Rd in Landbeach is welcomed and should be committed to along with the proposed cycle way to Cottenham. However, the multiple (possibly 5) sets of crossings over the A10 will unnecessarily delay

cyclists/pedestrians. This is not a practical option. A far better option is the use of single-stage crossing as recommended by IAN 195/16 section 2.4.5 and that the crossing should be in a straight-line and not staggered, as recommended by section 2.4.8.

- m) The proposal to create a cycle way along the Mere Way east of Landbeach is welcomed and should be committed to. This provides a safe, traffic free, attractive route to north-west Cambridge. However, a safe crossing is required across the A10 at Bollywood Spice since this is the route most Waterbeach residents would take to Landbeach. A multiple toucan crossing here is not a suitable option.
- n) A proposal is required for how a cycle link between communities to the west of the river such as Lode and Bottisham and Waterbeach/new town could be achieved. The communities to the east of the river Cam should be able to make use of the facilities in the new town without having to take a 15 mile detour south via Fen Ditton to reach them.
- o) The village of Chittering which is part of Waterbeach Parish is only accessible by vehicle. There must be provision for a cycle way which links Chittering and Waterbeach as directly as possible.
- p) The Cambridge Research Park has suffered since its construction due to inaccessibility by any other method than vehicle. Provision for access to this by foot and cycle must be included in the plans with a sensible crossing over the A10 which encourages non-car use.
- q) Substantive proposals for changes to the existing village to prevent rat-running and encourage walking and cycling should be put forward for consultation by the villagers and funding for the agreed changes committed to by the developer.
- r) Alternative cycle routes between the new town and existing station should be considered. A route east of Waterbeach village to the station would provide an attractive route for residents of the new town. The same route could be used by Waterbeach villagers if the station is subsequently moved north.
- s) The primary school is shown as being on a main road in the new development. This will encourage driving to school rather than cycling/walking.
- t) No vehicle routes through the centre of the new development should be possible. Vehicles should be taken to a road on the circumference of the development to ensure cycle and walking on routes which are more direct, safer and quicker are therefore encouraged.
- u) Although no detail was provided in the plan the lakeside should be accessible by pedestrians and cyclists for its entire perimeter. It should not be blocked off by hotels/restaurants/apartments.
- v) Timing of infrastructure improvements - As much of the infrastructure outside the new town should be in place before the first occupation in order to encourage cycling and exploit the Cambridge cultural cycling phenomenon' referenced in sec 6.5.12 before habits of driving become ingrained.
- w) An off-road cycleway to Ely should have safe junctions and be smooth and well maintained
- x) Need for cycleway along B1047 to improve safety and Clayhithe bridge to be a single lane for vehicles controlled by traffic lights with access for

- a cycle path on the other lane
- y) Proposed cycle/foot path along the A10 is too narrow and should be further distanced from traffic. It also involves several junction crossings which are cumbersome and inefficient. These should be replaced with single-phase crossings

#### Transport – Bus

- At present buses are underused because traffic makes them very slow and unreliable. Better bus routes should therefore be considered
- Provision for bus transport is unclear
- Park and ride facilities are not effective in travel mitigation terms if there is a parking fee
- Transport arrangements should recognise the emergence of autonomous vehicles and automated pgs running at high speed on dedicated tracks
- Where would the Park & Ride facility be located? A dedicated busway would be a great idea if it provides a fast link to the city centre/bio-medical campus
- Concern of gating of Landbeach Road during peak periods to allow bus priority will deny residents access to Milton School and will affect local businesses, services, local character and residential amenity

#### Building Heights and Local Character

- a) Concern about 8 storey buildings and high-rise flats – too high for flat landscape, Ely Cathedral stands out which is less than 8 storeys
- b) Scale & design inappropriate for site and fenland landscape character
- c) Redevelopment of the built up area of the barracks is appropriate but not the green spaces around the runways which have never been developed before (questionable definition of brownfield site)
- d) The gap between the village and the development and the village which was prioritised at an earlier stage has been lost and has not been reinstated in the new design
- e) Four storey on edge not in-keeping with area and not appropriate around children's play park or at historic entrance to barracks. Happier if it was two storey
- f) Concern that the max height of buildings along the south boundary of the development is 4 stories. These could potentially overlook existing residents of Waterbeach. If they are commercial buildings this could lead to noise, smells and fumes
- g) Can SCDC stipulate a 2 storey buffer zone along the southern boundary?
- h) The UC OLP includes building heights of 30m in the central area of the site, tapering away to 2 storey heights on the N & E edges which bound the RLW Estates site. Until the RLW OLP has been revealed, we cannot know if the UC proposed building heights will blend with their submission. Similarly, much is made of the green views and corridors but these will only work if the RLW OLP takes account of them and continues with the theme.
- i) the proposed height of the buildings which will inhibit light and are totally out of keeping with the nature of the area - these will be seen for miles

- around and will ruin the landscape for the area.
- j) The scale and density of the proposed development. The number of dwellings is excessive. The way they are planned in a relatively small area compared to the overall site will overpower the surrounds. Suggest a garden village with larger plots and more sympathetic design
  - k) 30m high chimney stacks and large energy centres out of character with rural area

#### Density & Quantum

- a) Unsustainable quantum of development for this site, which is distinct to the major and growing areas of employment in east and south of Cambridge
- b) The density is incongruous in this location
- c) Area of development should be confined to existing buildings and to west near A10
- d) Long views are available from high ground (Stretham-Haddenham ridge to north, chalk hills to south and east and local fen views). Development will form dominant feature in many of these views, which are currently wide and almost entirely rural
- e) Runway park is narrow at southern end. Where will families in this area be able to enjoy the outdoors without having to travel by car?

#### Flooding & Drainage

- a) The development would create greater flooding of Waterbeach, the surrounding villages and possibly Cambridge
- b) Areas to the west of the Cambridge Research Park already floods
- c) The proposal will lead to a raising of the water table and increased flood risk
- d) Sewage seepage is already occurring in Bannold Road
- e) Concern that surface water from development will cause more consistent flooding to the locality including buildings
- f) The application does not have a valid foul drainage/waste plan. Foul sewerage discharge is currently a problem in Waterbeach.
- g) Environmental and visual impacts of a new sewerage plant

#### Green Spaces & Ecology

- a) Green spaces need to be secured and as much of the natural environment protected as possible. Inadequate green provision for size of development
- b) Concern of impact on wildlife given proximity of development to the river
- c) Bee orchids, crested newts, little owls and bats exist on the site – have these been given consideration?
- d) Waterbeach golf course and in the immediate surrounding area are inhabited by Adders. This development will have a significant effect on their habitat
- e) Please can the trees bordering the Cam Locks development be kept
- f) Trees must be protected during construction phase
- g) The developers should build biodiversity into designated green spaces and into every part of the development e.g. small ground-level holes in fences for hedgehogs

- h) Loss of trees around lakeside
- i) Please consider integrated swift boxes
- j) Harm to surrounding SSSIs
- k) Provision of green spaces is minimal given the likely population of the new town

#### Pollution

- Noise and air pollution affecting the development and arising from the development
- Schools should be located away from main roads to avoid air pollution
- Noise from trains
- Further detail required on emissions from proposed energy centres
- Odour issues from Amey plant
- What acoustic improvements on the bund and emissions monitoring are being planned?

#### Energy

- Should be much higher sustainable energy proposed eg solar panels and wind generation

#### Housing

- Council should push for maximum % of social affordable housing as renting is currently unaffordable within 20 miles of Cambridge
- Ought to be provision for housing older people 70+ - single level one & two bedroom houses with appropriate facilities
- Range of homes from social rent up to market purchase should be made available for whole community. Viability should not get in the way of affordable housing
- Need for less flats and more family homes

#### Healthcare

- GP Surgery must be constructed and in phase 1
- Concern regarding capacity of existing GP surgery
- Insufficient information on healthcare provision

#### Sports & Open Space

- Need to retain community use of swimming pool at barracks site
- The area of development should be confined to the existing buildings and to the west near to the A10. The rest of the site to the north and east should be excluded from buildings and open Space etc.
- It would be good if something recreational for the existing village could be placed at the southern border of the site so that there is easier access

#### Education

- Must factor in capacity and phasing. Schools should be built first
- Must ensure Waterbeach village are able to attend
- Secondary school must allow for extension for existing village & proposed RLW development.

- 3 primary schools seems low compared to the six in Cambourne
- Location of schools alongside main roads would support a secondary school for St Bede's with phased opening such that year 7 intake could start as soon as possible
- The development must provide enough land and school provision to provide capacity sufficient for Waterbeach Village.

#### Equestrian Access

- No provision / consideration for bridleways for existing equestrian community. Provision should be made for non-motorised routes within the submitted plans
- Protection and provision of safe access is a must to avoid the equine community losing rights to ride & enjoy countryside

#### Social Integration/Aspects

- a) Development will erode character and heritage of village due to scale and lack of distinction and separation
- b) Needs to be a form of boundary/separation between the town and the village. Need for green space separation with pedestrian and cycle routes to link the two
- c) Need to retain rural nature of area – need green spaces
- d) How is the existing community going to be connected south & north?
- e) Strong identity of Waterbeach – needs to be integrated. Potential loss of identity
- f) Need for recreational space for the existing village to the southern border of the site
- g) Need activities and facilities for the youth e.g. swimming pool
- h) Is there a place of worship planned or a pub?
- i) How will the future of the Garden of Remembrance near the runway be assured and safeguarded?

#### Employment

- The existing hangars should not be demolished and should be listed and re-used for commercial use
- Concern that services and businesses will migrate to town to the detriment of the village

#### Loss of Buildings

- Looking at the existing building marked for proposed demolition, It will be an opportunity missed or denied to establish some economic activity by offering this spaces and building for business venture to get employment to Waterbeach and the surrounding residents who will be most affected by the development.
- The iconic Hangars (Buildings 43 & 135 in the proposal) are an example where their demolition will take away the character that is Waterbeach. They should be listed to save them from disappearing and put to use by providing them for commercial use. If they are turned into commercial use sooner than later, they will add more value to the community and the developer from jobs created and revenue generated.

### Draft Local Plan Allocation

- a) Currently no precedent for residential development on barracks and airfield site. Does not make sense to make any decisions relating to suitability of the site until Local Plan Inspector has made her report
- b) Non compliance with the Local Plan: LP proposed 8,000-9,000 dwellings on the whole site. This application is for 6,500 dwellings while the RLW site is closer to the proposed new rail station where a higher proportion of dwellings would be more appropriate.
- c) The site was originally farmland and the majority of the site should be returned to that use. For a considerable number of years hay crops have been taken and in my view agriculture should continue to make use of the high quality of the land. The need to produce food from home grown crops can only increase
- d) Development outside the village would have a detrimental effect on Waterbeach. Some of its amenities would surely be taken away (see the station above). I therefore request that development in the manner proposed should be refused. I ask that common sense should return to the way we think and act as surely the majority of people regard the proposal as totally unsuitable even if the aim to produce more dwellings is understandable
- e) The site is not a brownfield site; most of the land is grassland. It is all agricultural land; some of the best and most versatile in the country

### Comprehensive Development

- Hard to comment on OPA in the absence of an understanding of RLW's plans
- SCDC needs to be mindful of the objectives and development intentions of Fenland DC and work symbiotically to ensure that Fenland and the future of the Fen Edge/Cambridge Edge has a joined up approach to development
- The two landowners should submit one application for the entire strategic site to ensure comprehensive development

### Other Issues

- Clarification needed on whether site is brownfield or greenfield land
- Currently not enough capacity to provide utilities such as water, gas or electricity without huge cost

## **Consultation - Third Party Representations – Response to Amendments and Further Information**

225. Over 20 general representations were received following consultation on the amendments/additional documents (including EIA) received on 16 May, 2 and 10 October 2018 and 27 March 2019. The comments received raised the following additional issues to those representations listed above:

- a) Greater provision of sporting facilities is required including Olympic standard swimming pool and floodlit full sized G4 football pitches
- b) Developer should work with the Community Land Trust East
- c) Need for safe access to Sunrise Business Park (currently accessed off A10)
- d) The replacement of full length barriers at the railway station will result in added queuing in peak hours. A better solution is to link Clayhithe Road to Long Drove
- e) Has the travel assessment included all population including staff, construction workers etc.
- f) Concern of level of affordable housing delivery and viability
- g) The additional landscape information does not give the true impact of the design/density of development
- h) The development will give existing villagers more facilities/amenities
- i) Concern of continued odours and flies from Amey site, new odours from new wastewater facility and breaches of Amey's permits
- j) Concern of capacity of existing cemetery
- k) The revised Parameter Plan does not reflect or conform with the adopted Waterbeach New Town SPD
- l) £10.5m is insufficient for community facilities including sports pitches, leisure centres, community centres, swimming pool, wooded area and sporting lake
- m) Lack of EIA cumulative impact assessment in relation to Amey waste incinerator
- n) Developer needs to do much more to build in green and truly sustainable energy solutions. Electric vehicles should be considered and low emission vehicles during construction to meet Euro 6 standards
- o) Concern of impact of access ransom issue on S106 infrastructure
- p) Concern of revised location of primary schools crossing primary transport routes and encouraging car trips to schools. Further clarity required on primary routes and public transport priority

The adjacent land promoter, **RLW Estates**, has raised concerns (dated 11 April 2019) regarding the determination of the application, which are summarised as follows:

- a) The 'first phase' infrastructure must not work against the principle of comprehensive delivery or impact adversely on the rate of delivery across the

site

b) The principle of 'monitor and manage' to infrastructure is only acceptable if there is a clear framework for its provision that is consistent with, and not in conflict with, the detailed provisions of Policy SS/6

c) The principle of 'monitor and manage' cannot be acceptable if, beyond the first 1600 dwellings, there is an identified and unresolved constraint which would render the residual 4,900 dwellings undeliverable.

d) The proposed rail package for improvements to the existing Waterbeach Station has no certainty on scope, cost and compatibility with other rail industry objectives

e) There is no provision included in the 1600 home Key Phase 1 for the east-west link relocated station link road

f) The applicant's financial viability assessment needs to be made publicly available, as well as the draft S106 agreement to ensure consistency between the two active outline applications and delivery of comprehensive sustainable development.

The following suggestions are made to address this concern:

- The redefinition of the initial infrastructure package to include an access road across the land ownership boundary subject to a cost sharing arrangement between the two landowners but free of ransom value positions, enforceable by planning condition
- The inclusion of the station relocation as a committed development and the deletion of measures to improve the existing station
- The reformulation of the 1600 dwellings scenario to a more realistic timeframe
- In order for the policy requirement for sustainable development to be achieved any available A10 headroom capacity should be allocated evenly, not only across the whole site, but also in respect of phasing timescales
- A series of negative obligations/conditions preventing development of the U&C site beyond a certain quantum to ensure necessary vehicular, pedestrian and cycle routes across the landholding boundary are secured in a manner that does not disadvantage either development.
- Step-in provisions to enable RLW to construct an access road on U&C land if RLW's development programme is ahead of U&C's with provisions to enable RLW to recover a fair proportion of its construction costs from DIO
- A legal requirement upon U&C to make access to necessary infrastructure available without any premium

## Planning Assessment

226. The key issues to consider in the determination of this application are:

	<b>Planning Assessment – Key Issues</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Principle of development</b> Policy background	<b>60</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Land Use and Parameters</b> Amount Movement Land Uses Landscape Approach Height Density Phasing Conclusion	<b>62</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Access and Transport</b> Ely to Cambridge Transport Study and Waterbeach New Town SPD Applicant’s Transport Strategy Combined Transport Strategies of DIO/U&C and RLW Relocated Railway Station and Link Road Existing Station Improvements Site Access – Construction and Post-Construction Framework Travel Plan and Low Emissions Strategy Parking Other Transport Matters Conclusion	<b>72</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Economic Impacts</b> Employment Town Centre Assessment Conclusion	<b>85</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Housing delivery</b> Quantum, Density and Mix Affordable Housing Affordable Housing Review Mechanism Accessible Housing and Internal Space Standards Community-led Housing Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Self and Custom Build Conclusion	<b>87</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Social and Community Infrastructure</b> Education	<b>93</b>

	Community Meeting Places Health Facilities Libraries Open Space, Productive Space, Children’s Play Space and Sports Facilities Commercial Facilities Important to Community Life Provision for Faith Groups Provision for Burials Community Development Workers and Early Development Collaborative Support Public Art Waterbeach Museum and Memorial Garden Governance Other Community Issues – Crime and Emergency Services Conclusion	
<b>7</b>	<b>Environmental Considerations</b> Air Quality, Dust and Odour Archaeology and Heritage Biodiversity Contamination and Unexploded Ordnance Drainage and Flood Risk Health Impact Assessment Landscape, Trees and Lighting Minerals Noise and Vibration Sustainable Construction and Design (Built Design, Energy, Overheating, Recycling and Waste, Water) Utilities (Digital Infrastructure, Electricity, Gas, Heat Importation, Potable Water)	<b>102</b>

## 1. Principle of Development

### Policy Background

227. The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan plays a key role in establishing how many jobs and homes are required to meet the objectively assessed needs of the district for the period to 2031. It is important to provide for appropriate levels of employment so the Cambridge area can continue to develop as part of the home of one of the largest clusters of research and development activity in Europe, with housing provided in the right locations to support the local economy and provide for housing needs. It must do this whilst maintaining the quality of life for residents in existing and new communities, as well as maintaining the quality of the natural and built environment. It must also continue to provide an attractive rural hinterland and setting for the historic city of Cambridge, with those parts closer to Cambridge being protected by the Cambridge Green Belt.

228. Overall, the Local Plan identifies the need for 19,500 new homes in the district by 2031. The strategy for addressing this need involves three strategic scale allocations as follows:
- a) A new town north of Waterbeach (approx. 8000-9000 homes)
  - b) A new village based on Bourn Airfield (3500 homes)
  - c) A major expansion of Cambourne (1200 homes)
229. The new town north of Waterbeach will play a key role in sustaining housing and economic growth in the area during the current Local Plan period and beyond. Policy SS/6 of the Local Plan goes on to state that the final number of dwellings at the new town will be determined through a design-led approach and spatial framework diagram included in the now adopted Waterbeach New Town SPD. The key objectives for the new town Policy SS/6 include:
- a) Creation of a sustainable and vibrant new community with its own distinctive local identity but also drawing on the traditions of fen-edge market towns
  - b) Maintain the identity of Waterbeach as a village close to but separate from the new town with appropriate integration of suitable links
  - c) Deliver an example of excellence in sustainable development and healthier living including high quality public transport links to Cambridge, a relocated railway station and high modal share of travel by means other than the car
  - d) Design of the northern edge of the new town to have an appropriate relationship with Denny Abbey listed building and scheduled monument
  - e) Establish an appropriate relationship and interaction with Waterbeach village and Cambridge Research Park
  - f) Appropriate phasing and a mix of uses
  - g) Measures to address landscape, townscape and setting of heritage assets in the surrounding area, and deliver a high quality new development
  - h) Delivery of a significant network of green infrastructure
  - i) Significant improvements in public transport
  - j) Measures to promote cycling and walking from the start of development
  - k) Highway improvements including access onto the A10, additional capacity to meet the forecast road traffic generation of the new town and measures to mitigate traffic on surrounding villages
  - l) Seek opportunities to exceed sustainable design and construction
  - m) Meet infrastructure requirements including arrangements for foul and surface

water disposal

- n) Measures to assist community development
  - o) Site wide investigation and assessment of land contamination and other issues resulting from former land uses to ensure the land is suitable for the proposed end use
  - p) Be in accordance with the spatial framework diagram set out in the SPD to ensure comprehensive development of the site as a whole, and establishing suitable mechanisms to deliver the infrastructure in a timely and efficient way
  - q) Make satisfactory arrangements to ensure appropriate engagement and consultation with local people and stakeholders
230. In summary, the vision for the new town, as set out in the adopted SPD (Section 3), is for an innovative, forward looking, sustainable and healthy new town set within a rich landscape setting. The aspiration is for a place that is:-
- Independent
  - Distinctive
  - Well connected
  - Healthy and safe
  - Vibrant
  - Attractive and modern
  - Inclusive
  - Sustainable and resilient
  - Prosperous
231. The adopted SPD sets out further guidance and detail on the implementation of Policy SS/6 and will be discussed throughout this report and in the assessment of the application.

## **2. Amount, Land Use and Parameters**

### Amount

232. Local plan policy SS/6 allocates the site for development of approximately 8,000 – 9,000 dwellings, but also states that the final number of dwellings will be determined through a design-led approach. The two outline planning applications for the site propose a cumulative 11,000 dwellings. Concern has been expressed that the number of dwellings is significantly greater than the figure established in the policy.
233. Whilst this first application for 6,500 homes falls within the allocated quantum of dwellings set out in Policy SS/6 further assessment of all its parameters (and implications thereof) is required to determine whether the proposal meets the objectives of Policy SS/6 and sustainable development, as defined in national policy. The number of dwellings to be delivered on the adjacent land will be subject to separate assessment, including cumulative impact testing, in outline

application (S/2075/18/OL).

234. In addition to 6,500 homes, the submitted Development Specification (revised May 2018) includes a range of commercial, community and employment uses. The Local Plan identifies a target of 22,000 additional jobs for South Cambridgeshire between 2011 and 2031. Waterbeach New Town is included as an employment location to support the additional job targets, although it is recognised that the new town will not be self sufficient in jobs, given the location of the existing research park and close proximity of Cambridge. The SPD advises that the New Town will provide a significant amount of employment land, including an appropriate mix of offices, light industrial and research and development. These will be in appropriate locations focused upon the new town centre, the rail station district and other local centres. The proposed scheme includes up to 16,500m<sup>2</sup> of retail uses (A1-A5 use), 15,000m<sup>2</sup> of B1 employment uses to meet this objective and the accompanying strategies for employment, economic development and town centre development are assessed later on in this report.
235. The proposed development also includes land for education and up to 9000m<sup>2</sup> of community uses (D1 Use), 7000m<sup>2</sup> of health, fitness, cultural and recreation uses (D2 use), 4000m<sup>2</sup> of hotel accommodation and open space, landscaping, access roads associated infrastructure. This mix of uses is considered to positively contribute to Policy SS/6 objectives of achieving a range of uses appropriate to the new town and supporting a sustainable and vibrant new community.

### Movement

236. Policy SS/6 requires the new town to be founded on a comprehensive movement network, connecting key locations including the town centre and the railway station to encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel. SS/6 also includes the requirement for significant improvements to public transport, measures to promote cycling and walking, and off site highway improvements. The fundamental principle, as set out in Guiding Principle 1 of SPD is to prioritise sustainable movement across the new town, making such modes more convenient than car travel.
237. The proposal, as demonstrated on the revised Parameter Plan (1330 GA 010002 Rev 17), provides primary road access to the neighbouring RLW site in two key locations. These connections would link to the northern and southern roundabout access points on the A10. The southern access point would be the most direct connection to the railway station for users from outside the new town. The revised Parameter Plan includes changes to comply with the spatial framework of the new town SPD with primary routes positioned out towards the perimeter of the new town to facilitate a more cycle/pedestrian friendly centre.
238. Section 5.1 of the Design and Access Statement Supplement sets out the approach to movement and circulation within the site, drawing on the Framework Travel plan and Transport Assessment. The proposed design approach incorporates the following broad measures to reduce private car trips

and promote sustainable travel modes:

- a) location of local facilities and primary schools on main public transport routes
- b) walkable neighbourhoods with all homes within 400m walking distance of a bus stop, primary school or a defined centre
- c) concentration of highest density of residential development closest to on-site public transport routes
- d) movement framework that reduces walk cycle journey times and discourages short trip vehicle use (for example, more direct pedestrian and cycle routes compared to more circuitous and inconvenient vehicular routes)
- e) defined and clear crossings to ensure safe movement for pedestrians and cyclists
- f) provision of on-road and off-road cycle routes to promote leisure activities and safe routes for children travelling within neighbourhoods and to school
- g) measures to reduce car speeds within the site

239. This design approach, together with the indicative movement network shown in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) Supplement, demonstrates prioritisation of sustainable movement across the new town and is further enhanced by proposed measures to secure immediate off-site connections including:

- a new toucan crossing at the Cambridge Research Park to provide a safe crossing point for cyclists and pedestrians;
- a foot/cycle bridge across the A10 near Denny End Road connecting to Landbeach and the proposed Mere Way cycleway;
- causeway link to the northern boundary to facilitate connection to Denny Abbey for cyclists and pedestrians
- cycle/pedestrian connections to the adjacent RLW site; and
- commitment to fund improvements for cyclists and pedestrian movement through Waterbeach.

240. Notwithstanding the above, section 5.2 'Movement and Place' of Waterbeach New Town SPD requires development proposals to create a network of routes suitable for all non motorised users including horse riders across the site. There is very little reference to equestrian access and routes within the DAS Supplement, particularly section 5.1 'Movement Framework', as noted by the British Horse Society and Waterbeach District Bridleways Group. The provision of green corridors and a high quality network of pedestrian and cycle routes is promoted within the DAS Supplement and there is opportunity at detailed design stage to include provision within this network for equestrian users. This can be addressed at design code stage and therefore a condition is recommended to ensure that the submission of design codes includes measures to secure equestrian access and multi-user routes through the site. Further

detailed consideration of transport and highway impacts are considered later on in this report (Section 3 'Access and Transport') but overall, subject to conditions, the proposed movement network is considered to accord with the objectives of Policy SS/6 and the new town SPD.

### Land uses

241. Policy SS/6 requires all built development to be provided within the Major Development Site. Land outside the Major Development Site can provide other associated uses and mitigation including drainage, habitat compensation and informal open space (SS/6[7]). Strategic landscaping within and beyond the Major Development Site will deliver high quality environs and provide an appropriate screening of the town in views from Denny Abbey in order to protect the historic significance of the Abbey. The Spatial Framework Diagram in the SPD establishes the broad structure for development of the new town and the disposition of key uses, consistent with the Local Plan policy requirements, particularly in regard to the policy requirement to contain built development south of the Major Development Site boundary. This framework plan incorporates a number of structuring elements and fixes. It is however an indicative diagram, so the alignment of the routes and the precise locations of buildings are to be determined through the planning application process.
242. The submitted amended Parameter Plan accords with the locations of the town centre and the lakeside local centre set out in the new town SPD. These two centres act as community hubs and focal points for their areas, and are located at key points in the movement network. The town centre would be the location for the main retail and commercial use and the lakeside centre will have complementary uses. This will be facilitated through a town centre strategy to be agreed by planning condition (see recommended condition no.11), but further measures are included in the DAS Supplement (Spatial Principles SP19 and 20). These spatial principles direct the majority of retail, services, employment, community and civic uses to the town centre and guide the size of single commercial outlets (A1-A5 use) to no more than 4000m<sup>2</sup> in the town centre and no more in total than 2000m<sup>2</sup> of commercial (A1-A5 use) and 4000m<sup>2</sup> of employment (B1) use in any other centre to respect the establishment of the town centre as a key focus for commercial and community activity. This objective is complemented by the position of the secondary school next to the town centre.
243. Where appropriate, local centres are co-located with a primary school and adjoin public open/play space to support informal gathering in accordance with Guiding Principle 1 of the new town SPD. The location of one of the primary schools differs from the spatial framework of the new town SPD, as it is located further north towards the end of the runway park. However, this location would facilitate co-location of school activities with adjoining public open space and sports facilities, and ensure that all homes would be within 400m walking distance of a bus stop, primary school or a defined centre (Spatial Principle 4 of the DAS Supplement). On this basis the proposed alternative location of primary school 2 is considered acceptable with regards to the objectives of Policy SS/6 and new town SPD. Assessment of landscaping and open space is

given in the section below ('Landscape Approach').

### Landscape Approach

244. The new town SPD advises that development proposals should draw on the exceptional historical landscape context of the site, including retention, enhancement and incorporation of the following features:
- a) Soldier's Hill earthworks
  - b) Grid structure of Waterbeach Barracks
  - c) Waterbeach Barracks Watertower (subject to structural survey)
  - d) Waterbeach Barracks Watchtower
  - e) Memorial Garden
  - f) Denny Causeway
  - g) Winfold Greenway
  - h) Runway Park
  - i) Car Dyke
245. In terms of edge treatments, the SPD advises that the application site should include: a strategic landscape to the north; an open space to the south west boundary; retention and enhancement of the existing trees and open space entrance to the barracks; retention of the western boundary bund with additional planting; and a cohesive design between the two land ownerships to the east of the application site.
246. The submitted DAS Supplement, Green Infrastructure Strategy Addendum and revised Parameter Plan specify the applicant's proposals for strategic landscaping within the site, which include the following main components:
- Northern park
  - South-West park
  - Runway park
  - Winfold Common (existing golf course and snake pit)
  - Western boundary bund and planting
  - Lake and surrounding open space
  - Existing Woodland Blocks
247. The proposal includes approximately 35.7ha of combined parks and gardens that contribute towards the Council's open space standards set out in Policy SC/7. The majority of these areas comprise existing landscaping, which can be retained and/or enhanced, as shown on the revised Parameter Plan and reinforced through Design Principles 17, 18 and 19 of the DAS.
248. The Northern Park plays an important role in respecting the setting of Denny Abbey and is supported by Historic England following the submitted amendment to the northern built development boundary. This area would vary in width from 100-350m with its widest point alongside the causeway leading to Denny Abbey. Spatial Principle 14 in the DAS confirms that tree planting would be implemented north of the built development line to filter and soften views of the development to and from Denny Abbey. This would include parkland planting

rather than a linear belt to be implemented in the first planting season after works commence on the site (ES Addendum, Chapter 5). The Northern Park also includes proposals for grassland habitat/meadow, playfields and surface water attenuation ponds and ditches.

249. The proposed Runway Park would preserve the long distance views out towards the Fens and would connect to the Northern Park to integrate green infrastructure within the site. Large, grassland areas would be retained and public recreation managed within these areas to protect biodiversity.
250. Winfold Common would provide a Great Crested Newt corridor. Ponds already exist in this area, as well as grassland meadow and mature trees. These features would be retained and enhanced to create an informal parkland area, rich in biodiversity and open to the public.
251. The South-West Park forms a key element of sporting, amenity and play space close to Waterbeach village with cycle and pedestrian links through. This open space would vary in width between 50-300m with grassland linking to the western boundary. The western boundary would include existing/enhanced grasslands, waterways, trees and bunding to create a wildlife corridor approximately 70m in width. This landscape would provide a soft edge to the development and facilitate a much needed landscaped buffer between the proposed development and the A10. Further tree planting is required within this buffer area, notably along the south-western boundary to mitigate the visual impact of the development. The exact details of this tree planting can be secured at a later detailed design stage.
252. The existing main lake on the site is proposed to be retained to be publicly accessible for informal and formal recreation (as per Spatial Principle 9 set out in the DAS). The amended proposals include retention of an area of woodland to the west of the lake, in which no built development would occur. This lies within a larger woodland block where some low-density development can be accommodated as shown on the amended Parameter Plan.
253. Spatial Principle 9 in the DAS supplement along with the revised Parameter Plan demonstrate that existing woodland blocks on the site would be managed and restored to allow safe public use, to include play and recreation opportunities and sustainable drainage. New trees would be planted to ensure that there is no overall loss in canopy cover on the site (the target is to achieve a net gain).
254. Overall, the proposals conform to the principles of the SPD of maintaining the exceptional historical landscape context of the site through retention, enhancement and incorporation of key features such as the northern open space buffer to Denny Abbey, the central lake, woodland blocks, grasslands and wetland areas. Edge treatments also accord with the principles of the SPD with regard to the RLW site and the need for comprehensive development.

## Height

255. Policy SS/6 states that creation of a new town in this location is to be of high quality development responding to local character, but also with its own identity. It will be founded on best practice urban design principles, drawing on the traditions of fen-edge market towns, which encourages the high quality traditions and innovation that are characteristic of the Cambridge Sub-Region.
256. Several representations in the application raise concern with the extent of height and massing in the proposed development and the potential harm this will have on the fenland landscape and local character.
257. The SPD (p.70) advises the proposal is for a new town, not a village, and must therefore create denser urban character in appropriate locations, such as at the station district, the town centre and the lakeside. This denser urban character is not just achieved by having all the buildings closer together. It is also achieved by increasing the storey heights of buildings in appropriate locations. Adding variety in density and height to the townscape in such a way helps to create the idea of what makes a town.
258. The SPD then goes on to draw useful comparisons with the new town at Northstowe, approximately 6 miles to the west of the application site. The town centre at Northstowe will be mainly 4-5 storeys to ridge height with some 6 storey elements and with a limited number of lower 3 storey elements to add variety. This is useful guidance to follow for the new town at Waterbeach and, as such, the appropriate scale in higher density locations can be up to 6 storeys as shown in Figure 30 (p.71) of the SPD ('Indicative density and storey heights'). The SPD advises that to enable further articulation of the wider townscape, particularly in the town centre and station quarter, the opportunity exists for a limited number of fine grained towers 'popping up' above the rest of the townscape, which could have a similar impact upon the townscape as towers have in older towns, such as Ely and Stamford.
259. The DAS Supplement and amended Parameter Plan show design intent to position taller buildings in relation to specific settings where such scale can be justified for placemaking and orientation such as the two centres and key movement corridors. The submitted 'heat map' of the DAS Supplement (p.45) shows predominant two-three storey heights in order to achieve the proposed quantum of development. It demonstrates how proposed taller development heights would compare to existing buildings and mature trees on the site. For example, the potential maximum 6 storey building height shown on the amended Parameter Plan would match the height of the existing water tower on site at 24m and would be comparable in height to the existing woodland blocks near the lake and runway.
260. Exceptional spot heights of 8 storey development are included on the amended Parameter Plan to provide key landmark buildings within the town and create identity/character. These taller buildings would be at a suitable distance away from Waterbeach village to create distinction to the new town whilst the lower, two storey building heights at the southern end of the site would be sympathetic to the adjoining village character. Notwithstanding this, there is an element of 4 storey height proposed to the north of the village cemetery, which is not

supported by the local parish council.

261. The new town SPD (p.71) indicates 2-3 storey buildings to the southern end of the site but is guidance only and therefore the scheme must be assessed on its individual merits. The proposal aims to create a transition in heights and densities from the barracks/village entrance towards the proposed town centre area, which is a principle supported by the new town SPD (see p.70-71). The proposed 4 storey height in this location would represent a maximum storey height and there is opportunity for height in this area to positively respond to the surrounding character whilst marking the transition to the new town. However, this will require sensitive treatment given the proximity of the cemetery and presence of existing mature trees along the intervening boundary. The final design response will therefore be subject to further assessment through the design code process to be secured by condition at Key Phase stage.
262. Heights of up to a maximum of 4 storeys are shown on the amended Parameter Plan to the eastern boundary adjoining RLW's outline application (S/2075/18/OL). These taller heights would allow scope for higher densities around the town centre and primary east-west route connections through the strategic site. Lower, 2 storey heights are shown on the same boundary to the northern and southern extents with respect to the setting of Denny Abbey and the existing village.

### Density

263. The objective of Local Plan Policy H/8 is that new settlements should have higher densities compared to rural villages and aim for 40 dwellings per hectare (dph). This is to make the most of land in sustainable locations. It goes on to state that local character, the scale of development, and other circumstances can justify development at lower and higher densities than 40 dph (net).
264. The new town SPD (p.71) gives indication of where higher and lower densities should be located at the site. Generally, it advocates higher densities around the town centre, the station district and the lakeside area. The proposed development provides an overall residential density of 45 dph, which is marginally above Policy H/8. The majority of the site would have densities ranging from between 35 and 60 dph with a maximum of 100dph at the lakeside and principal centre and 25dph (or less) at the northern edge nearest Denny Abbey and southern edge nearest Waterbeach village. The lower densities are sympathetic to the setting of Denny Abbey and the existing character of Waterbeach village, whilst the higher densities would support vibrant centres and activate key movement corridors throughout the development.

### Phasing

#### a) General approach

265. The applicant proposes a 'three tier' approval process which will follow the outline application and be informed by its planning conditions. The first tier approval involves submission and agreement of any site-wide strategies. A

second tier approval then requires the applicant to define, justify and detail the next Key Phase area of the site to be developed (including design coding, transport assessment and viability review etc.). Reserved matters submissions can then be submitted at the final, third tier approval stage.

266. A framework is therefore proposed to be created through planning conditions to allow the site to be developed in a series of 'Key Phases' (see recommended conditions 9 and 10). The Council would need to agree the location, boundary, uses and quantum of development for each Key Phase, which would trigger S106 obligations and give rise to reserved matters applications. The Council would also need to agree the following in each Key Phase submission:

- Key Phase Definition Plan and Supporting Statement
- Schedule of Uses and Quantum of Development
- Progress Statement
- Key Phase Transport Assessment
- Key Phase Travel Plan
- Key Phase Delivery Plan including: Reserved Matters development sequence; housing delivery statement including an affordable housing delivery statement;; a school and childcare facilities delivery programme; an open space delivery programme; sports and community facilities delivery programme (including youth facilities and children's play); approach to delivery of public art and heritage measures, construction and skills plan including employment uses, faith space opportunities, infrastructure and services plan and a transport mitigation delivery programme
- Arboricultural Statement
- Design Code and Regulatory Plan
- Construction and Environmental Management Plan Supplement
- Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation
- Land Investigation and Remediation Scheme
- Surface Water Drainage Strategy
- Foul Water Drainage Strategy
- Details of Existing and Proposed Site Levels and Land Profiling
- Sustainability Statement
- Ecological Management Plan

267. The above framework would facilitate planned infrastructure and comprehensive development at each phase of the development in accordance with Policy SS/6(16). Each Key Phase would represent a second tier of planning approval that would enable outline application strategies to be updated and refined to reflect best practice and new technologies throughout the planning of the new town. It would also allow further consultation and engagement with local people and stakeholders at important stages in the planning process.

#### b) Early Phase

268. The new town SPD (section 6.4) advises that, unless agreed otherwise, the development should first take place in a location or locations that is/are

accessible from the A10 and the new primary route. Other early and subsequent phases of development must provide sustainable movement options and supportive connections with Waterbeach Village. The infrastructure which will be required upfront and/or within the first/early phase(s) of development (as set out above) will be allied to the options for how the development should be phased.

269. The revised Early Delivery Plan (1330 GA 010003 Rev 02) is submitted for approval and includes both the barracks refurbishment and re-use area and Key Phase 1 area. The barracks refurbishment and re-use relates to the ongoing incremental re-use of existing buildings within the barracks, being progressed through refurbishment and change of use. In the longer term, the applicant is minded to retain existing buildings where it is practical, economic and compatible with new development.
270. Key Phase 1 adjoins the barracks refurbishment and re-use area and continues north east to the include land north of the lake and access to the A10 Cambridge Research Park roundabout. The extent of this area has been amended in response to concerns raised during the public consultation that it should be more integrated with the existing village and less isolated. The amended Key Phase 1, when combined with the barracks area provides integration between the village and lake and allows for significant infrastructure to be delivered to serve the first 1600 residential units and a hotel, including:
- A primary school
  - Community centre hub (including commercial, employment, retail, sports, leisure and health uses)
  - Lakeside access and facilities
  - Temporary Park & Ride facility
  - Pedestrian/cycle links between the village and Cambridge Research Park
  - Continued and enhanced use of barracks facilities
271. The amendments conform to the indicative first phase of development set out in the SPD (Figure 34) and the aforementioned objectives set out in section 6.4 'Development Phasing' to provide sustainable movement options and supportive connections with Waterbeach Village. Key Phase 1 also facilities key infrastructure, which is needed to meet the early needs of the new town.

### Conclusion

272. The proposed quantum and mix of uses is considered to positively contribute to Policy SS/6 objectives of achieving a range of uses appropriate to the new town and supporting a sustainable and vibrant new community. Movement within the site is founded on comprehensive development and prioritisation of sustainable travel, although further consideration will be required at design code stage towards all non-motorised modes (including equestrian).
273. Overall, the proposals conform to the principles of the SPD of maintaining the exceptional historical landscape context of the site and providing comprehensive development across the strategic site. Whilst concern has been

raised in relation to height and density, the proposals are considered to align with Policy SS/6's objective of creating a new town of high quality development responding to local character whilst also having its own identity (as guided by the new town SPD). Subject to conditions, there are sufficient safeguards to ensure commitments set out within the DAS supplement will be followed through at design code stage.

274. The amended early phase proposals are considered to address concerns raised in relation to integration of existing and new communities and conform to the indicative first phase of development set out in the SPD. Early phase measures also support sustainable movement options, connections with Waterbeach Village and key infrastructure, services and facilities to meet the early needs of the new town. A further framework of key phase approvals will ensure planned infrastructure is agreed in advance of reserved matters applications and opportunities for new technologies and sustainability measures are integrated over time to demonstrate excellence in sustainable development (Policy SS/6[4]).

### **3. Access and Transport**

275. Local Plan Policy SS/6 requires a comprehensive movement network for the new town, that connects key locations including the town centre and relocated railway station to encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel, and includes:

a) Significant improvements in public transport, including:

- i) Relocation of Waterbeach railway station with appropriate access arrangements by all modes to serve the village and the new town
- ii) Provision of a Park and Ride site on the A10 to intercept traffic from the north of Waterbeach, served by a new segregated bus link to Cambridge;

b) Measures to promote cycling and walking, from the start of the development including:

- i. Provision of a network of attractive, direct, safe and convenient walking and cycling routes linking homes to public transport and the main areas of activity such as the town centre, schools and employment areas;
- ii. Provision of direct, segregated high quality pedestrian and cycle links to north Cambridge, surrounding villages and nearby existing facilities such as Cambridge Research Park;
- iii. A Smarter Choices package including residential, school and workplace travel planning.

c) Highway Improvements, including:

- i. Primary road access from the A10;
- ii. Additional capacity to meet the forecast road traffic generation of the new town, particularly on the A10 and at the junction with the A14;
- iii. Measures to mitigate the traffic impact of the new town on surrounding villages

including Waterbeach, Landbeach, Horningseas, Fen Ditton and Milton;  
iv. A review of the access arrangements to Denny Abbey and the Farmland Museum.

276. The new town must also plan for essential services, facilities and infrastructure to be provided in a comprehensive manner, anticipating future needs, and establishing suitable mechanisms to deliver the infrastructure in a timely and efficient way to achieve the successful delivery of the new town, including the needs of individual phases, and the requirements on developers (SS/6 [16c]).

#### Ely to Cambridge Transport Study and New Town SPD

277. The Ely to Cambridge Transport Study (the A10 study) is a wide-ranging multi modal study which has made recommendations on the transport schemes needed to accommodate the major development planned at Waterbeach New Town. Strand 2 of this report recommends contributions will be required towards a package of appropriate, deliverable measures to mitigate the impact of developments on existing roads. Strand 2 lists the following potential interventions:

- a. New or improved walking and cycling routes (e.g between Ely, Waterbeach and Cambridge)
- b. A new segregated busway (between Waterbeach and Cambridge)
- c. A relocated railway station
- d. Dualling of the A10 between the proposed southern access to the new town and the Milton interchange

278. The report also reviews the predicted impact of the proposed interventions on development travel behaviour and the performance of the surrounding road network, and suggests that the greatest benefits for the development are seen in the upgrading of the A10 and the Milton interchange, helping to reduce pressure on the A10 and on parallel routes. In order to mitigate the impact upon the A10, the development must achieve a significant modal shift towards public transport and active travel. This can be achieved through the combination of innovative Travel Plan measures and direct infrastructure provision, which the new town SPD (89-90) suggests could include the following:

- a) Active Travel Improvements
  - i. A new cycling route via Landbeach, utilising Green End and Mere Way
  - ii. Improvements to the existing off road walkway/cycleway adjacent to the A10, and improved crossings
  - iii. New cross connections between the two routes described above and connecting to Cottenham
  - iv. A new cycleway adjacent to the rail corridor between Waterbeach and Cambridge
  - v. Improvements to the existing National Cycle Route between the existing Waterbeach Rail Station and Cambridge
  - vi. Greenways connecting the railway station to surrounding key destinations, facilitating multi-modal trips.

- b) Public Transport Improvements

- Provision of a new segregated busway between Waterbeach New Town and Cambridge, allowing improved and more reliable journey times. Potential provision of Park and Ride facility adjacent to the A10

#### c) Rail Improvements

Relocation of the railway station to Waterbeach New Town, to serve the enlarged catchment population and improve accessibility. Potential for a transport hub, with integration between rail, bus, walking and cycling, and potentially including park and ride facilities.

#### d) Highway Improvements

Strategic highway improvements that could include on or off line dualling of the A10 corridor, and upgrades to the junctions on the corridor including Milton Interchange. Local highway improvements to mitigate development impacts at all points where capacity challenges are identified. Traffic calming and measures to discourage through-traffic in local villages.

279. The SPD (p.91) goes on to advise that development proposals must be accompanied by the submission of a full Transport Assessment that assesses the cumulative development impact of the entire site, regardless of land ownership. A S106 agreement will be used to set out financial contributions/ measures required to mitigate impact on the surrounding highway network.

#### Applicant's Transport Strategy

280. The applicant has submitted a revised Transport Assessment (TA) in response to the publication of the A10 Study and consultation responses received in the application. The revised TA accounts for the full Waterbeach allocation in the Local Plan and committed developments up until 2031, including housing, jobs and transport schemes.
281. There are two strands to the applicant's transport strategy contained within the revised TA, which has been assessed and agreed by the County Council transport team, as follows:
282. The evidence suggests that the site could be brought forward on a '**monitor and manage**' basis, described below:
- **Initial Phase:** The proposals include an initial phase of up to 1,600 units accessed off a new fourth arm at the Cambridge Research Park A10 roundabout. This phase would be accompanied with a defined mitigation package that would satisfactorily address the impacts of this phase. The development would require a strong emphasis on sustainable travel and the proposed mitigation package has been designed to drive this. Trips from the development would be monitored with a view to capping the development to accord with a phase one 'trip budget'. Beyond this phase, no further development would be allowed on the site without (a) further transport assessment, and (b) agreement of additional (strategic) mitigation.

The early, scheme-led transport mitigation package begins the process of implementing the Ely to Cambridge corridor solution as well as mitigating the

Phase 1 impacts. A summary table of the proposed transport measures and triggers can be found in **Appendix I** and has been agreed with the County Council further to its response of 12 July 2018. The proposed early interventions aim to divert trips to more sustainable modes – walk, bus, cycle and train. This approach, along with proposed interventions within the highway network, would partially relieve existing problems and create some capacity for car journeys arising from the development. However, this capacity is limited and therefore the amount of the proposed development that can be supported by the early interventions is limited to a maximum of 1,600 units. The early scheme led transport mitigation package begins to build the foundations of a broad-based and more sustainable transport solution for the whole corridor.

- **Future Phases:** No future phases could be developed beyond 1,600 units without agreement of further mitigation measures. The details of the future mitigation will be drawn from the emerging findings of the A10 study and associated work streams, and agreed as part of a phase by phase TA process. As part of this outline application, the principle of a significant financial cap is secured – i.e. a financial contribution towards strategic solutions to unlock future phases. This financial contribution would have flexibility in terms of how it is spent, with the fundamental purpose of supporting whichever strategic solutions are deemed most appropriate for the site/A10 area. This would include, where feasible, consideration of new connections to surrounding villages for non-motorised users. Highways England has confirmed that it is satisfied with the Phase 1 proposals and associated mitigation and has reserved its position on future phases for future review of transport assessments. The County Council is satisfied with the Phase 1 proposals and associated mitigation, however has expressed concerns regarding the level of funding offered for future phases, and is objecting on that basis. This objection is assessed later on in the report under Section 8 ‘Financial Viability and S106 Obligations’.

Strand 2 of the A10 Study has established the strategic transport interventions that are required to unlock full development at the site. Further development of the new town will be dependent on this infrastructure being implemented. The Combined Authority (CA) and Greater Cambridge Partnership are leading work to advance the recommendations of the A10 Study regarding coordinated multi modal strategic solutions – including consideration of the A10 upgrade, mass transit solutions (e.g segregated public transport route), extensive walking and cycling routes within the immediate vicinity of public transport nodes and an on-demand mobility and bus service. The aim must be to create a sustainable, high quality transport system that becomes the preferential travel choice over the car. The developer would ultimately be required to contribute, with an overall funding cap, towards the strategic solutions identified by the CA and partners (Greater Cambridge Partnership, Cambridgeshire County Council) to unlock future phases, which could include:

- the upgrade of the A10 between the A14 and Waterbeach
- the upgrade of the A14 / 10 interchange

- a public transport / mass transit corridor between Waterbeach and Cambridge
  - provision of improved cycle connections to Cambridge, Histon, Impington, Cottenham, Chittering, Stretham, Fen Ditton and Lode (requiring a bridge across the River Cam)
  - a relocated station at Waterbeach
  - a Waterbeach multi modal transport hub. At this stage there are no details agreed, though the relocation of the railway station provides an opportunity for an interchange of public transport/mass transit, rail services, on demand/bus services and cars (with an option for c.1000 park and ride spaces)
  - ongoing monitoring of travel behaviour and vehicle flows in the study area and any additional mitigation measures required resulting from increased traffic flows.
283. Ultimately, the monitor and manage process would be controlled through S106 agreement and Key Phase conditions, with all future key phases subject to further transport assessments and agreement of mitigation release of funding from the transport cap.

#### Combined Transport Strategies of DIO/U&C and RLW

284. The baseline position, established by the A10 Study, is that strategic intervention (beyond the early, scheme-led transport mitigation package) is necessary to deliver the capacity to accommodate journeys within the corridor over the longer term, including those arising from the proposed development. Without strategic interventions the full development potential at Waterbeach, and more widely across north Cambridge, cannot be realised. To this end, both outline applications support a monitor and manage approach towards strategic transport interventions through proportionate S106 contributions. This would enable a sustainable solution to be put in place relative to the growth rate of the new town and pressures on the network. It would also enable the longer term transport strategy to respond to new technologies and other developments within the wider study area.
285. Additional transport mitigation measures are proposed by RLW in its revised Transport Assessment to proceed beyond DIO/U&C's early phase of up to 1600 units as set out in their outline application S/2075/18/OL. This transport mitigation package proposes capacity for up to an additional 800 homes in the early phase through the following measures:
- Contributions towards GCP's Greenways Cycleway project from Waterbeach to Cambridge
  - Relocation and enhancement of Waterbeach Railway Station in 2021 and expansion capacity for 12 carriage trains, new main station building and car and cycle parking with a Park and Ride facility (250 spaces initially then increasing to 1000 spaces in the longer term)

286. Beyond this early phase a monitor and manage approach is proposed allowing S106 funds to be used in response to the actual outturn effects of the development on the local network. Whilst the RLW transport strategy is currently under assessment, it does show compatibility with DIO/U&C's Phase 1 transport strategy and the Ely to Cambridge A10 Study recommendations through the promotion of early modal shift measures and reduced reliance on the private car. It also promotes early delivery of the railway station to support the uptake of sustainable travel behaviours within the new town and wider area. This has potential to ensure a high mode share for rail journeys from the new town.
287. The key therefore on any large scale development with more than one land promoter is to ensure sufficient measures are secured at outline stage to coordinate and manage development alongside delivery of transport infrastructure in accordance with Policy SS/6(16c). The principle measure adopted in this instance would be a monitor and manage regime secured by S106 agreement. Development would be capped to accord with a phase one 'trip budget' i.e. the total number of vehicle trips that can be satisfactorily mitigated'. For both developers this requires complementary early phase transport mitigation, as discussed above, and a requirement to monitor trips from the site on an ongoing basis. Future mitigation would then be considered on a phase by phase basis, with no further development beyond phase one until the mitigation for the subsequent phase(s) is agreed.
288. A Transport Strategy Steering Group comprising the Councils, developers and relevant stakeholders (e.g. Highways England or Network Rail) would review the transport monitoring and make recommendations for coordinating further transport infrastructure delivery across the strategic site. The establishment and terms of reference for this review group would be secured via S106 agreement, as guided by the new town SPD.
289. RLW has requested that any available A10 headroom capacity be allocated evenly, not only across the whole site, but also in respect of phasing timescales to ensure sustainable development is achieved. However, the aim of sustainable development in this context, and as guided by Policy SS/6(16c), is to ensure timely and efficient delivery of infrastructure. Requiring an even split of A10 capacity between the two land promoters would create an artificial constraint on development and growth of the new town, which is not advocated in Policy SS/6 of the new town SPD.

#### Railway Station and Link Road

290. Resolution has been given to grant planning permission for the relocation of Waterbeach railway station (ref S/1925/18/FL) and its delivery will be subject to agreement of a funding scheme and technical approvals with Network Rail/Department for Transport and other potential funding agents. An opportunity exists for the two developers of the new town to work together to facilitate the prompt delivery of the new relocated railway station at the earliest opportunity. This will promote modal shift across the strategic site and existing

village with improved station facilities and increased train capacity/frequency. It would also ensure that vehicular trips are not directed through the existing village and would facilitate the interception of A10 traffic to a potential park & rail facility at the new station. Given the traffic capacity limits at the proposed northern A10 access, the east-west relocated station link road would need to be served via a proposed new southern A10 access, as shown on the revised Parameter Plan.

291. The applicant has set out legal mechanisms in the submitted 'Legal Obligations Note' to demonstrate how provision can be made for early delivery of a link road to serve the relocated station should it come forward within Key Phase 1. It is agreed that delivery of the east-west relocated station link road (to County Council satisfaction) should be legally binding on the land owner and secured through provisions in the S106 agreement. These provisions will need to ensure the link road is designed, planned and built (including rights of access secured between DIO/U&C and RLW) by the time the relocated railway station is open for public use. As this link road would fall outside of Key Phase 1 it would need to be facilitated through a condition to secure 'out of Key Phase' infrastructure details (see recommended condition 13).
292. Market value will need to be agreed between the two land promoters for access rights and in the event that agreement cannot be reached the valuation will be referred to an independent expert to determine. Timescales and provisions for this process are to be established in the S106 agreement to ensure timely coordination of site-wide infrastructure.
293. Two further east-west primary routes would need to be constructed across the strategic site and are included in the revised Parameter Plan. The mechanism for delivery of these links would also be secured through the S106 agreement and Key Phase submission. Timing of these primary routes would be facilitated through proposed steering groups to be established in the S106 agreement, including a Transport Strategy Review Group and Planning Delivery Group (**see Appendix J**) with the final timetable to be submitted to and agreed by the Council. Access for construction traffic serving the relocated station across DIO/U&C land is also a consideration and can be dealt with at Key Phase approval stage and detailed within a Construction Environment Management Plan. Subject to these provisions, the development would accord with the objectives of securing timely infrastructure and comprehensive development for the new town (Policy SS/6).

#### Existing Station Improvements

294. Network Rail has assessed the safety implications which would likely occur as a result of the increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic arising from the development. It recommends that there is no rail network operator objection to the development, subject to S106 contributions towards safety improvements at the existing station level crossing and a cap of £1m towards levelling and improvements to station access routes.
295. Further discussion during the application process has clarified that Network

Rail will commit funding and deliver the level crossing upgrade during its 5 year plan (2019-2024) in conjunction with platform lengthening to eight carriage trains. This is anticipated to be delivered by mid-2022 and will therefore require an interim solution to address safety. Network Rail has confirmed that should occupations of the development occur prior to this point the interim solution would be to staff the level crossing, with an indicative cost of £500,000 (per annum).

296. The principle of mitigating safety and access impacts at the railway station is agreed between all parties and the proposed S106 heads of terms includes contributions towards improved safety and access, improved cycle parking and bus stop provision along with car parking monitoring and management around the station. These improvements can be secured within the Phase 1 transport mitigation package. Should the proposed S106 contribution not eventually be required by Network Rail it is recommended to be transferred to a Transport Enhancement Fund (reserve fund) to be utilised on other key phase transport mitigation within the S106 agreement.

#### Site Access (Construction and Post Construction)

##### a) Construction Access and Traffic

297. The final construction access points are yet to be formally agreed and would be subject to the submission and approval of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (see recommended condition no.7). Routing of construction traffic through the existing village would result in unacceptable adverse impacts on existing amenity and highway safety and therefore the applicant proposes to enter the site directly off the A10 with complete segregation from the village. Construction access could be via:
- A new fourth arm off CRP roundabout
  - Off Denny End Road via an existing access adjacent to the Sterling House Business Centre
  - A new construction access (to be agreed) from the A10
298. The revised TA confirms that during the construction of the early phases, construction vehicles would be directed via the first two accesses (listed above). Once the northern early phases of development are occupied, construction vehicles would be directed towards the Denny End Road and yet to be agreed second access off the A10 therefore separating construction traffic from residential traffic.
299. The proposed construction access located off Denny End Road would enable construction vehicles to avoid the residential areas of Waterbeach Village and use a section of Denny End Road that is currently used by industrial type vehicles accessing the existing light industrial units located adjacent to the Sterling House Business Centre.
300. The revised TA estimates construction traffic would have a maximum impact of just 3.0% (total vehicles) and 7.6% (HGVs) on the A10, which has been agreed

with Cambridgeshire County Council transport assessment team. Construction methods employed by the developer need to adhere to Policy CC/6, which requires new development to carefully manage materials already on-site (including soils), or brought to the site, to reduce the amount of waste produced and maximise the reuse or recycling of materials either onsite or locally. The Environmental Statement (ES) does not assume a specific amount of soil importation or vehicles associated with it; however it does make a general assumption about construction traffic vehicle movements contained in Chapter 9 of the ES. It is recommended that the management of these issues be controlled by the following planning conditions:

- a site-wide Construction and Environmental Management Plan (to be submitted alongside key phase one and supplements with each subsequent key phase as necessary) and;
- ii) a Construction Method Statement and Construction Traffic Management Plan with each reserved matters submission

301. A Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) is proposed by the applicant and can be incorporated into the above strategies to be agreed by condition (see recommended condition nos.7 and 14).

#### b) Site Access - New Development

302. Denny End Road, which runs parallel to the southern boundary of the site already provides access into the site via the existing military base access road. This would be retained during the early barracks reuse and refurbishment phase with existing occupation already in place (i.e. Papworth staff). This site access is currently designed to offer suitable capacity and accessibility for both residents and employment uses during this phase.

303. In Phase 1 the barracks access would continue to be used for access for residents within the barracks area or for others accessing the specific community uses (e.g. sports hall). Private vehicles would be unable to travel though the site between the barracks access and Cambridge Research Park junction. The only link in this regard would be via public transport, cycling and foot (including the proposed causeway link). Travel between Phase 1 and the village would be by sustainable modes or indirectly by car, via the new A10 access.

304. Beyond Phase 1, the barracks access would be restricted to public transport, taxis, cycles, pedestrians and emergency vehicles. This would be controlled through signage and, once the road is adopted, could be defined through a Traffic Regulation Order and enforced by Cambridgeshire County Council. To ensure that there is some potential flexibility to the longer-term access strategy, it is recommended that the access be kept under review and monitored at each key phase through the Transport Strategy Review Group with a strategy to be formally agreed by planning condition (see recommended condition no.26).

305. Principal vehicle access for Key Phase 1 (1600 homes) would be achieved via

a northern junction off the existing Cambridge Research Park (CRP) roundabout, which has been designed in detail (drawing 30509/2003/SK12) and submitted for approval within this outline application. The proposals also incorporate a signalised crossing of the A10 between the site and CRP. This has necessitated a speed limit reduction to 40mph through a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). This TRO has been approved and would be implemented prior to the implementation of the highway works.

306. Whilst the longer-term nature of the A10 will be determined through the Ely – Cambridge Transport Study, the Research Park Roundabout will remain and is considered a sensible anchor for the early phases of development. Beyond this, the full 6,500 homes scheme will require a second, southern A10 access to be created. The specific location of the southern A10 access is not known at present but an approximate location is shown on the revised Parameter Plan. The detail of this junction would be subject to future detailed planning approval although its timing is likely to coincide with delivery of the relocated railway station given the limits on capacity at the northern A10 access and the need to disperse traffic movement entering the site. Further consideration would also need to be given to potential passive design measures for future mass transit infrastructure within this southern primary access route.
307. A further access point is proposed to be retained to the west of Stirling House along Denny End Road. This is not intended for general vehicular access but could be used for construction traffic and/or buses. Both accesses along Denny End Road would need to be managed and controlled via condition at Key Phase approval stage and through relevant Construction Environmental Management Plans.
308. Consequently, subject to the aforementioned conditions, access to the site would be in accordance with Local Plan Policy SS/6 and Waterbeach New Town SPD.

### Highway Safety

#### a) A10 Northern Access - Cambridge Research Park

309. The submitted revised A10 northern access to the application site has been reviewed by Cambridgeshire County Council and accepted on highway safety grounds. This would be introduced prior to first occupation of the development and would connect to a safe and lit non-motorised route connecting to Key Phase 1 of the development. The principle of this scheme is supported by Cambridgeshire County Council transport team and, whilst not yet fully approved, the details and timing of this mitigation measure can be secured by planning condition (see recommended condition no.27) and will require separate S278 highway approval.

#### b) Provision of non-motorised user bridge across A10

310. The revised Key Phase 1 transport mitigation package includes measures to provide safe passage for non-motorised users across the A10 at Denny End

Road to connect to an improved non-motorised route along Mere Way byway linking Waterbeach new town to the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway at north Cambridge. This would be in the form of a bridge north of the A10 junction with Denny End Road to be delivered by the occupation of the 150<sup>th</sup> dwelling. The principle of this scheme is supported by Cambridgeshire County Council transport team and, whilst not yet fully approved, the details and timing of this mitigation measure can be secured by S106 agreement.

c) Travel through the site to Waterbeach village and existing station

311. The applicant proposes a safe and lit non-motorised connection from Key Phase 1 to Waterbeach Village from first occupation. Connections onwards towards the existing station will utilise existing road and footpath infrastructure, which require improvements to ensure safe passage for cyclists in particular. The applicant has committed to mitigation in the form of S106 funding towards cycle and public realm improvements through Waterbeach to reduce rat running, improve traffic management and deliver a safer cycling and walking environment. The principle of this scheme is supported by Cambridgeshire County Council transport team and, whilst not yet fully approved, the details and timing of this mitigation measure can be secured by S106 agreement, including opportunity for the Parish Council or key stakeholders to lead on the project for improvements within the village.

d) Waterbeach Road/Car Dyke Junction improvements

312. Concern has been raised in relation to the existing safety of these A10 junctions and the applicant proposes introduction of a signalised staggered toucan crossing north of Car Dyke Road across the A10 to Waterbeach Road to be delivered by occupation of the 1,250<sup>th</sup> dwelling. This would improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists and is agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council and would be secured by financial contribution in the S106 agreement.

e) A10 Cycle Lane Improvements

313. The applicant acknowledges that the existing A10 shared footway/cycleway will always be comprised by its proximity to fast moving traffic but there is potential to cost effectively improve it in the short term. In the longer term, these proposals are likely to be subsumed by the A10 road widening. As agreed with Cambridgeshire County Council, the proposal includes improvements to widen the existing path up to 3m with edge protection from the A10 between the junction of Denny End Road and Ely Road, Milton. The scheme also includes a new foot/cycleway north of Denny End Road towards the access into the site. This will be delivered prior to first occupation and secured by planning condition (see recommended condition no.28).

f) Traffic Management and Public Realm Improvements through Landbeach, Cottenham, Horningsea and Milton

314. The submitted revised Transport Assessment recognises the limitations of existing infrastructure for non-motorised users through Landbeach, Cottenham,

Horningsea and Milton. Given the level of anticipated movement between these areas and the new town it is considered necessary to seek mitigation through S106 agreement towards funding traffic management measures in these villages. The principle of this scheme is supported by Cambridgeshire County Council transport team, including opportunity for the Parish Council or key stakeholders to lead on the project for improvements within their village.

g) Safe access to and from Chittering

315. Chittering currently does not benefit from safe access for non-motorised modes to the proposed new town. Connections to Chittering could be made via improvements to existing public rights of way to the east and south of Chittering, which connect into Bannold Drove and the RLW Estates application site. Therefore, further enhancements to these existing public rights of way are recommended to be sought separately in application S/2075/18/OL.

h) Other Highway Safety Mitigation

316. Additional highway safety mitigation measures were proposed by Cambridgeshire County Council in its Economy and Environment report of July 2018 and further discussion since then between the Councils and applicant has refined the mitigation package to that discussed above. All matters are now agreed, or in some instances agreed subject to needing minor design changes. The applicant will therefore be providing the County Council with a schedule of agreements and, where necessary, minor amendments to drawings concerning the above highway safety measures. Further road safety audits are now not needed until detailed design stage.
317. Consequently, subject to the recommended conditions and S106 mitigation measures, the scheme would have an acceptable impact on highway safety in accordance with Policy HQ/1.

Framework Travel Plan and Low Emissions Strategy

318. Policy SS/6 calls for measures to promote cycling and walking from the start of development including the use of a Smarter Choices package for residential, school and workplace travel planning to reduce car use and enhance alternative transport choices.
319. The submitted Side-Wide Framework Travel plan proposes a reduction in car usage from 54.2% in year 1 to 41.1% in year 20 through sustainable transport measures, incentives and supporting infrastructure. This target reduction is considered achievable and is supported by the County Council transport assessment team.
320. The various 'Hard measures' relating to physical infrastructure to support walking, cycling and public transport are proposed in the Phase 1 S106 transport package (**Appendix I**). The indicative programme for implementation of the Travel Plan acts as a guide for future detailed Travel Plans to be submitted at Key Phase stage. Monitoring towards the mode share targets

would occur on an annual basis with employment of a Travel Plan Coordinator. The monitoring of traffic flows onto the A10 would be secured by planning condition (see recommended condition no.26).

321. If the observed mode share deviates significantly from the review mode share targets, discussions will be held with the Highways Authorities and Transport Strategy Review Group to discuss whether the impact of this deviation is significant and should trigger the requirement for implementation of contingency measures, or whether these changes are in response to external factors beyond the control of the applicants (e.g. petrol prices) and should therefore trigger a revision of the interim or full-term mode share targets. This can be closely managed by aforementioned planning condition and provisions within the S106 agreement to ensure the scheme accords with Policy SS/6 (11).

### Parking

322. The applicant proposes to provide a lower car parking ratio than Policy TI/3 for the first phase with an average 1.5 spaces per dwelling including for visitor parking. This allows for one space for 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings, and 2 spaces for 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings. This is on the basis that the provisions for alternative modes of travel from the site will limit the need for car ownership by future residents. This is proposed to be monitored throughout the lifetime of the first phase to inform future phases of development.
323. The County Council has reservations regarding the low parking provision. The 2011 Census showed average level of car ownership across the South Cambridgeshire District area as 1.56, and for Waterbeach a lower than the average 1.37 cars per household. The reasons for this lower car ownership are unclear. Applying existing car ownership levels to the Key Phase 1 homes profile may result in a need to provide unallocated car parking. This would allow the 2 bedroom homes with 1 allocated space to use the unallocated parking should they need to. This would need to be factored into the design coding and subject to monitoring through phase 1 for review by the Transport Strategy Review Group.
324. A further factor to consider would be the likely layout and location of parking, as this can determine the use of the parking to be provided. This is evident in Orchard Park to the north of Cambridge where rear courtyard parking is not fully used by residents, leading to on street and pavement parking. The future layout and design of parking will be considered in more detail in the design code and detailed applications to follow for the first phase. This will need to accommodate both allocated and unallocated parking for residents to cater for the expected demand.

### Conclusion

325. The early, scheme-led transport mitigation package and Framework Travel Plan begin the process of implementing the Ely to Cambridge corridor solution and prioritising sustainable travel modes in the development. This approach would

- support a first phase of 1,600 units and build the foundations of a broad-based and more sustainable transport solution for the whole corridor. Whilst, the proposed development is a generator of additional traffic, it is also key to delivering the substantial investment necessary to overcome existing problems.
326. The proposed S106 financial contribution towards strategic solutions to unlock future phases through a 'monitor and manage' approach would ensure an appropriate level of mitigation to meet actual highway conditions at the relevant future time in collaboration with the Combined Authority (CA) and Greater Cambridge Partnership.
327. The proposed transport strategy also aligns complements the adjoining RLW Estates proposed transport strategy to allow for comprehensive development to come forward. Highway safety, access, parking and travel plan measures are considered acceptable subject to recommended conditions and further detailed planning. On this basis, the proposal accords with Policies HQ/1, SS/6 and TI/2 objectives and paragraphs 110 and 111 of the NPPF.

#### **4. Economic Impacts**

328. National Planning Policy places a clear emphasis on the importance of economic growth and delivering economic benefits as a key component of sustainable development. Policy SS/6 echoes this and requires employment provision of a quantum, type and mix to meet the needs of the town and provide access to local jobs, and support the continued development of the economy of the Cambridge area to be established through an Economic Development Strategy prepared in partnership with the local authority and key stakeholders.

#### Employment

329. The applicant has submitted an Employment Statement to estimate the number of direct and indirect jobs that would be created by the proposed development and explain how skills and enterprise will be encouraged. The proposed development is estimated to create the following:
- 800-1000 direct and indirect construction jobs per year
  - 2,431 on site jobs associated with non residential uses
  - 2,026 on site jobs associated with residential uses
  - 1,591 homeworkers
  - 2,475 additional employment at Cambridge Research Park and Stirling House
  - 51% of total population in employment
330. Given the 22,000 additional jobs required in South Cambridgeshire alone during the Local Plan period and high levels of inward commuting, this level of employment is considered to be sustainable. The generation of skills and enterprise would be delivered through on-site jobs brokerage scheme to be secured as part of the S106 agreement. This is detailed in the Employment Statement and would mean making premises available for the jobs brokerage scheme, working with local partners such as Cambridge Regional College regarding vocational and work experience opportunities and creating an online

procurement portal to support local businesses. It would also involve creating positive conditions for homeworking and offering a range of business space for start-up and growing businesses.

331. As more detailed plans are prepared, and the land use mix is refined, stakeholders can work together to shape an Economic Development Strategy, building upon the submitted Employment Statement and Town Centres Uses Assessment. A condition is therefore recommended (see condition No.) to agree Economic Development Strategies at construction stage and occupation stage, as recommended by the economic development officer, with separate provisions for the proposed jobs brokerage scheme to be established in the S106 agreement.

### Town Centre Assessment

332. Policy SS/6(8) requires the new town to provide a range of uses appropriate to a new town including shops, services, leisure and other town centre uses of an appropriate scale for a town whilst avoiding significant impacts on the vitality and viability of surrounding centres, and not competing with Cambridge as a sub regional centre.
333. The majority of retail, services, community and employment uses will be located within the town centre, as governed by Spatial Principle 19 of the Design and Access Statement Supplement. No single outlet (A1-A5 use classes) will exceed 4000m<sup>2</sup> in size and there is total provision of up to 15,000m<sup>2</sup> of employment uses within the application site comprising offices, research and development and light industrial.
334. The applicant has submitted a Town Centre Uses Assessment by Savills to assess the impact of the town centre proposals on Waterbeach, Cambridge City Centre and Cambridge District and Local Centres/Out of Centre facilities. In summary the assessment shows:

#### a) Waterbeach Impact

335. The existing comparison retail offer in Waterbeach is limited. Proposed new comparison goods floorspace in the new town would provide an option for residents – new and existing – which does not require travel into Cambridge or beyond. The convenience offer within Waterbeach is limited to two stores, which meets convenience top up needs for local residents. Any similar ‘local’ facilities will only be built out in accordance with new housing, each benefitting from locational advantages of a corresponding immediate catchment. New supermarket facilities built within the application site would ‘claw back’ trade currently being lost to large out of centre stores.

#### b) Cambridge City Centre Impact

336. The assessment shows an estimated convenience trade diversion of £0.51m (3% impact on Cambridge City Centre) and an estimated comparison trade diversion £10.52m (2% impact on Cambridge City Centre). All impacts remain

well within acceptable levels and are shown in each case to be at a corresponding healthy residual trading level.

#### c) Cambridge District and Local Centres/Out of Centre Facilities Impact

337. At the time of the assessment the key locations for convenience retail spend originating within the primary catchment area were:

- Local Shops, Histon Road
- Sainsbury's, Coldhams Lane
- Tesco, Cheddars Lane
- Tesco Extra, Bar Hill
- Tesco, Milton

338. The impacts range between 0% and 9%, with the exception of the impact of 13% on Tesco (Milton), which is the closest superstore to Waterbeach.

339. Comparison impacts are each minimal given the scale of the provision trade would be diverted, as follows:

- Cambridge Retail Park (2%)
- Retail Warehousing, Newmarket Road (4%)
- Beehive Centre (3%)
- Other (miscellaneous floor space) (1%)

340. As such, the impacts would be within acceptable levels and residual trading performances within these centres is concluded as strong. Consequently, the development proposals would not threaten the ongoing vitality and viability of surrounding centres, including Cambridge City Centre, in accordance with Policy SS/6(8).

#### Conclusion

341. The development's impacts have been considered in relation to surrounding communities and in particular the impact on the viability and vitality of surrounding centres. No adverse impacts have been identified that warrant a change to the development's scale or description. The principle of the applicant's proposals to secure a jobs brokerage scheme and develop an Economic Development Strategy are agreed and shall be conditioned or included in the S106 agreement (where appropriate) to fulfil the objectives of Policy SS/6.

#### **5. Housing Delivery**

342. Local Plan Policy SS/6 (8a) requires the new town to include an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes and types, including affordable housing, to achieve a balanced and inclusive community. Waterbeach New Town SPD (p.96) provides further guidance on housing delivery and requires developers to provide an appropriate housing delivery strategy to meet identified housing need with consideration of the following: affordable housing, older people

housing and specialist accommodation, key working housing, self/custom build plots, space standards, private rented/build-to-rent schemes and community-led housing.

#### Quantum, density and mix

343. Policy H/8 requires housing density in new settlements to achieve a housing density of 40 dwellings per hectare (dph). However, the policy also goes on to say that this density may vary where justified by the character of the locality, the scale of the development, or other local circumstances. Policy H/9 requires a wide choice, type and mix of housing to be provided to meet the needs of different groups in the community. An appropriate mix of market housing is set out which gives a target of at least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes, at least 30% 3 bedroom homes, and at least 30% 4 bedroom homes.
344. The application for this part of the new town includes up to 6,500 dwellings, and the onus is on the applicant to demonstrate in the submitted plans and accompanying documents that this can be achieved at an appropriate density and mix. The new town is expected to be developed at least to 40 dph, to make the most efficient use of land in this sustainable location. The development would exceed this density requirement across the application site (at approximately 45 dph) with opportunities for a range of both high and low density housing to be delivered.
345. NPPF paragraphs 122 (c) and 123 (a) sets out the government's approach to housing density, and requires significant uplifts in residential density in areas that are well served by public transport, taking into account the availability and capacity of infrastructure and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use. As mentioned in the transport section of this report, the new town would be well served by public transport and sustainable travel modes to support the proposed higher density in this instance.
346. The scale and height of development, assessed separately in this report, demonstrates that at the proposed density of 45dph, the development would conform to the spatial principles set out in new town SPD spatial objectives and be acceptable in terms of impacts on landscape and local character.
347. Objections have been made to the application on the basis of there being too much housing when compared to the SS/6 allocation, and that the density, height and scale are inappropriate. However, as stated elsewhere in the report the applicant has submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the quantum of proposed housing can be successfully delivered on the site together with all the necessary infrastructure and open space.
348. An indicative housing mix can be determined at Key Phase approval stage to guide reserved matters parcels. Each phase would need to have regard to cumulative housing mix across the application site and also the needs for specialist accommodation such as for disabled and the elderly in accordance with Policy H/9. A condition is recommended requiring each residential parcel to be accompanied by a statement demonstrating how it accords with the

agreed Key Phase indicative housing mix and delivery strategy or, if justified, why it deviates (e.g. change in market conditions).

### Affordable housing

349. Local Plan Policy H/10 requires 40% affordable homes on development sites of 11 dwellings or more except where it can be demonstrated unviable in light of changing market conditions, individual site circumstances and development costs. In which case a revised mix of affordable house types and tenures and then a lower level of affordable housing provision may be negotiated. Due to the complexity and length of construction of major development sites, the New Town SPD (Guiding Principle 10) advises the inclusion of affordable housing review mechanisms in S106 agreements to allow the exact level of affordable housing for each large phase of development to be set based upon an appropriate assessment of the scheme's viability at that time.
350. The Council's financial viability consultant (Gerald Eve) has reviewed the financial appraisal of the scheme in light of the development costs, including S106 financial contributions (see **Appendix K**). The overall development costs are such that achieving 40% affordable homes on site (with a policy compliant tenure split of 70% affordable rent and 30% shared ownership) would render the scheme financially unviable.
351. On the basis of the results of the financial viability review work, a revised mix of affordable housing types and tenures has been explored with the Council's affordable housing team in line with Policy H/10(2d). This exercise shows that revising the tenure split between affordable rent and shared ownership results in limited improvement to the overall affordable housing percentage. The scheme is much improved, however, when the timing of affordable units is delayed until after the first 300 homes and a broader affordable housing tenure (as defined in the NPPF) is employed. This increases the overall on site offer to 30%, comprising the following tenure split:
- 30% Affordable Rent
  - 30% Shared Ownership
  - 20% Rent to Buy
  - 20% Discounted Market Sale
352. The Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy acknowledges the significant affordability challenge for Greater Cambridge for households across a range of income levels. Whilst the provision of affordable rent remains the highest priority to support households on the lowest incomes, there is also recognition that there is a growing 'affordability gap', where middle income households are being squeezed out of the market; with limited housing options for low cost home ownership or the private rented sector. Having a blended mix of different tenure types provides greater choice for those unable to access the open market and is in line with the objectives of the Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy.
353. Shared ownership is generally the traditional form of intermediate housing that

provides an affordable housing option for households on median incomes who are able to raise a small deposit and qualify for a mortgage. The shared ownership model gives households the opportunity to initially purchase between 25-75% of the property and pay rent on the remaining equity.

354. Including a rent to buy model will support households who aspire to buy but are not yet in a position to do so, such as inability to raise a deposit or those on apprentices or training where their incomes are likely to increase over the next 5-10 years. Rent to Buy models generally help support a tenant with a deposit and budget management, as well as providing a lower rent than on the open market. This model may suit those whose only option previously would have been to either wait for an affordable rented property, remain in the family home to save for a deposit, or struggle to afford a private rented property.
355. Whilst it is acknowledged that a discounted market sale property will not be affordable to those on the lower incomes, it is estimated that those on an median income of around £43,700 may be able to afford to buy a home priced at around £236,000 which would be 20% discount based on an average lower quartile property. It is therefore considered that this will go some way to help meet the housing needs of average household incomes.
356. Introducing a delay in the delivery of affordable housing until after the first 300 units has a positive impact in terms of increasing overall provision by 2.5% to reach 30%. Given the proposed build out rates, this would not result in a significant delay in terms of time (2 years). It also means that planned infrastructure, such as the primary school, healthcare and community centre can be delivered in a timely way to support households with greater needs.
357. Other affordable tenure mixes have been tested and by increasing the component level of Rent to Buy to 30% and reducing the affordable rent to 20% it is possible to increase the overall affordable housing offer to 32.5% (including no affordable in the first 300 units). However, affordable rent remains affordable in perpetuity in contrast to Rent to Buy and therefore a stronger case is made for retaining the higher component level of affordable rent (30%) to better reflect the longer term housing needs of the district.
358. In summary, the proposed model of affordable housing presents a suite of housing options to meet varying household incomes. It would help to place shape a large strategic site in terms of a more diverse and balanced community and ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure in accordance with the social objectives of sustainable development (para. 8 of the NPPF) and Policy SS/6(8 &16).

#### Affordable Housing Review Mechanism

359. Due to the obvious significant infrastructure costs that will be associated with the initial opening up of the site and the delivery of essential infrastructure, it is accepted best practice for the Local Planning Authority to have regard to the need to be appropriately flexible in its requirements for affordable housing, particularly in the early phases of large schemes. In respect of Key Phase 1 of

1600 homes it is recommended that the proposed level of affordable housing (30%) should be accepted to enable the initial commencement of development and opening up of the site. To further facilitate the initial commencement of development, it is also recommended that the first 300 homes are all private market dwellings, with the affordable housing element of the first phase of development (30% of 1600 homes) to begin to be delivered after this.

360. A review mechanism is recommended to be set within the S106 agreement that would guarantee a minimum of 30% affordable housing across the remainder of the site (post Phase 1) but would allow the exact level of affordable housing to be set for each later phase of development based upon an appropriate assessment of the scheme's viability at that time. This would be in line with Guiding Principle 10 of the New Town SPD and would allow for any increase in the developer's returns from the site, above an agreed level, to be shared equally (50:50) between the developer and the District Council to increase the amount of affordable housing upwards from the 30% minimum.
361. In agreeing the size of each 'Key Phase' of development, consideration will also be given to how the proposed scale of development within that Key Phase could allow the prevailing policy target affordable housing level to be met. Specifically, the Council would have the ability to request a reduction in the size of a proposed Key Phase if it considered that it was too large and could result in appropriately fixing the level of affordable housing below the prevailing policy target for a significant proportion of the development. At the beginning of each Key Phase of development a S106 viability review would be carried out, the outcome of which would be the exact level and the tenure mix of affordable housing for that Key Phase.
362. The Section 106 review mechanism would include an agreed level for the developer's return set at an internal rate of return (IRR) of 20%. This level of return is consistent with current practice and similar largescale projects elsewhere in the country. When the developer's return exceeds 20% IRR the level of affordable housing and tenure mix would need to be reviewed with and agreed with the Council prior to agreement of the Key Phase.
363. In summary, it is clear that the proposed affordable housing provision would be below the current policy target of 40% when taking into account the significant infrastructure costs of the project and viability considerations. However, a suite of affordable housing options, and a total provision of 30% on site affordable housing, are proposed to meet varying household incomes and will help to facilitate a more diverse and balanced community in accordance with the social objectives of sustainable development set out in paragraph 8 of the NPPF. Furthermore, a review mechanism will be structured such that in each subsequent phase of development any uplift in values or cost savings can be captured and fed back into affordable housing provision in accordance with Policy H/10.

#### Accessible Housing and Internal Space Standards

364. Policy H/9 requires all affordable homes and 5% of private new homes on sites

of 20 or more to be built to The Building Regulations M4(2) standard (accessible and adaptable dwelling standard). This can be addressed by way of planning condition (see recommended condition no.17).

365. Policy H/12 requires gross internal floor areas in all new residential developments to meet or exceed the Government's Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015) or successor document. This level of detail would not be expected at outline planning stage and would be assessed at reserved matters stage.

### Community-Led Housing

366. Guiding Principle 10 of the New Town SPD supports measures to broaden the mix of housing types and delivery models. It advises that the Council is supportive in principle, subject to viability and deliverability, to working with a Community Land Trust (CLT) to support the provision of the new town. Future opportunities for CLT involvement can be captured at Key Phase approval stage where there is a requirement for the applicant to submit a Housing Delivery Statement.

### Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

367. National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) requires Councils to maintain a five year land supply of Travellers sites, in a similar way to housing, and identify deliverable sites to meet the needs to meet identified for the first five years. The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2016) identified no need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches during the plan period, taking account of existing available supply. Provision is required for Travelling Showpeople and Policy H/20 makes safeguards for land use in this regard.
368. Opportunities to deliver Gypsy and Traveller sites, where need is identified, will be sought as part of large scale new communities and significant major development sites (Policy H/21). Future opportunities for such sites can be captured at Key Phase approval stage when there is a requirement for the applicant to submit a Housing Delivery Statement.

### Self and Custom Build

369. The delivery of self-build and custom-build housing is strongly supported by national policy, and offers the opportunity for residents to be involved in the design and construction of their own homes. Local Plan Policy H/9 requires strategic sites to provide plots for self and custom builders, although no specific level of provision is specified for new development sites. Given the significant role the new town will play in delivering housing over the current and following Local Plan period, the development should in theory provide the opportunity to meet a high level of the district's self and custom build.
370. Unfortunately, there are no forecasts for future demand for self and custom build in South Cambridgeshire. However, the Council does keep a current register of those seeking self or custom build plots, which at the time of writing

totals approximately 502 people. A target of 5% self and custom build has been applied elsewhere on large strategic sites and would equate to 325 homes for this development. Whilst this would be a relatively ambitious target given the limited delivery of self and custom build elsewhere in the district to date it has the potential to meet unmet demand and contribute towards the aims and objectives of Policy H/9. Therefore, a cumulative target of 5% across the site is recommended to be secured within the S106 agreement along with a mechanism for marketing self/custom build plots.

### Conclusion

371. In summary, the overall quantum and density of the development is considered to make best use of a sustainable site in accordance with Policies H/8 and SS/6 and NPPF paragraphs 122 and 123. The proposal includes an affordable housing review mechanism, a suite of affordable housing options and a total provision of 30% on site affordable housing. This would help meet the needs of varying household incomes in the area, facilitate a more diverse and balanced community and ensure a financially viable and deliverable scheme in accordance with Policies H/9 and H/10. Additionally, conditions are recommended to ensure accessible homes, residential space standards, and opportunities for Gypsy and Traveller sites, self/custom build sites and community-led housing are captured at Key Phase approval stage in accordance with Policies H/9, H/12 and H/21.

## **6. Social & Community Infrastructure**

372. Policy SS/6(8) requires a range of uses appropriate to the new town including community services and facilities and measures to assist the development of a new community. Broader policies in the Local Plan require large scale major developments to provide detailed assessments and strategies for community needs, which take account of capacity and accessibility at existing facilities in the locality (Policy SC/4). Community facilities and services to be provided include:
- a) primary and secondary schools
  - b) meeting places
  - c) health facilities
  - d) libraries
  - e) sports facilities
  - f) commercial facilities important to community life (e.g. childcare nurseries)
  - g) provision for faith groups
  - h) provision for burials
  - i) provision for waste and recycling
373. Such facilities should be provided in accessible locations with opportunities sought for joint provision or co-location of compatible services and facilities. The timely delivery of services and facilities will be required, including consideration of early phase requirements of the development.
374. The applicant has submitted a Community Facilities Statement setting out their

assessment and strategy for meeting community needs. This document summarises the outcomes from pre-application engagement with the community and other stakeholders. In summary, Waterbeach village is served by a good range of community uses, spaces and organisations. This is reflected in the earlier SCDC Services and Facilities Study (2014). Existing community facilities and activities are also located at the barracks site including a community room/museum, sports hall, squash and tennis courts.

375. The Community Facilities Statement has been updated during the course of the application and a revised statement submitted in May 2018 to respond to further information obtained from consultees at SCDC and Cambridgeshire County Council and a change to population estimates. A higher average household size has been applied from 2.4 to 2.8 to reflect experience found at other largescale growth sites and evidence gathered from the Cambridgeshire Research Group.
376. Clearly, capacity in the majority of existing village facilities would not be sufficient to serve a new town population and there is a need to introduce new facilities such as a secondary school to serve both the existing village and new town. On this basis, the development proposes a schedule of new community facilities/services to meet demand. Each of these will now be examined in turn with consideration for the delivery and timing of each as per the requirements of Policy SC/4.

#### a) Education

377. The applicant and the County Council, as the local education authority, agree that the scheme will require education provision on site, and this will be secured through a section 106 obligation for land and construction costs. The provision will be broken down into the following elements:
- i) Early years and Primary schools
377. The original application made provision for 3 primary school sites each of 3 hectares in size to accommodate up to 3 forms of entry (FE) (630 children), including early years provision in each. The amended application has reduced the amount of land reserved for expansion to 2 hectares which will provide a maximum of 11 FE and total land provision of 11ha. This is in line with the maximum demand of 11 FE projected using Cambridgeshire County Council's general multipliers (25 to 35 primary aged children per 100 dwellings).
378. Delivery and timing of the primary schools is based on build out rates of the development and projected child yield, as agreed with Cambridgeshire County Council and estimated as follows:
- 1st Primary School – Prior to first occupation
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Primary School – By 1,600 dwellings
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> Primary School – By 3,300 dwellings

#### ii) Secondary school

379. An 8FE secondary school of 8.5ha will be required on site with 2FE taking into account the existing cohort in the village. The school will have the potential to increase to 11FE with a further 3ha of land safeguarded to accommodate the highest level of anticipated need. Its proposed central location next to the town centre provides scope for this expansion to be accommodated on either or both landownership parcels; however, it is highly likely that a separate secondary school will be required to serve the RLW development. A S106 contribution will be sought in the form of the provision of land and a pro-rata capital cost contribution should the reserve 3ha land be required. The estimated opening of the school is prior to occupation of the 2000<sup>th</sup> dwelling and will be guided by the County Council.

iii) Sixth form

380. A 400 place post-sixteen sixth form centre will be required to serve the new town. The contribution will be in the form of the provision of a pro-rata capital cost contribution (estimated to be 60%) with land to be provided on the RLW site or a contribution to off-site provision if necessary. The proposed timing of this facility will be subject to review in the S106 agreement, which will be undertaken no sooner than occupation of the 2000<sup>th</sup> dwelling and no later than 3500<sup>th</sup> dwelling.

iv) Special needs

381. The County Council requires 1.7ha of land to be safeguarded and pro-rata contribution (estimated to be 44.5%) towards a 110 place special needs school within the application site. This is proposed to the south west of the lake in accordance with the SPD spatial framework. A S106 agreement will secure the land provision for this facility and a pro-rata capital cost contribution from each developer (DIO/U&C and RLW). A review of the school timing is to be undertaken no sooner than occupation of the 2000<sup>th</sup> dwelling and no later than 3500<sup>th</sup> dwelling.

382. The County Council is supportive of the general location of the proposed schools shown on the revised Parameter Plan, although the precise locations and boundaries will need to be agreed at the detailed planning stage. In terms of construction, the current County Council standard requires BREEAM 'Very Good', which can be secured in the Key Phase sustainability statement (see recommended condition nos.9 and 10).

b) Community Meeting Places

383. Policy SC/6 requires all housing developments to contribute towards the provision of indoor community facilities to meet the need generated by the development. This is based on a standard of 111m<sup>2</sup> of such floorspace per 1,000 additional population. The proposed development would result in an expected 18,200 additional population, requiring provision of 2020.2m<sup>2</sup> of indoor community floorspace.

384. At the early stage of development the applicant proposes to continue the use of the sports hall, control tower building and museum building as community meeting spaces. Then at the following triggers, the applicant proposes land and capital funding for the construction of four new multi-purpose community centres (MpCC) at the following triggers:

MpCC 1: 100<sup>th</sup> dwelling

MpCC 2: 1,850<sup>th</sup> dwelling

MpCC 3: 4,000<sup>th</sup> dwelling

MpCC 4: 5,200<sup>th</sup> dwelling

385. One of these community centres will be required to contain indoor sports capability (2 court hall) and one will contain a hub library. The total number of community centres would provide good spatial coverage across the site and in a delivery sequence that would meet the growing demands of the community over time.

386. Developing a sense of community during the early stages of the development is critical in any new settlement and the applicant's proposal to use/enhance the existing barracks buildings early on in the development is welcomed. The accessible location of these buildings to both new and existing residents provides good opportunity for community development and integration.

387. It is unknown at this stage if any of the barracks buildings will be retained in the long term and whether the extent of existing community indoor floorspace will remain the same. The quality and quantum of existing community floorspace will no doubt require further appraisal at a later date and it is recommended that an updated community facility strategy be submitted at each key phase stage, including details of any replacement facilities and any equivalent/improved level of floorspace to be provided. This provision can be secured by planning condition (see recommended conditions nos.9 and 10).

### c) Health Facilities

388. Several concerns have been raised in relation to capacity at the existing Waterbeach GP surgery to cope with the demands of the new town. Direct dialogue with the surgery has confirmed that capacity at the surgery is already exceeded following the Bannold Road developments. Whilst these developments have made S106 contributions towards healthcare improvements, capacity is likely to remain limited due to the restricted location and size of the existing surgery site. The new town development will therefore need to fund new healthcare provision both as an interim, early solution and a permanent new facility on the site, as detailed in the NHS consultation response.

389. The interim health facility is proposed to be provided within an existing or new building in Key Phase 1 (such as a community centre). Accordingly, a financial contribution will be sought and the interim health facility delivered prior to occupation of 250 dwellings.

390. The NHS has stated that a new primary health facility will be required on the site by 1600<sup>th</sup> dwelling to serve the new town in the long term. This will replace or improve upon the interim healthcare provision in Phase 1 and require land within the town centre to be set aside, as well as a financial contribution towards its construction. The NHS requires a facility with a footprint of 1,180m<sup>2</sup>, which can be built in phases to meet increased demands from the development (including adjoining RLW development).
391. Other healthcare facilities such as pharmacies and dental surgeries have not been sought by the NHS and would be delivered privately through the market. Such services would be facilitated through A1 and D1 land uses included in the development specification.

#### d) Libraries

The County's library service has sought interim provision to cover the early stages of the development with a permanent hub library (1050m<sup>2</sup> minimum floor space) to be provided in a community building to serve the whole allocation. The site, timing and arrangements for delivering of this facility will be secured through a Section 106 agreement.

#### e) Open Space, Productive Space, Children's Play Space and Sports Facilities

393. Local Policies SC/6 and SC/7 require all housing developments to contribute towards indoor community facilities and outdoor playing space (including children's play space, formal outdoor sports facilities) and informal open space in accordance with minimum standards.
394. The proposed quantum of development establishes a minimum requirement for 29.12ha of formal outdoor sports provision; 14.56ha of children's play space; 7.28ha of informal open space; and 7.28ha of allotment/community orchards space. This totals 58.24ha (46%) of the 126.1ha of green infrastructure space shown on the submitted parameter plan. The precise details of the open space facilities will be defined through future Key Phase submissions including design codes and reserved matters applications.
395. The submitted Sports & Recreation Study (May 2018) sets out the applicant's overarching vision for the retention and delivery of formal sports and recreation facilities. It also sets out an initial sports strategy giving indicative locations for key sports facilities across the site (see **Appendix G**) and an outline strategy for delivery, management and maintenance of such facilities. This, together with the submitted S106 heads of terms, identifies the following key sports facilities to be delivered on the site:

##### Early Phase Development

- £200,000 of improvements to existing sports hall and squash courts on the barracks area by 100<sup>th</sup> dwelling
- 1<sup>st</sup> strategic open space no later than 1600<sup>th</sup> dwelling (with temporary early provision)
- Lake side sports pavilion by 1000<sup>th</sup> dwelling

- Lakeside indoor sports pavilion no later than 1,000<sup>th</sup> dwelling

#### Later Phases of Development

- 2<sup>nd</sup> strategic open space no later than 3,500<sup>th</sup> dwelling
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> strategic open space no later than 4,800<sup>th</sup> dwelling
  - Artificial Grass Pitch by 3,500<sup>th</sup> dwelling
  - Sports and Leisure Centre (4 court sports hall; 4 lane swimming pool with large learner pool; 60 fitness stations and activity halls/changing rooms) by 5,500<sup>th</sup> dwelling
  - 2 sports pavilions linked to delivery and timing of 2 strategic open spaces
  - 2-court sports hall to be co-located with a community centre
396. The above list positively responds to the consultation feedback from Sport England and SCDC's development officer and aligns with the findings of the Greater Cambridge Area Playing Pitch Strategy and Indoor Sports Strategy (June 2016). The overall quantum of open sports provision also accords with the minimum open space standards set out in Policy SC/7.
397. Scope is shown within the Sports & Recreation Study to accommodate various sports pitches within the Southern and Northern Parks and water based sports at the lake. The details of these areas will be subject to further planning and a condition is recommended requiring the indicative outline sports strategy to be updated and approved at the time of Key Phase submission. The sports lake strategy (to be submitted with Key Phase 1) should demonstrate that it will complement rather than compete with existing water-based facilities, such as Milton Country Park, and this advice will be relayed to the applicant by informative.
398. Concern has been raised in relation to the capacity of the existing sports hall to cope with further demand given existing village use. Current usage figures submitted by the applicant show that the main hall is booked for a total of 9 hours out of a total available 98 hours (9.2% usage). Overall, this shows there is considerable capacity at the sports hall for further use. Furthermore, the four-court hall can be split into 2 x two-court sports hall to increase capacity.
399. Delivery of specific sports infrastructure and strategic open spaces will be secured through the S106 agreement in line with future phasing to be agreed. Given the potential development to the eastern side of the new town (RLW Estates) there will need to be coordination of sports and community facilities, through the S106 agreement via the proposed 'Project Delivery Group' - a body responsible for ensuring comprehensive development including community infrastructure.

#### f) Commercial facilities important to community life

400. Local Plan Policy SC/4 requires development to meet community needs and ensure the delivery of commercial facilities important to community life such as childcare nurseries, local shops, restaurants, cafes and public houses. The submitted Development Specification (as amended) provides for these land

uses although such uses are only likely to come forward in response to market demand or through a community group. Childcare facilities are often left to the market to deliver separately to early years provision at primary schools. On other large settlements in the area, land availability for childcare provision has been limited and/or non-existent leading to unsustainable travel movements away from the site and difficulty for residents in accessing childcare provision. To address this, a condition is recommended to ensure a strategy is submitted and agreed at Key Phase stage for appropriate planning and marketing of land/units for potential childcare providers.

#### g) Provision for Faith Groups

401. Local Plan Policy SC/4 requires developments to provide services and facilities necessary to meet the needs of different faith groups. There are no minimum standards set out in policy but the Development Specification (as amended) provides up to 9000m<sup>2</sup> of community uses (Class D1) to include places of worship.
402. At this stage it is not known what level of faith provision is required by the new community or of what type/specification. Consequently, it is considered appropriate to allow faith uses/buildings to come forward naturally over time, as the community evolves and sites become available within the new town. In the interim, provision for faith groups is to be made within the community centres, which are tabled in the draft S106 Heads of Terms. A condition is recommended to ensure a strategy is submitted and agreed at Key Phase stage for appropriate marketing of land/units for potential faith groups to meet Policy SC/4 objectives.

#### h) Provision for Burials

403. Local Plan Policy SC/4 requires developments to include provision for burials. Waterbeach cemetery is adjacent to the barracks entrance and has been extended under planning permission ref S/2770/16/F. The applicant has submitted further information to clarify its level of use and capacity in response to the concerns raised at public consultation stage.
404. The cemetery has been extended by 0.44 ha, which would provide up to 850 new plots. The figures used in application S/2770/16/F show a demand of up to 8 plots per annum for the existing cemetery over the last 5 years. Assuming the same take-up per population (and assuming the Parish population of 5,200 people) this would mean for 6,500 homes (18,200 people) additional demand for 10 plots and for 11,000 homes (30,800 people) 17 plots per annum. Overall this would mean capacity for 47 years for existing Waterbeach plus 6,500 dwellings or 34 years for existing Waterbeach plus 11,000 homes. This does not take into account the UK's increasing cremation rate, which rose from 34.7% in 1960 to 77.05% in 2017 (Cremation Society of Great Britain).
405. On the basis of the above assessment, the development would be adequately served by existing burial provision in the local area but should further provision be identified in future, the revised Development Specification allows for such

uses to come forward.

i) Community Development Workers and Early Development Collaborative Support

406. Policy SS/6(14) requires the new town proposals to include measures to assist the development of a new community, such as through community development workers.
407. The S106 Heads of Terms includes provision of a financial contribution of £400,000 towards a community development worker for 10 years, which has been reviewed and accepted by SCDC's community development officer. After this time period it is expected that a new community group or town council will be established. This total cost is expected to be shared with the adjoining owner with relevant pro-rata provisions set out within the S106 agreements.
408. Further provision of £1,870,757.00 is made towards early collaborative support, as per the request of Cambridgeshire County Council. This contribution is based on evidence from other settlements in the County, which show that new communities tend to have higher needs which will escalate quicker than in more established communities placing significant pressure on intensive public sector services. Much of the research into new towns has established clear links between loneliness, poor mental health and antisocial behaviours with a lack of community cohesion and social networks. Therefore, a S106 contribution is sought to mitigate these impacts through funding of a variety of professionals based on the ground whose work extends beyond the remit of a community development worker.
409. Depending on need this could be through the work of family workers, school liaison officers, adult learning courses, public health campaigns and commissioned services, traditional community development workers, housing association support, faith provision, community led-support groups & GP services. These various professionals and organisations (including voluntary and community) will help the community create a mechanism to build social capital which in turn will lead to better mental and physical health, higher educational attainment, better chances of employment and lower crime. If the anticipated need of the community does not transpire within 10 years of the first occupancy many elements of the funding will not be required and will be captured in the Key Phase viability review.
410. Subject to the proposed S106 contributions, the development is considered to accord with Policy SS/6(14).

j) Public Art

411. Local Plan Policy HQ/2 states that the Council will encourage the provision or commissioning of public art that is integrated into the design of development as a means of enhancing the quality of development proposals. The provision of public art must involve the local community and could be community-led.
412. Design Principle 8 of the Design and Access Statement Supplement states the

applicant's intention to use particular materials or public art as a means of commemorating the military heritage of the site. Other opportunities will exist for public art installations particularly at key civic spaces such as the town centre. The provision of quality visual arts and crafts as part of new developments can bring social, cultural, environmental, educational and economic benefits, both to new development and the local community. Given the aims of Policy HQ/2 and the aforementioned community benefits related to public art, it is considered appropriate to apply a condition seeking a public art strategy at design code stage, along with a public art delivery plan at reserved matters stage.

#### k) Waterbeach Museum and Memorial Garden

413. The specific commitment to providing built space for the existing museum is welcomed in the S106 Heads of Terms and the retention of the memorial garden in the runway parkland can be secured at design code stage. Whilst the Trustees of the Heritage Museum would prefer to see the current museum building retained in perpetuity, it will need to be assessed at detailed planning stage as to whether it is practical, economic and compatible with new development as per Spatial Principle 15 in the DAS Supplement. Ongoing stakeholder involvement regarding community buildings/uses is important and would be facilitated through pre-application consultation.

#### m) Governance

414. Paragraph 9.17 of Policy SC/4 recognises that the dual use of sports facilities and community spaces by the local community and the school population in village colleges is a successful part of the way of life in South Cambridgeshire that should be continued in new schools. Such sharing of facilities can assist in ensuring that a wider range of services is available to a community but is not necessary in this instance to mitigate the impacts of the development. Therefore any community access agreements would be sought outside of the recommended S106 agreement.
415. Overall within the new town there should be consideration given to community-led development and the management of community uses so that they can be retained for the benefit of the community in the long term, as advised by guiding principles 18 of the new town SPD. Such provisions are recommended to be included in the S106 agreement and continued engagement with the community and stakeholders sought through pre-application consultation.

#### n) Other Community Issues – Crime and Emergency Services

416. Concern has been raised during the consultation period in relation to how crime will be addressed in the new town and if new facilities for emergency services will be provided.
417. Designing out crime and creating an environment for people that is, and feels safe, is an objective of Policy HQ/1 (Design Principles) and would be addressed later on at detailed design stage and through design coding. The

consultation response from Cambridgeshire Constabulary confirms that no on-site policing facilities are sought at the new town. A new police station is to be located elsewhere (location to be determined) and a S106 financial contribution is sought towards this facility by the Constabulary but not evidenced or specified in the consultation response. This request does not accord with the Statutory tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (Regulation 122), which require S106 planning obligations to be: i) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; ii) directly related to the development and fairly and iii) reasonable related in scale and kind to the development.

418. No formal request has been made from any other emergency services (ambulance or fire services) requiring new facilities at the new town, although such uses could come forward over time through the proposed Key Phase approach and conditions.

### Conclusion

419. Subject to recommended conditions and S106 legal obligation, the development is found to accord with the social and community objectives of Policy SS/6 and SC/4 by providing a range of uses appropriate to the new town including community services and facilities and measures to assist the development of a new community and involve existing stakeholders.

## **7. Environmental Considerations**

### **Air Quality, Dust and Odour**

420. One of the objectives of Policy SS/6 (9f) is to ensure the new town has no significant adverse impact on local air quality and/or mitigate as necessary with a Low Emissions Scheme. Local Plan Policy SC/12 (Air Quality) requires there to be no significant adverse effects on health, the environment or amenity arising from existing poor air quality.
421. ES Chapter 10 (air quality) and its Addendum include computer modelling of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter concentrations arising from changes in road traffic levels predicted by the revised Transport Assessment, as well as a qualitative analysis of the likely effects arising from dust and finer particulate matter generated during construction. In addition, an odour assessment has been undertaken in relation to the operation of Amey Cespa Waste Management Park to the north west of the proposed development and the Waterbeach Water Recycling Centre to the east.

#### a) Air quality (road traffic, construction traffic and energy centres)

422. To date, SCDC has declared one Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) within the district due to exceedances of the annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective. This AQMA is located approximately 4.8 km south west of the application site. Similarly, in the proximity of the application site there is an AQMA declared by Cambridge City Council (CCC) (the centre of Cambridge) due to exceedances of the

annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective. This AQMA is located approximately 6.5 km south of the application site. The potential road traffic impacts on both AQMAs have been assessed by the applicant in the submitted ES Chapter 10.

423. ES Chapter 10 and its Addendum include information on measured NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations at all the local authority monitoring sites in the surroundings of the application site. Overall effects of development traffic on existing human health receptors are judged to be not significant as the predicted pollutants concentrations are well within the relevant air quality objectives. However, to further reduce the impacts, a site-wide Framework Travel Plan and Low Emissions Strategy have been developed and submitted.
424. The submitted Low Emission Strategies (LES) and Framework Travel Plan (FTP) provide a package of measures to help specifically mitigate the transport emissions impacts of the development as well as reduce car usage. The FTP includes targets to create reduce car usage from 54.2% in year 1 to 41.1% in year 20. This would be achieved through sustainable transport measures, incentives and supporting infrastructure discussed in the transport chapter of this committee report. This objective will be supported by an appointed Travel Plan coordinator, monitoring plan and provision of contingency measures to be agreed. Provision in the LES is also included for electric vehicle charging facilities for both residential and commercial properties across the site. The principle of these strategies is agreed by the Council's air quality officer and implementation of the proposed measures contained within the LES and FTP can be conditioned.
425. Emissions from the energy centre equipment would be controlled by the requirements of the Medium Combustion Plant Directive (EU 2015/2193) and appropriate stack heights would be selected to adequately disperse emissions. The exact equipment to be installed is unknown at present and would be fully assessed at detailed planning stage with relevant safeguarding conditions in relation to emissions and air quality.
426. Specific concern has been raised during the public consultation in relation to air quality levels at the first planned primary school to the north west of the site due to its proximity to the A10. Its approximate location, as shown on the revised Parameter Plan, is 100m from the west boundary with proposed intervening soft landscaping and an earth bund/fence boundary to the school to mitigate noise levels. As noted by the Council's air quality officer, assessment of the worst-case scenario with future dualling of the A10 shows that predicted concentrations for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and Particulate Matters (PM<sub>10</sub> PM<sub>2.5</sub>) meet both UK and World Health Organisation air quality health objectives at the school boundary, for the first phase of development (2021) and throughout the full development (2031). It is also worth noting that as the vast majority of the predicted PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations come from the background concentration, not from the road contribution, the re-location of the school elsewhere on the site would not significantly change concentration levels.
427. The recommended provision of air quality monitoring at the proposed school location can be secured within a holistic air quality monitoring scheme for the

site (to be conditioned). Further consideration of landscaping at the school boundary and the distance to the western boundary will be assessed later within the Key Phase design coding process (in consultation with the Council's air quality officer).

428. The Council's air quality officer recommends a planning condition to set emissions limits for all proposed combined heat & power (CHPs) and boilers. This can be agreed at detailed design stage.

#### b) Dust

429. ES Chapter 10 explains that the main cause of unmitigated dust generation from construction sites is from demolition and vehicles using unpaved haul roads, and off-site from the suspension of dust from mud deposited on local roads by construction traffic. Given the large scale of construction on the site there is a high potential for dust emission and therefore appropriate mitigation is required through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) condition, as agreed by the Council's environmental health officer. The air quality officer recommends construction dust monitoring to be undertaken during the construction period.
430. The CEMP would incorporate measures to limit dust and particulate matter generated during the construction of the proposed development, and therefore no significant effects on air quality are predicted.

#### c) Odour

431. ES Chapter 10 and its Addendum include assessment of odour impacts in relation to the operation of Amey Cespa Waste Management Park to the north west of the proposed development and the Waterbeach Water Recycling Centre to the east.
432. The Water Recycling Centre (WRC) is located approximately 450m to the east of the application site. The applicant's consultants have undertaken odour sniff tests in several locations in the vicinity of the site. The results indicate that under worst case odour generation conditions, no odour would be detectable along the eastern boundary of the application site. The odour source potential is concluded to be small, taking into account the scale of the WRC site, the unpleasantness of the odour, the prevailing wind conditions and the results of the sniff test.
433. Concerns have been raised in relation to odour impacts from the Amey Cespa Waste Management Park and additional odour surveys (received 2 October 2018) has been submitted by the applicant to improve the robustness of the Environmental Impact Assessment. The submitted report and additional surveys conclude that odour has a slight adverse effect which in EIA terms is 'not significant'. Reasons for this include the low frequencies of wind from the direction of the Waste Management Park and the distances involved. On this basis, it can be concluded that the development meets the objectives of Local Plan Policy SC/12 air quality, and new town Policy SS/6 (criterion 9e).

## Archaeology and Heritage

### a) Denny Abbey

434. There are no designated heritage assets within the application site boundary. Scheduled Monuments are located within 2km of the application site, at: Denny Abbey (less than 0.5 km to the north), the site of Waterbeach Abbey (to the south) and Car Dyke (sections to the north of the application site but not the Car Dyke drain within the site). There are five listed buildings (all Grade II) to the north and west but outside the Scheduled Denny Abbey area. There are other non-designated heritage assets within 2km of the site including Waterbeach Conservation Area.
435. Local Plan Policy SS/6 (1b) requires the new town SPD to set out a spatial framework having regard to maintaining an appropriate setting for Denny Abbey listed building and scheduled monument. The submitted revised plans show a change to the northern boundary of the built development area to reflect the Local Plan SS/6 allocated area and SPD spatial framework, establishing an open, green buffer ('Northern Park') to the south of Denny Abbey, consistent with comments received from Historic England. This setting area forms a key part in understanding the significance of Denny Abbey and how that significance is experienced but also minimising harm to what is at present a relatively isolated heritage site set within a Fenland landscape. To help restore a sense of separation and isolation the proposals include permeable tree planting within the green buffer zone. This is proposed to be planted in the first available season after the commencement of works (to be conditioned) and would eventually filter views, allowing protection of key views (e.g. from the Causeway) towards the heritage asset.
436. The proposed northern edge of built development is approximately 400m from Denny Abbey. Built development along this northern edge is proposed to be low density with maximum two storey heights shown on the revised Parameter Plan to respond sensitively to Denny Abbey's setting and adjoining Fenland landscape. However, Historic England has raised concern with proposed taller building heights of 4-6 storey shown in the revised Parameter Plan, which it says may result in an inappropriate level of height and density for a small fen-edge town. It goes on to suggest a 4-5 storeys with tall puncturing buildings being limited to six storeys, as at Northstowe.
437. These comments are acknowledged to have been submitted prior to the adoption of the Waterbeach New Town SPD, which supports higher density locations of up to 6 storeys towards the main centres of the new town with opportunities for select taller buildings to articulate the wider townscape (pages 70-71). The proposed locations of exceptional height (up to 8 storeys) are shown at these main centres on the revised Parameter Plan with a reduction in heights towards the northern Denny

Abbey buffer. Careful design of these taller buildings together with controls set out in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) Supplement design principles (to be conditioned) would limit any visual harm to Denny Abbey's setting and ensure a varied townscape and skyline.

438. Policy SS/6(7) restricts all built development to the Major Development Site (Adopted Policies Map Insert H) but permits land outside this area within the allocation site to provide other associated uses and mitigation including drainage, habitat compensation and informal open space. Spatial Principle 14 of the DAS Supplement is in conformity with this approach with proposals for drainage features and public open space to ensure a sensitive transition between built development and the setting area.
439. Spatial Principle 7 in the DAS Supplement states that a reinstated causeway link will be made between the barracks entrance and the northern edge of the site forming a continuous pedestrian/cycle route. The remaining link between the northern boundary of the application site and Denny Abbey would be on separate land ownership (related to RLW Estates) and can be sought via S106 agreement in outline application S/2075/18/OL for the adjoining eastern part of the new town. Reinstatement of a causeway link is supported in the Waterbeach New Town SPD (page 57) and would provide leisure routes for residents and sustainable travel modes to Denny Abbey.
440. In addition to the setting of Denny Abbey, concern has been raised by English Heritage in relation to increased visitor impacts arising from the new town. This concern stems from existing poor road access to Denny Abbey; security problems and ongoing financial viability of the site. It goes on to state that the development would significantly reduce the quality of experience that visitors would get and impact on their enjoyment and engagement with the site.
441. The visual impacts of the development have been assessed above and are not considered to undermine the viability of the heritage asset. The reinstatement of the causeway route would introduce sustainable travel modes to Denny Abbey, which could be facilitated by an informal parking area to the north of the new town and the creation of a heritage trail and footpath/cycle connections. This would help to mitigate visitor impacts on parking and access at Denny Abbey and can be steered through a heritage strategy (to be conditioned). Security concerns have been raised by English Heritage but no specific projects identified. Whilst security is raised as a concern there is no evidence to suggest this aspect would undermine the viability of the heritage asset. Further, the proposals would generate extra patronage to the site through which visitor enhancements could be funded. The proposal is therefore not found to undermine the viability of Denny Abbey and Farmland Museum.
442. In summary, the proposed development would result in some harm to the setting of Denny Abbey through visual impact and the reduced sense of

separation and isolation that the heritage asset currently benefits from. However, the harm is considered less than substantial given the parameters of the development and the aforementioned mitigation measures. In accordance with the test set out in paragraph 196 of the NPPF, the significant public benefits of the development (summarised at the end of this report) are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm in this instance.

#### b) Scheduled Monuments

443. Scheduled Monuments are located within 2km of the application site, at: Denny Abbey (less than 0.5 km to the north), the site of Waterbeach Abbey (to the south) and Car Dyke Roman Canal (sections to the north of the application site but not the Car Dyke drain within the site). The ES concludes that the distance and separation to these sites from the proposed development would rule out any significant effects from construction activities or built development, which is accepted.

#### c) Surrounding listed buildings, structures and conservation areas

444. There are five listed buildings (all Grade II) to the north and west of the site (outside the Scheduled Denny Abbey area) including Landbeach Parish Church (Grade I). Listed milestones and Denny Abbey gate piers are located along the A10 and conservation areas can be found with Landbeach and Waterbeach villages.
445. As mentioned in the ES Chapter 7, most of the impacts on the above listed buildings or structures would be successfully mitigated by the location of strategic open space and limited building heights set out in the revised parameter plans, the distance and separation to the development site and/or intervening screening and planting.
446. Glimpsed views of Waterbeach Conservation Area boundary to the proposed development may be possible, although unlikely given the intervening development and vegetation. The immediate setting of the conservation area to the north has already changed significantly given the extent of development that has already been undertaken immediately surrounding the conservation area boundary, and along the northern approach from the west (Denny End Road). This includes development within the application site itself. The approach from Clayhithe to the east will remain unchanged.
447. Provision has been made in the application to ensure that the identity of Waterbeach village is maintained. The retention of open space along the southern boundary and at the former MOD main entrance will help to mitigate impacts, together with the maximum two storey heights proposed across the southern boundary of the site and strategic open space to the south western area. The main access points to the application site would be from the A10 away from the conservation area.

#### d) Non designated heritage assets and archaeology

448. Within the site there are non-designated archaeological features of interest: a remnant of the causeway that connected Waterbeach village to Denny Abbey; a drain/ditch which follows the alignment of the Car Dyke; and Soldiers Hill (an earthworks feature). The World War II structures and buildings are also assessed for their historic and cultural association. The archaeological assessment has identified three areas of dense Roman archaeology indicating Roman settlement activity on site.
449. ES Chapter 7 on Cultural Heritage concludes low to moderate impacts on each of the above assets before and after construction. Successful mitigation of these impacts includes the following:
- i. Retention of a length of the Causeway as part of the green infrastructure;
  - ii. Incorporation of runway into spatial characteristics of built and green infrastructure (SP15 of the DAS Supplement);
  - iii. Incorporation of gridded pattern to former MOD development into new built form (SP15 of the DAS Supplement);
  - iv. Retention of open space to the entrance to the former MOD site to retain campus character and buffer to Waterbeach Village (shown on Parameter Plan);
  - v. Retention of existing woodland and vegetation to maintain vegetated skyline and provide visual screening; retention of trees and vegetation to be removed as part of the proposed development for as long as reasonably possible during the course of construction (shown on Parameter Plan but also controlled through detailed phase approval and subsequent Tree Retention Plans)
  - vi. Retention of the existing bund and Car Dyke ditch along the western application site boundary in a green buffer of strategic open space (shown on Parameter Plan);
  - vii. Key transport links taken from A10 (shown on Parameter Plan); and
  - viii. Incorporation of strategic open space along the western section of the southern boundary to the application site (shown on Parameter Plan)
  - ix. Full building recording report for the barracks structures (to be conditioned)
450. In addition to the known features of Car Dyke, Soldiers Hill and the Causeway, the level of archaeological remains identified during the applicant's trial trench evaluation necessitates a mitigation strategy for their preservation, either in situ or by record (i.e. open area of archaeological excavation). This can be secured by condition as

recommended by the County Council's archaeology team. Soldiers Hill and the Causeway are within an area of proposed strategic open space to ensure their retention and that of their setting.

451. Spatial Principle 15 of the DAS Supplement includes provision for retention of some existing barracks buildings which make a contribution to character and where it is practical, economic and compatible with the new development. A condition is recommended to ensure no demolition of the barracks buildings takes place in advance of the relevant agreed Key Phase for the barracks area and a corresponding plan identifying retained buildings. This approach would accord with guiding principle 8 of the SPD and would ensure the proposal does not result in unjustified loss of non-designated heritage assets in accordance with paragraph 197 of the NPPF. A condition to secure full building recording of the barracks buildings and structures is recommended, as required by paragraph 199 of the NPPF.

#### e) Conclusion

452. Based on the above assessment and recommended conditions, the development is considered to accord with cultural heritage objectives set out in the Local Plan policies, Waterbeach New Town SPD, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the NPPF.

#### **Biodiversity**

453. Local Plan Policy NH/4 states that development proposals will be permitted where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity. Opportunities should be taken to achieve positive gain through the form and design of development. Applicants will be expected to provide an adequate level of survey information and site assessment to establish the extent of a biodiversity impact. Previously developed land (brownfield sites) will not be considered to be devoid of biodiversity. Development proposals on such sites will be expected to include measures that maintain and enhance important features and appropriately incorporate them within any development of the site.
454. Alongside this, Policy NH/6 encourages proposals which create new green infrastructure and enhance public enjoyment of it. All new developments will be required to contribute towards the enhancement of the green infrastructure network within the district.
455. Specifically, the new town is required under Policy SS/6 to provide a high degree of connectivity to existing corridors and networks; create and retain woods, hedges, and water features which would contribute to the character and amenity of the town and help preserve and enhance the setting of Denny Abbey, managed to enhance their ecological value; and consider the multifunctional value of spaces, e.g. amenity, landscape, biodiversity, recreation and drainage. Land outside the Major Development Site can provide other associated uses and mitigation

including drainage, habitat compensation and informal open space (Policy SS/6).

456. Section 6 of the SPD (p.52) guides delivery of a green infrastructure network within the new town, which responds to the site's existing natural and man-made assets as well as delivering integrated benefits for biodiversity, flood prevention, climate change adaptation, play, movement and health and wellbeing. Strategic landscape areas are set out in the SPD spatial framework at the following locations in the application site:
- the north park (Denny Abbey buffer zone)
  - runway park
  - south park
  - Snake Pit area
457. Guidance is also contained within the SPD on the provision of greenways and corridors. The overarching aim is to connect and integrate strategic open spaces within the new town and the surrounding countryside. Seven strategic green corridors are identified within the SPD, which perform several functions including safeguarding and enhancing ecological corridors.
458. The SPD requires applications to be accompanied by a landscape and ecology management plan (LEMP), which sets out how impacts on existing and newly created habitats will be mitigated and managed.
459. Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement, and the submitted addendum (May 2018), provide assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed development in relation to ecology and nature conservation. Supporting information is also submitted in the form of a Biodiversity Strategy and Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy. The Biodiversity Strategy provides a framework to guide and inform the preparation of subsequent, more detailed applications and ensure a net gain in biodiversity can be achieved within the application site over time. The document identifies specific biodiversity aims, principles and objectives that support the aims of the proposed Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy for the site. The Biodiversity and GI Strategies aim to ensure an integrated approach to development is taken with respect to landscape, ecology, open space and play, climate change adaptation, biodiversity and connectivity, in order to create a successful multi-functional green infrastructure. An addendum has been submitted to the GI Strategy, which takes account of a number of changes which have emerged from the consultation process.

#### Existing site biodiversity

460. The site itself comprises a built-up barracks area of buildings and associated hardstanding and landscape, a large central airfield comprising grasslands, woodland blocks and waterbodies, a number of agricultural fields and a former golf course.

461. The applicant carried out a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal in 2015; this included a desk study and Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys. More detailed Phase II surveys in respect of great crested newt (GCN), reptiles, roosting bats, foraging and commuting bats, breeding birds, wintering birds, water vole, otter, badger, botanical assessments and invertebrates were undertaken during the 2015 and 2016 survey seasons. Further bat, badger and winter bird surveys were undertaken in 2017 and 2018 following the advice of the Council's ecologist.
462. The ecological assessments conclude that the site supports or has potential to support a number of protected and notable species, including bats, badgers, nesting birds, hedgehogs, reptiles and great crested newt. A single grassland compartment within the airfield conforms to the UK Priority Habitat Description: Unimproved Neutral Grassland and is considered to be a high quality example of this UK priority habitat type. A number of woodland blocks and native hedgerows are considered to conform to the UK Priority Habitat Description of Broadleaved Woodland and Native Hedgerows respectively; however, these are not considered high-quality examples. Furthermore, a number of waterbodies within the site, although of generally limited quality, are considered to conform to qualifying criteria as the UK Priority Habitat: Ponds for supporting the protected species and UK Priority species (great crested newt and common toad respectively). None of the other habitats on site are considered to be high quality examples of UK Priority Habitats.
463. ES Chapter 6 confirms that there are no statutory designations on the application site relating to biodiversity. Such designated sites are located at Wicken Fen (SAC/SSSI and NNR), Cam Washes (SSSI) and Stow Cum Quy Fen (SSSI). Their approximate distance to the site is as follows:

Wicken Fen – 4.6km north east of site  
Cam Washes – 2.7km north east of site  
Stow Cum Quy Fen – 3.3km south east of site

Other non-statutory designated sites (County Wildlife Sites) are located as follows:

Beach Ditch & Engine Drain – 0.5km north west of site  
Landbeach Pits Woodland Wood – 0.5km north west of site  
Cambridge Road Willow Pollards – 1km south of site

### Impact, mitigation and enhancement

#### a) Application site

464. The Council's ecologist concludes that no further ecological surveys are necessary to determine the outline application. Species surveys such as bats and great crested newts have been completed; other species such

as hedgehog and non-native invasive species have not been completed, although, provision is made for their safeguarding (hedgehogs) and irradiation (invasive species) should the need arise within the submitted Biodiversity Strategy.

465. Concern has been raised in the consultation responses that not enough consideration had been given to the extent of cumulative impact in the ES. However, the ES Chapter 6 Addendum document has provided a re-written section 6.8 (paragraphs 6.8.1 – 6.8.5), which includes a more in-depth evaluation of cumulative effects including the adjacent proposal for 4500 dwellings (RLW Estates). The breadth of the analysis and the conclusions drawn are considered sensible.
466. The applicant has submitted both a Green Infrastructure Strategy Addendum to which section 1.2 is an abridged Biodiversity Strategy, and the full Biodiversity Strategy which provides explicit detail of how both species and retained habitats will be protected during construction, the process of securing protected species licences as and when they are necessary, and post construction mitigation, habitat creation and compensation. The combination of these documents provides a suitable framework to reduce and remove the risk of legislative conflict and provide suitably designed habitat (both retained and created).
467. At a high level the main approach behind the Biodiversity Strategy is the retention of key existing habitat mosaic areas, identified as Biodiversity Priority Areas in the baseline, which form the basis of three north-south wildlife corridors:
- western bund and Car Dyke comprising grasslands and linear watercourse ecosystems, open water and wetlands,
  - lake and runway comprising open water, grassland and scrub ecosystems,
  - former golf course comprising wetland ecosystems.
468. These north-south corridors are linked along the northern extent of the site by an east-west wildlife corridor forming part of the northern buffer, comprising grassland and parkland habitats. A finer grain level of biodiversity connectivity is provided by a network of green links, connecting internal stepping stones such as woodland ecosystems, productive landscapes, hedgerows, wildlife friendly amenity space and school playing fields, to the strategic wildlife corridors. The precise detail of these areas and potential mitigation actions can be scrutinised at detailed design stage.
469. Beyond the site, wildlife corridors connect with surrounding arable land, to the north and east, in the short term. In the long term, opportunities exist to connect with future wildlife corridors associated with Bannold Drove to the east and Denny Abbey to the north. Additionally, proposed enhancements to the ecological value of Car Dyke and the creation of wetland ecosystems in the north west extent of the site provide

opportunities for connectivity with existing water bodies in Cambridge Research Park.

470. Paragraph 170 of the NPPF requires planning decisions to minimise impacts on and provide net gains for biodiversity including the establishment of coherent ecological networks. This objective is also reflected in Local Plan Policy NH/4. In response, the applicant has submitted the results of a Biodiversity Impact Assessment within section 3.1 of the Green Infrastructure Strategy Addendum. The results of the calculation show that an additional 24.72 biodiversity units (as calculated by DEFRA's Biodiversity Impact Assessment Calculator) would be created within mitigation areas. Linear biodiversity values are calculated separately and show a 94% gain in biodiversity units. As a consequence, the development does accord with the aforementioned biodiversity objectives in local and national planning policy. Conditions are recommended to secure the submission of cumulative biodiversity calculations at future reserved matters stage to ensure the commitment to net gain is fulfilled throughout the development.
471. The Council's ecological officer has recommended a condition to secure green, brown and blue roofs to enhance ecological interests, which can be secured at detailed planning stage.

b) Wicken Fen SSSI/Ramsar

472. Natural England has advised that the development has the potential to have adverse effects on the integrity of Wicken Fen SSSI/Ramsar through the effects of changes in water quality (addressed in drainage section of this report) and increased recreational pressure. It goes on to request evidence that the development can deliver net biodiversity gain in a landscape scale context to mitigate the residual effects of increased recreational pressure on Wicken Fen. The National Trust reiterates this concern and highlights the vulnerability of the fen vegetation to trampling damage by human footfall and potential disturbance of wintering and breeding birdlife by walkers and their dogs. In their original comments, the National Trust advises the applicant to carry out an evaluation of the recreational visits to Wicken Fen and the wider Wicken Vision areas such as Burwell Fen before concluding potential environmental effects in the Environmental Statement.
473. The ES Chapter 6 Addendum has offered further analysis of possible increased visitor effects on Wicken Fen. This has been informed by National Trust's data on visitor numbers originating from Waterbeach Village. The predicted additional yearly visits attributed to this development amounts to 580 visitors equating to 0.9% of total visitor numbers for 2016/17. However, the National Trust data is limited and derives from Trust member visits recorded at the main entry point only and does not account for non-member visits and other public entry points to the site. Therefore, whilst the total visitor number arising from the development is likely to be higher than 0.9%, it would still remain

relatively small in proportion to the total visitor numbers to the point where attributing clear and significant harm would be difficult to reason.

474. The approximate distance to Wicken Fen by foot (starting from the Denny Road access lane) on official public rights of way is 9.9 km, a route largely constrained by available crossings over the River Cam. As such, the vast majority of potential visitors from the site will be via car. Parking availability at Wicken Fen is chargeable for non-members, as is entry. The closest available official parking for Wicken Fen to the Denny End Road access point of the application site is approximately 17.7 km (18 minutes drive) away; since this car park is limited in size, the number of visitors will continue to be constrained by the size of this car park, as is the current situation.
475. The applicant's ES Chapter 6 highlights that many studies have been undertaken in relation to increased footfall to European Designated sites (e.g. Footprint Ecology, 2014). Although these may vary from site to site the general conclusions are that visitor rates rapidly decline with increasing distance, typically falling off between 3 and 5 km. Therefore, Wicken Fen is towards the higher end of distances that people will travel regularly in order to visit a site. Importantly, the proposed development aims to meet its own recreational needs with 43% of the land use at the application site be offered up as open space including formal and informal recreation areas. This includes lake side amenities, sports pitches, formal parks, trails and cycle paths integrated within nature conservation corridors (e.g. the western boundary) and the northern habitat area. It is therefore highly likely that the majority of new residents associated with the development would predominately use on site facilities on a regular basis, such as recreation, general exercise and dog walking rather than relying on Wicken Fen.
476. It is noted that the National Trust already manages surrounding growth access to areas sensitive to footfall and is developing a long-term plan to overcome the existing management challenge of removing visitor pressure from the SSSI to areas of lower sensitivity within the Wider Fen Vision area. It is therefore dependent on attracting revenue to support further land acquisition and management, which the additional patronage from the development would support.
477. In further comments, submitted 25 July, the National Trust requested specific S106 monies from the strategic site towards monitoring and mitigation of visitor impacts at Wicken Fen as follows:
- i) £35,000 – upgrade of footpath and boardwalk (100m in total) with the ability to reallocate any surplus money towards unforeseen impacts or potentially to contribute to visitor related viewing facilities or interpretation projects, which would enhance the visitor experience.
  - ii) £30,000 – monitoring and surveys of visitor impacts including two repeat surveys

478. As mentioned before, no adverse or significant harm has been identified at Wicken Fen resulting from the recreational pressures of the development given the distance between the two sites and the level of green infrastructure afforded to new residents at the application site. Whilst the development would result in some additional visitors at Wicken Fen, proportionally this number would be low and the phased build out of the new town would mean that increases in visitor numbers would rise steadily to facilitate ongoing, planned management, monitoring and mitigation of Wicken Fen carried out by the National Trust.

#### c) Cam Washes

479. Natural England raises concerns regarding the increase of visitor pressure at the Cam Washes SSSI and specifically disturbance to nesting birds from uncontrolled access and dogs off-lead. Despite the scale of accessible on-site open space, Natural England is of the view that this provision is insufficient to rule out residual impacts on the Cam Washes SSSI. Natural England goes on to say that it is investing considerable resource in conjunction with landowners within and surrounding the SSSI to implement Higher Level Stewardships measures to safeguard and enhance conditions for the notified breeding bird interest of the Cam Washes SSSI. It recommends that the applicant carries out a detailed visitor impact study and makes financial contributions towards the following:

480. Access management (and associated enhancement work):

- c19ha wash, centrepnt @ OS Grid Ref TL529 692 – creation of 1000m x 5m wide perimeter dyke (parallel but offset from riverside PROW), creation 500m x 5m internal dykes/gutters. Carting of spoil within site to create low-lying ‘islands’ within waterbody / spread thinly within agreed areas / placed against floodbank.
- c10.5ha wash, centrepnt @ OS Grid Ref TL528 683 – widening & where required, deepening of existing 800m perimeter dyke (recently created as part of an agri-env agreement). Carting of spoil within site to create low-lying ‘islands’ within waterbody / spread thinly within agreed areas / placed against floodbank.
- Estimated cost of excavating 2300m x 5m dykes & handling spoil on site = **£32,200**

481. Habitat creation within the SSSI (to improve resilience) or off site (to create alternative habitat to support SSSI birds)

- creation of c2ha scrape which may be partly within appropriate / agreed areas of the above SSSI washes or partly / wholly within nearby c14ha riverside site at Clayhithe. The latter would build upon work previously completed under an agri-environment agreement and could provide habitat that supports the SSSI’s notified breeding bird interest. Importantly, this site is set back from public rights of way.

- Estimated cost of 2ha scrape & appropriate handling of spoil = **£56,000**

481. The applicant has responded to these concerns and is of the view that a large increase in visitor footfall to the SSSIs of Cam Washes and the Wicken Fen Vision Area due to this development is considered highly unlikely:

“The sites are too far away from the proposed development to accommodate the vast majority of leisure walks that would be undertaken by residents of the new development. When residents make the decision to travel to a leisure walk destination by car, it is considered that there are other choices of venue, notably Milton Country Park, that are closer and/or have better parking, facilities and dog-walking terrain than the SSSI sites. While the proposed development may have a very small impact on visitor numbers to the sensitive sites in the local area, this needs to be considered within the wider context of all the housing development planned within a typical journey radius of these sites. Reserve managers will be making changes to their education programmes, warden numbers and infrastructure to account for this overall growth in population and visitor impact (as verified in the National Trusts vision for the area). The developer is willing to support reserve managers in these efforts where appropriate.”

482. The applicant concludes that the proposed scheme is likely to have a positive impact on sensitive sites by providing alternative local routes and accessible green space tailored to users specific needs (e.g. play areas, sports facilities, specifically designed and facilitated dog walking loops and demarcated perimeter walks), which will contribute to a reduction in visitor pressure on these sites.

483. The applicant’s Drawing BMD.15.001.DRE.9146 illustrates the available routes and associated distances via roads, Public Rights of Way and other tracks between the site and the Cam Washes SSSI. The nearest access point is 4.5 km, approx. 55 minutes’ walk and a circular walk (starting in the south-east corner of the proposed development) of approximately 14 km, or 2.75 hours). This route requires users to walk on roads without footways for approximately half a kilometre and is only likely to be taken infrequently and by a very small minority of residents. As previously discussed, the higher risk category of visitors (short leisure walks and dog walking) would be adequately provided for within the development, which will cater for the majority of residents seeking such activities, thus reducing trips to other sites in the locality. On this basis, no adverse or significant harm is identified at Cam Washes SSSI given the distance between the two sites and the level of green infrastructure afforded to new residents at the application site.

#### d) Other Issues

484. Consultees have raised concern of flood risk/wastewater impacts on statutory designated sites including the River Cam and surrounding

SSSIs. The impacts of the development in this regard have been assessed and can be satisfactorily safeguarded by planning condition, as explained in the separate section of this report titled 'Drainage and Flooding'.

### Conclusion

485. Based on the above assessment, the submitted documentation and recommended conditions, the development is considered to accord with ecological objectives set out in the Local Plan policies, Waterbeach new town SPD and the NPPF.

### **Contamination and Unexploded Ordnance**

486. Local Plan Policies SS/6 (15a&b) and SC/11 require developers to undertake site wide investigation and assessment of land contamination to ensure the land is suitable for the proposed end use and is not presenting a risk to the environment. It also requires all ordnance to be removed from the site in ways that ensure the development can take place without unacceptable risk to workers and neighbours including major disruption to the wider public off site.
487. The applicant has submitted an assessment of ground conditions in ES Chapter 13. These have been assessed in relation to geology, geodiversity, ground stability and land contamination both during construction and following completion. This includes an assessment of effects on water quality, mineral sterilisation and potential for re-use of site won material, risks associated with unexploded ordnance (UXO), radioactivity and historical land uses. The investigations identify potential sources of contamination associated with previous land uses including fuel stores, ammunition dumps, burned areas, incinerators and storage of hazardous substances. This has led to some localised contamination of soil and water including heavy metals, hydrocarbons, organic and inorganic compounds.
488. Both the construction stage and post-completion stage would, if not mitigated, give rise to adverse effects ranging from minor to major level of significance. A range of mitigation measures are proposed to be implemented throughout the construction of the scheme including further detailed ground investigations and risk assessment (including unexploded ordnance) and the implementation of measures through Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMPs), including potential for re-use of excavated minerals.
489. Post-mitigation residual impacts are judged to reduce to 'negligible' post-mitigation for a number of issues. Locally, where contamination is present in the soil and groundwater, remediation work implemented ahead of development would result in improvements to soil, groundwater and surface water quality both on site and locally resulting in localised beneficial effects. All remediation works can be addressed by condition along with the recommendations of the Council's contamination officer regarding a site-wide strategy to deal with UXOs.

## Conclusion

490. Based on the above assessment and ES Chapter 13 the development is considered to accord with environmental objectives set out in the Local Plan policies, Waterbeach new town SPD and the NPPF.

## **Drainage and Flood Risk**

491. Policy SS/6(13) requires the new town to make appropriate arrangements for foul drainage and sewerage disposal together with provision and management of sustainable surface water drainage measures to reduce the risk of flooding. In general, sites of over 1ha size must be accompanied by specific Flood Risk Assessments appropriate to the scale and nature of the development and the risks involved, and which takes account of future climate change (Policy CC/9).

## Surface Water and Flood Risk

492. The site lies, for the large part, within the lowest defined flood risk area (Flood Zone 1 - less than 1 in 1,000 annual risk). A small area in the north-west adjacent to the A10 roundabout is within Flood Zone 2 (between 1 in 1000 and 1 in 100 annual risk). Surface water runoff rates are to be restricted to below existing runoff rates with an agreed limiting discharge of 1.1 l/s ha as confirmed in the submitted Surface Water Drainage Strategy and Addendum. This provides betterment when compared to the existing runoff generated by the site and aligns with the requirements of the Internal Drainage Board.

493. ES Chapter 12 and the accompanying Flood Risk Assessment (and Addendums) demonstrate that proposed surface water attenuation at the site would accommodate the 1 in 100 annual probability storm event, plus an allowance for 40% climate change increase in rainfall intensity (as agreed with the Environment Agency).

494. The updated analysis in the FRA Addendum addresses the concerns raised by the Environment Agency in earlier consultation and demonstrates that:

- The potential impacts of climate change may lead to a small part of the area currently within Flood Zone 2 increasing in flood risk to Flood Zone 3. The area at increased risk of flooding is allocated for green space and drainage and will have no other development within it.
- The residual risks of flooding in more extreme events will be mitigated by raising finished floor levels to a minimum of 300 mm freeboard above the design flood level.
- The potential impacts of blockage and siltation on flood risk will be managed through a regime of regular maintenance undertaken by the Waterbeach Internal Drainage Board (IDB).
- These mitigation measures will allow the development to remain safe for its lifetime with no detrimental impacts on flood risk elsewhere.

495. Sustainable drainage systems will need to be adopted by a body responsible for management and maintenance of these areas (to be agreed by condition ). At the construction stage, significant effects on the quality of surface water and groundwater would be avoided by measures in the Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMPs) to be agreed by condition. Overall, the concerns/objectives of the Local Lead Flood Authority, Environment Agency and the Council's drainage officer with regard to surface water drainage and flooding can be addressed by conditions recommended at the end of this report.

#### b) Foul Water Drainage

496. The foul drainage from this proposed development is in the catchment of the Waterbeach Water Recycling Centre (WRC), which does not have the capacity to treat all the flows from the proposed or cumulative development. Strategic group meetings have been attended by Anglian Water, Urban & Civic, RLW Estates, Environment Agency and SCDC officers to consider the foul drainage strategy for the strategic site.

497. The submitted Utility and Physical Infrastructure Report Addendum (October 2018) confirms that there is capacity at the foul water network to the west of the A10 at the Cambridge Research Park to serve up to approximately 964 dwellings. In addition, Anglian Water has confirmed that there is capacity at the existing Waterbeach WRC for 500 units and existing commitments. From 2021, the permit at the existing Waterbeach WRC will be varied to enable foul water treatment for an additional 750 properties. This will be achieved by diverting the discharge from the existing WRC to the River Cam. New capacity will be required beyond this point to serve the new town but would provide sufficient headroom (1714 dwellings) to serve the early phases of development.

498. A new WRC is scheduled by Anglian Water to be operational by 2024 and flows from the new town will be re-directed to this WRC. To support the timely delivery of the new Waterbeach WRC, Urban and Civic and RLW Estates have signed a Letter of Underwriting (LOU) in December 2017. This LOU underwrites the detailed design costs Anglian Water incurs for producing the detailed design for the new Waterbeach WRC and allows the process to be started so that delivery dates may be achieved.

499. The Environment Agency has objected to the application as the proposal is not served by adequate or determinate wastewater infrastructure and therefore poses an unacceptable risk to water quality and may increase flood risk to nearby communities. It requires further assessment of environmental effects for the preferred wastewater option and in the selection and assessment of alternative fall-back options.

500. The position of the new WRC is yet to be confirmed, as it is subject to a site selection process. The conclusion of the 2014 Water Cycle Strategy was that the new facility would be located east of the railway line, between the railway line and the river Cam. However, it is recognised that the final position of the relocated WRC may not be restricted to this area and would be subject to a site sequential test and separate EIA testing to be determined by Cambridgeshire County Council as the Minerals and Waste authority. Therefore, it is not possible at this stage to specify a project or scheme for the purposes of Environmental Impact Assessment.

501. Anglian Water has a duty under S94 of the Water Industry Act 1991 to ensure an effective foul water drainage strategy for the development and the most feasible alternative fall-back option for Anglian Water would be to direct foul water flows to the existing Cambridge Waste Water Recycling Centre at Milton (operated by Anglian Water). This may require some increased pump storage and capacity to deliver the effluent to the Milton WRC. Whilst the details of this are not known in this application, if any significant additional infrastructure is required this would need to be applied for as a waste development to Cambridgeshire County Council and any significant environmental impacts assessed at that time. On this basis a positive recommendation can be made on this outline application with regard to foul water drainage because any infrastructure proposals put forward by Anglian Water would be subject to a separate and robust assessment process. Importantly, the intermediate capacity available allows time for all parties to work together on the next stage solution rather than make broad assumptions about what may or may not be the preferred solution.

### Conclusion

502. The outline strategy, demonstrated as part of the original outline application, concludes that a suitable surface water drainage scheme can be accommodated within the indicative masterplan layout. The flood risk assessment confirms that residual risks of flooding in more extreme events can be mitigated taking into account climate change. These mitigation measures will allow the development to remain safe for its lifetime with no detrimental impacts on flood risk elsewhere. Foul water drainage capacity is available to serve the early phases of development and despite the objection of the Environment Agency, a separate and robust assessment process will determine where the new WRC will be located or what the fall-back option will be to rule out significant environmental effects. Subject to recommended conditions the proposal accords with Policies CC/9 and SS/6

### **Health Impact Assessment (HIA)**

503. Policy SC/2 of the Local Plan requires the submission of a Health Impact Assessment to consider the positive and negative impacts of

development on the health of different groups in the population, in order to enhance the benefits and minimise any risks to health.

504. The submitted HIA has been supplemented by an addendum (May 2018) to address comments made by SCDC / County Council on the original HIA and to assess the implications of the revisions to the application on the HIA. Based on the baseline character of the local area and likely composition of new residents the following vulnerable groups are identified:

- Children
- People without access to a car in the daytime, including those on lower incomes, stay at home parents, those who are unable to drive due to disability, younger people
- Older residents, especially in the existing Waterbeach community
- Those on lower incomes

505. A list of 53 health and wellbeing objectives have been set out in the HIA to minimise any potential negative health impacts and maximise potential positive health impacts, referencing where possible the most affected vulnerable group(s). The proposed committed measures are found acceptable by County Council and SCDC health specialists and can be secured by appropriate planning conditions and provisions within the S106 agreement. Consequently, the proposal would accord the health and wellbeing objectives set out in Local Plan Policy SC/2 and the Health Impact Assessment SPD.

## **Landscape, Trees and Lighting**

### **a) Landscape Impacts**

506. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF requires developments to be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities). Proposals should also be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping. This is reflected in Policy SS/6, which requires the new town to reflect a high quality development responding to local character, but also with its own identity.

507. ES Chapter 5 and its addendum identify and describe the nature and significance of the effects likely to arise as a result of the proposed development on the existing landscape and visual amenity.

508. Natural England has divided England into 159 distinct areas

referred to as National Character Areas (NCA's). The application site falls within two of these: the Fens and Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands. The Fens lie to the east and north of the application site with a very small eastern section of the site falling within the character area. It is generally described as comprising expansive, flat, open, low-lying wetland landscape; woodland cover is sparse, notably a few small woodland blocks; and the landscape pattern is geometric/rectilinear.

509. The majority of the site however falls within the Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands, which are characterised as: gently undulating, lowland plateaus divided by shallow river valleys; variable, scattered woodlands; settlements clustered around major road and rail corridors, with smaller town, villages and linear settlements widely dispersed throughout.
510. The Landscape Visual Impact Assessment, which forms part of the ES, includes an assessment of the proposed landscape impacts. To do this it has modelled digitally those areas of the landscape that theoretically would be visually connected to the development. It also includes representative photomontages of the development from surrounding public viewpoints and illustrated 'wirelines' showing the different height parameters.
511. It is important at this point to note that the ES does not anticipate the need for significant land level raising at the application site for drainage, flooding or other reasons. The site is broadly flat, mostly within 3m-6m AOD, although there is a high spot of circa 10.5m (a mound north of the lake). The submitted Flood Risk Assessment recommends finished floor levels of 300mm above estimated flood levels in more extreme rainfall events and ES Chapter 5 has had regard to a potential variance in finished floor levels of up to 1.5m from existing ground levels (AOD), as shown on the revised Parameter Plan.
512. The Council's landscape consultant has reviewed the landscape assessment and is of the view that the extent of 4-6 storey development has potential to be a noticeable and extensive feature in the landscape from commencement of development. This would be notable in views from the south west from the Tithe Barn and Green End in Landbeach (Views 13 & 14). In terms of this latter point, the development would be set beyond the western boundary landscaped buffer and would therefore be filtered to a degree; however a restricted use of 4 storeys solely at gateway locations would be more appropriate. The applicant has accordingly amended the DAS Supplement (SP10.1) to guide future design codes and ensure a 'curtain wall' of development is avoided in this location and to encourage the building line, height, mass and form to be carefully designed to create a varied and graduated edge. At the same time the development should not be hidden or entirely inward facing and therefore an element of 4 storey height along this boundary is supported in line with the objective of Policy SS/6 requiring the new town to have its own identity.

513. Officers have given considerable thought to the extent of 4-6 storey development shown on the amended Parameter Plan. On the one hand, the taller height parameters would provide ample opportunity and flexibility for landmark buildings and higher densities to be located within the townscape and evolve with the detailed masterplanning and design code process. On the other hand, this generous parameter could result in undesirable design and landscape impacts with continuous tall building heights, unbroken rooflines and poor mitigation of mass and height. To address this, Section 4.3 of the DAS Supplement sets out principles and concepts that would guide future design codes in mitigating mass and height in the development. Design Principles 12, 13 and 14 stipulate that the development would:

- Ensure the creation of varied townscape and skyline and not result in a predominantly, continuous unbroken roofline at the maximum height
- Explore opportunities through the design code to introduce landmark and gateway buildings at appropriate locations either in clusters of taller buildings or on the perimeter of the site visible to visitors or those passing
- Concentrate density in and around public transport nodes and within centres with generous areas of public open space sited alongside higher density development.
- Density will correspond to the varied characteristics of the development and the site (relating in part to landscape and topography) and include a range of housing typologies, including apartments and houses of varied sizes

514. Prominence would therefore be given to buildings in key locations, such as on the lakeside, around the runway parklands and around the town centre where taller buildings would create visual landmarks and aid legibility. However, mostly notably, the density/height 'heat map' included within the DAS Supplement (p.45) demonstrates that the full compliment of 6500 homes would not require long expanses of 4-6 storey buildings, with the majority of the site being 2-4 storey in keeping with Cambridgeshire.

515. In views from the east (Views 8iii and 12ii), the extent of 4-6 storey development is extensive; however it is acknowledged that development in this location would adjoin the RLW site, which would be seen in the foreground and would obscure the DIO/U&C proposals. The need to ensure coordination between the two schemes and ongoing testing of views as the schemes evolve is therefore particularly important and can be carefully managed through design codes and steering groups such as the Planning Delivery Group.

516. View 17 from Denny Abbey Causeway and View 18 from Ely

Road/Denny Abbey entrance help to show how the proposed building heights and extent of development relate to Denny Abbey. The increased width of open space buffer immediately south of Denny Abbey is welcomed. Although this buffer reduces in width to the northwest corner of the site closest to View 18, the 4-6 storey development height would be set behind a foreground of lower, two storey height buildings and viewed from Denny Abbey against the wider townscape context.

517. A condition is recommended to agree the aforementioned Design and Spatial Principles set out in the DAS Supplement in order to guide future design codes. In addition it is considered reasonable to apply a pre-commencement condition to agree details of existing and proposed site levels, land profiling, associated land drainage works and strategic landscape elements. Subject to these conditions, the development is considered to satisfactorily mitigate its landscape impacts and provide high quality design in accordance with the objectives of Policy SS/6, Waterbeach New Town SPD and the NPPF.

#### b) Trees

518. Policy SS/6(10) requires the new town to provide and retain woods and hedges that would contribute to the character and amenity of the town and enhance their ecological value, and preserve and enhance the setting of Denny Abbey.
519. The submitted Arboricultural Statement details 1232 individual trees, 279 groups, 40 hedgerows and 14 woodlands on the application site. Paragraph 5.4.1 of this report states that existing trees will be retained where their condition and location makes a positive contribution to the public realm. New trees will be planted to ensure there is no overall loss in canopy cover on the site (the target is to achieve a net gain). Existing woodland blocks would be managed and restored to allow safe public use and are included on the revised Parameter Plan. This outline application does not have sufficient detail to establish specifically which trees will be retained or removed. As individual phases for more detailed applications are designed, specific arboricultural assessments will be required to support each application to ensure compliance with the aforementioned Policy SS/6 objectives.

#### c) Lighting

520. The NPPF (para. 180) states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location and should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation. This aim is reflected in Local Plan Policy SC/9.

#### i) Residential Amenity Impacts

521. The submitted Lighting Assessment by PBA acknowledges that

the proposal would result in the introduction of significant scale of development within an area which is currently of low district brightness. Lighting levels during the construction phase would be determined by health and safety requirements and although its effects would be transitory in nature a scheme of mitigation is required and can be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan condition.

522. At post completion stage, lighting levels from external lighting (e.g. highway, security, public area lighting) has the potential to cause nuisance to and be detrimental to the amenity of existing and proposed residential premises. This can be addressed at reserved matters stage either upfront or by planning condition.

#### ii) Landscape impacts

523. As previously mentioned, the submitted Lighting Assessment by PBA acknowledges that the proposal would result in the introduction of significant scale of development within an area which is currently of low district brightness. Residual effects such as sky glow would be perceptible from the wider surroundings but, as acknowledged in the commentary to Policy SC/9, artificial lighting is essential for reasons of safety or security and for living, working and recreational purposes. Therefore, mitigation will be required to limit the amount of obtrusive light and ensure no unacceptable adverse impact on local amenity and the surrounding area. Such a scheme would be subject to assessment at reserved matters stage.

#### iii) Heritage impacts

524. There are several listed buildings within Waterbeach village itself, however, due to intervening existing built development it is not likely that there will be potential effects from glare or intrusion from the proposed development at these assets.

525. Denny Abbey scheduled monument, Grade I listed building and associated listed buildings at the Abbey is approximately 400m away from the proposed built development area but given the flat topography and lack of intervening screening could potentially be affected by light pollution from the proposed development. However, the proposed permeable tree belt and structural planting along the northern boundary of the application site, and distance to the northern development edge would preserve the open character of the immediate setting and limit the effects of glare or intrusion on Denny Abbey.

#### iii) Biodiversity impacts

526. In order to mitigate for the confirmed presence of roosting and foraging or commuting bats within the site, detailed lighting schemes would need to be sensitively designed with ecological input. Where

illumination of these features cannot practicably be avoided, light-spill onto the features themselves would need to be kept to a minimum through utilisation of directional lighting and low wattage bulbs.

527. The submitted Biodiversity Strategy recommends dark corridors to the east-west wildlife corridor along the Northern Park and dark zones associated with the other biodiversity priority areas, notably the lake. Retained and proposed ecologically-sensitive areas would need to be safeguarded from excessive light pollution by the implementation of an ecologically-sensitive lighting design at each relevant detailed design stage to accord with the recommended Ecological Management Plan (to be conditioned).

528. Subject to the aforementioned conditions, the development would accord with the objectives of Policy SC/9 with regard to external lighting impacts on local amenity, landscape, heritage and biodiversity.

## **Minerals**

529. Much of the application site lies within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) and is subject to an appropriate safeguarding notification policy (Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, Policy CS26). This states that the purpose of MSAs is to make sure that mineral resources are adequately taken into account in all land use planning decisions. They do not automatically preclude other forms of development taking place, but flag up the presence of economic minerals (sand and gravel) so that they are considered, and not unknowingly or needlessly sterilised. This aligns with national policy objectives set out in the NPPF (para. 204).

530. The County Council has advised that the mineral resource is proven in this general area and it is a significant resource. Whilst this will not prevent development going ahead the County Council as Mineral Planning Authority will seek to ensure that any mineral extracted during development is put to a sustainable use and has recommended a condition to this effect requiring Construction Environmental Management Plan to include proposals for the sustainable use of mineral extracted from the site.

531. Within ES Chapter 13 (ground conditions) the applicant's consultant questions whether or not it would be economical to extract the mineral from the application site. This is due to the proven soil and groundwater contamination which would need to be treated, removed or remediated ahead of any quarrying activity. They go on to reason that the potential mineral 'lost' as a result of sterilisation by development of the application site would be a minute fraction of the total sand and gravel resources potentially available in the County due to the widespread presence of River Terrace Deposits and other sand and gravel bearing strata present in the County. On this basis the ES concludes that development of the site will have a negligible effect on mineral resources in Cambridgeshire; however, consideration will be

given to the sustainable reuse of non-contaminated minerals excavated from the site during construction works at the application site. On this basis, the recommended condition put forward by the Council Council is agreed by all parties.

532. In conclusion the development is considered to accord with the mineral resource objectives set out in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 2011 and the NPPF.

## **Noise and Vibration**

533. Paragraph 180 of the NPPF advises that planning policies and decisions should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life. Local Plan Policy SC/10 has an overarching objective to ensure development is appropriate and compatible for its location with regard to noise impacts. It advises that noise sensitive developments should be located away from existing sources of significant noise, and any potentially noisy developments located in areas where noise will not have an unacceptable impact on surrounding land uses or the environment, unless its impact can be mitigated by planning conditions or obligations to provide an adequate protection against noise both internally and externally.

534. The applicant has included a noise and vibration assessment as part ES Chapter 11 and an addendum (dated May 2018) to reflect the updated Transport Assessment. The assessment considers likely impacts from noise and vibration during construction and operational phases of the development. Assessment of noise has been carried out in accordance with national noise and policy guidance. The assessment concludes that demolition and construction noise can be satisfactorily mitigated through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to be secured via planning condition (see recommended condition no.7).

535. At post-construction stage, road traffic impacts on internal and external amenity areas close to road traffic can be satisfactorily mitigated through design (building fabric) and layout (ensuring gaps between dwellings are reduced such that no garden area has a line-of-sight/overlooks busy roads). This can be tested at detailed design stage with external building fabric calculations. Road traffic noise levels generated from the development would fall within 'minor' or 'negligible' (i.e. 0-3 decibel increase above existing) at noise sensitive receptors nearby. Given this low increase, no specific road traffic noise mitigation is required in relation to surrounding residential or commercial properties outside of the site.

536. The ES further reports that road traffic induced vibration from the existing road network is unlikely to cause a significant impact on the

development due to the distances between the proposed dwellings and existing roads. Fixed plant noise emissions from commercial properties should be designed to meet background noise levels at 1m from the closest noise sensitive receptor and any noise associated with the two energy centres would need to be thoroughly assessed at detailed design stage when plant details are known. Particular attention to the orientation and attenuation of air intake/discharge louvres and flues should be considered at detailed design stage.

537. The submitted ES recommends that limited environmental noise and vibration monitoring may be required during the construction phase and this would be established and secured through agreement of a CEMP.

538. In summary, the recommendations and findings of the ES Chapter 11 and its Addendum are agreed and the Council's environmental health officer has recommended approval subject to conditions. One of those is to agree phasing of the site, which would in any case be secured through agreement of the applicant's proposed Key Phase approach. All matters relating to that Key Phase, including a CEMP would need to be agreed upfront and applied to each reserved matters parcel in turn. A condition to secure a CEMP for any initial earthworks to the whole site is agreed. The suggested requirement for noise assessments to be submitted for proposed residential and commercial properties can be dealt with at reserved matters stage.

539. Subject to recommended conditions, the development would have an acceptable impact on health and quality of life in relation to noise and vibration in accordance with Local Plan Policy SC10 and the NPPF.

### **Sustainable Construction and Design**

540. Local Plan Policy CC/1 states that planning permission will only be granted for proposals that demonstrate and embed the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation into the development. Applicants must submit a Sustainability Statement to demonstrate how these principles have been embedded into the development proposal. Policy SS/6 specifically requires the new town to deliver opportunities to exceed sustainable design and construction standards established by the Local Plan; further guidance on this aspect is provided in the new town SPD.

541. The application is supported by a Sustainability Strategy and Addendum (dated October 2018), which includes a review of best practice in the Cambridge Area, a summary of opportunities for the application site and a set of targets and objectives for the development. These are assessed below.

### a) Built Design

542. The proposal should use layout, building orientation, design, and materials to ensure properties are not susceptible to overheating and include open space and vegetation for shading and cooling, as advised in Policy CC/1. Guiding Principle 33 of the new town SPD requires development to be designed and built in accordance with the energy hierarchy, which first and foremost includes reducing energy by design through consideration of building orientation and layout (for example, to promote passive heating in winter and cooling in summer), optimising opportunities for natural light; and by adopting a 'fabric-first' approach to building design.
543. Whilst the application is in outline only, the submitted Sustainability Strategy Addendum includes targets to exceed building regulations (Part L- Energy Efficiency) at later detailed design stage through building fabric, orientation, air tightness, provision of appropriate solar shading, creation of thermal mass and use of proven technologies. Issues of design, layout and orientation would be a matter for later, detailed planning; however, the commitments set out in the outline Sustainability Strategy Addendum would ensure fulfilment of the objectives of Policies CC/1 and the new town SPD in the initial phase with commitment to enhancing sustainability targets over time.
544. Policy CC/5 states that where a show home is being provided, a sustainable show home must be provided (either separately or instead of the show home) demonstrating environmentally sustainable alternatives beyond those provided to achieve the standard agreed for the development. This can be secured by condition at reserved matters stage.

### b) Energy

545. Policy CC/3 requires proposals for new dwellings and new non-residential buildings of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> or more to reduce carbon emissions by a minimum of 10% through the use of on-site renewable energy and low carbon technologies. The new town SPD also requires developers to think beyond the energy hierarchy to the role of smart energy systems, combining renewables, EV charging, battery storage and flexible plug and play systems to help offset some of the costs of grid reinforcement.
546. The submitted Sustainability Strategy Addendum includes specific targets in relation to energy as follows:
- i) each Key Phase within the development will sequentially identify design functions and strategies that will allow development within the Key Phase to exceed the minimum Building Regulation 2013 (Part L) requirement. Residential buildings will target the following Fabric Energy Efficiency Standard (FEES) of 52 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/yr or better for detached, semi-detached or end- terrace houses and 43 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/yr or better for

mid- terrace houses or apartment blocks

- ii) non-residential buildings, BREEAM will be used in part as a benchmark for delivering building performance and energy efficiency with a target of at least BREEAM (2014) 'Excellent' being set for the initial Key Phase with 'Very Good' for schools, as required by Cambridgeshire County Council
- iii) Early intervention to capture the possibility of a primary energy source for the site being delivered from a sustainable source
- iv) Promotion of on-site generation of energy on individual commercial and domestic plots and within landlord or common parts
- v) Exceed the minimum requirement of 10% energy met by incorporating on-site or near-site renewable or low carbon technology generation

547. In addition to the above, the revised Parameter Plan includes provision for up to two energy centres. These are intended as facilities for local energy generation

employing low or zero carbon technologies. The precise technology to be employed by the energy centres would be determined in a subsequent detailed study and reserved matters application.

548. As part of the strategy for achieving the above renewable energy targets, the Sustainability Strategy Addendum includes consideration of future proofing and decentralised energy creation, providing capabilities for future connectivity of locally generated power and smart grid technology, including residential battery storage solutions and smart metering controls.

549. The submitted targets and strategies set out in the Sustainability Statement Addendum would be reviewed and updated at each Key Phase submission and would therefore enable the strategy to adapt and evolve over time with new technologies and best practice. On this basis, the development is considered to accord with the objectives of Policies CC/1 and SS/6.

### c) Overheating

550. Policy CC/1 requires proposals to demonstrate and embed the principles of climate change mitigation and adaption into the development. This means, amongst other things, ensuring properties are not susceptible to overheating and include open space and vegetation for shading and cooling. The submitted Sustainability Strategy Addendum commits to targeting overheating through passive design principles and use of the cooling hierarchy. The cooling hierarchy aims to minimise internal heat generation through energy efficient design in the first instance and then employ measures to reduce the amount of heat entering a building in summer. This principle is agreed and would accord with Policy CC/1 objectives, subject to a condition to ensure this commitment is followed

through at detailed design stage.

#### d) Recycling and Waste

551. The NPPF requires Local Plans to consider a wide variety of infrastructure needs including waste management, as reflected in Local Plan Policy TI/8. Cambridgeshire County Council is responsible for minerals and waste planning in Cambridgeshire and has confirmed that no S106 contributions are required from the development towards strategic waste infrastructure in the region. Therefore, the main issues to consider in this instance are refuse collection and waste management.

##### i) Construction Waste

552. The applicant estimates that waste from the construction of the proposed development would total approximately 138,790 m<sup>3</sup>. The submitted outline Waste Management Strategy (WMS) and Sustainability Statement Addendum both strive to meet a target of a 95% diversion from landfill. This will be based on the principles of increasing waste prevention as part of the site development including re-use of buildings (e.g. Sports Hall, Nursery, Nursing Accommodation), re-use of land for the wider community (e.g. cemetery extension) and material recycling (e.g. processing of concrete for re-use on site).

553. A Waste Management and Minimisation Plan is recommended to be conditioned to ensure strategies are in place to achieve this target along with monitoring through each key phase.

##### ii) Operational Waste

554. Guiding Principle 36 of the Waterbeach New Town SPD requires applicants to consider innovative approaches to household waste collection and storage in the new town. The use of underground household waste storage and collection, particularly in high density areas, is an example of such an approach and can assist directly in reducing carbon emissions by taking away the stop-start collection of traditional above ground wheelie bins.

555. The applicant estimates that the proposed development would result in approximately 6,778 tonnes/annum of household waste and a volume of 17,966m<sup>3</sup> of commercial waste generated each year. The submitted Sustainability Strategy Addendum aims to exceed the following Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011) targets, during the operational phase, as follows:

- More than 67% of householder waste streams to be recycled / composted
- More than 88% of commercial and industrial waste streams to be recycled/recovered

556. The applicant has carried out work to understand the sustainable viability

and environmental impact of underground household waste storage solutions through desk top analysis, site visits and a review of existing schemes with users and operators. One of the key differentials between those sites currently in operation and the Waterbeach development is the high water table level that adds cost and complexity to the design, construction, operational frequency and management of the schemes. For this reason, it has not been possible to agree underground waste provision at outline planning stage and a more conventional waste collection is proposed to be secured in the S106 heads of terms.

#### e) Water

557. Policy CC/4 requires all new residential developments to achieve a minimum water efficiency equivalent to 110 litres per person per day. Proposals for non-residential development must be accompanied by a water conservation strategy, which demonstrates a minimum water efficiency standard equivalent to the BREEAM standard for 2 credits for water use levels unless demonstrated not practicable. Guiding principle 35 of the new town SPD advises that proposals at the new town will be expected to reduce water consumption below existing Policy CC/4 targets and seek opportunities for community-wide water re-use and grey water recycling schemes.
558. The Sustainability Statement Addendum includes a water efficiency target of less than 110 litres per person per day in accordance with the new town SPD with ambition to reduce this further over time. All commercial plots are proposed to be delivered with rain water and grey water recycling technology and a BREEAM 2 credit water use level required (25% improvement over BREEAM baseline building water consumption). Opportunities to do this could be sought through low flush WC facilities, water retention and recycling systems. A condition is recommended to ensure the proposed water efficiency targets are followed through at detailed design stage to ensure the scheme fulfils the objectives of Policy SS/6 as guided by the new town SPD.

#### Conclusion

559. The submitted outline strategies and targets for sustainable design, energy, climate change adaption, water, recycling and waste are considered to demonstrate and embed the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation into the development to meet the objectives of Local Plan Policy CC/1 and Policy SS/6. Conditions are recommended to ensure commitment to the sustainable strategies and targets set out in the Sustainability Statement Addendum with opportunities to enhance sustainability targets over time to reflect new technologies and best practice given the anticipated long build out of the new town.

#### **Utilities**

560. Local Plan Policy TI/8 states that planning permission will only be granted

for proposals that have made suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.

561. The applicant has submitted a Utility and Physical Infrastructure Report (May 2018) and addendum to identify any existing utility infrastructure that may constrain development within the site boundary and to provide advice on the most suitable course of action to mitigate these constraints in a timely and cost efficient manner.

#### a) Digital Infrastructure

562. Local Plan Policy TI/10 requires new development (residential, employment and commercial) to contribute towards the provision of infrastructure suitable to enable the delivery of high speed broadband services across the district. This is reflective of the objectives of the NPPF (para. 115), which encourages planning policies and decisions to support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including next generation mobile technology (such as 5G) and full fibre broadband connections.
563. The applicant has confirmed that the proposed development has been registered with Openreach. An offer has been provided by Openreach to supply the proposed development with Fibre to the Premise (FTTP) technology. The estimated Fibre broadband speed range will be in the vicinity of 300mb. Openreach has advised that this offer be accepted at least 3 months prior to the start date of construction on site in order to allow a lead in time for their design.
564. Implementation of broadband infrastructure and next generation mobile technology for both dwellings and commercial premises can be secured within Key Phase sustainability strategies and associated reserved matters to ensure the objectives of Policies CC/1 and TI/10 are met.

#### b) Electricity

565. The submitted Utility and Physical Infrastructure Statement identifies a number of substations located throughout the development. Two of these are located within the barracks area are owned by UKPN. The remaining substations are privately owned.
566. In September 2015, UKPN advised the applicant that due to the ever-growing demands on the network there is potential need for a new grid site to accommodate the demand. This new grid site would provide additional capacity between Histon, Fulbourn and Peterborough grid sites which supply primary sites such as Landbeach Primary.
567. UKPN advised the applicant on the 21/11/16 that the need for the new grid site has not yet been triggered and that the existing network will be managed to support the construction phasing. They advised that there is

sufficient capacity to supply the proposed development from Landbeach Primary substation which is located 1.6km to the north west within the vicinity of Cambridge Research Park. The installation of two new circuit breakers at the primary substation and the laying of three 11kV feeds from the substation to the proposed development boundary would provide the required supply.

#### c) Gas

568. The Utility and Physical Infrastructure Statement indicates that the gas pipelines located within the proposed development are private and may require diversion or removal. There are no significant assets such as high pressure pipelines that would be deemed particularly complicated to divert.

569. Cadent Gas Ltd advised the applicant on the 04/07/16 that there is sufficient capacity at Denny End Road to supply an early Key Phase of the proposed development consisting of 964 mixed size residential units. Cadent noted on the 23/11/16 that reinforcement to the local medium pressure main is required to provide the necessary supply to the proposed development. The same would apply to the adjoining RLW site, as highlighted in its submitted Utilities Statement (2018) and would be secured separately by statutory undertakers.

#### d) Heat importation

570. Policy SS/6(12) encourages measures to exceed sustainable design and construction standards established by the Local Plan through, for instance, potential combined heat and power provided from the adjacent Wasterbeach Waste Management Park. The submitted Sustainability Statement Addendum includes targets to capture primary energy sources from a sustainable source. The strategy for achieving this includes a commitment to explore potential connection to Amey Cespa to allow off-site generation of electricity but could also include heat importation in future. This can be captured in future Sustainability Statements to be submitted and approved at Key Phase stage.

#### e) Potable Water

571. The Utility and Physical Infrastructure Statement identifies enough capacity in the local network to supply an early phase of 964 mixed size residential units. To get this supply to the proposed development would require approximately 4km of 350mm nominal bore main to be laid from an existing 450mm main within Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton, located to the south. This new main would connect into existing mains located at the southern edge of the proposed development. This would provide a supply which could be obtained from an existing pipeline along the A10.

572. To supply the remainder of the proposed development, Cambridge Water advised the applicant on the 19/01/16 that there is sufficient capacity in

Cherry Hinton Reservoir located to the east of Cambridge. However, the local network would require upgrading. This would involve laying a new strategic main between Cherry Hinton Reservoir and the village of Milton located to the south of Waterbeach, and 4km of main between Milton and the proposed development. This new supply strategy also takes into account the wider Waterbeach development. The Cambridge Water consultation response received by RLW indicates that there is capacity to supply the proposed development from a trunk main in Fulbourn Road, Cambridge, approximately 12.5km from the site, subject to the installation of new water pipe infrastructure. Such infrastructure would be secured separately by statutory undertakers.

573. Therefore, subject to recommended conditions, the development is in accordance with the infrastructure objectives for utilities delivery, including electricity, gas, heat and potable water set out in the Local Plan and NPPF.

## **8) Financial Viability and S106 Obligations**

### Financial Viability

574. Policy H/10 seeks the delivery of 40% affordable housing except where it can be demonstrated that the level of affordable housing sought would make the development unviable in light of changing market conditions, individual site circumstances and development costs. Where viability assessments are submitted the NPPF (para.57) requires applicants to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage.

575. The applicant has submitted a viability assessment on the basis that seeking a policy compliant 40% affordable housing (Policy H/10) would in this instance render the scheme unviable when taking into account the substantial level of S106 infrastructure costs (approximately £141 million) and the level of upfront/early infrastructure required to facilitate sustainable development of the site. Gerald Eve, on behalf of the Council, has reviewed the submitted financial viability appraisal (FVA) and is in agreement with the key inputs, assumptions and values. Based on a 20% target developer return (which has been evidenced against comparable schemes), the scheme would be viable at 21% affordable housing contribution assuming 50% rental and 50% shared ownership.

576. To improve this offer, further testing has been undertaken to reduce the burden of S106 contributions and ease the cash flow particularly in the early phase of development. This testing has improved the affordable housing offer to 30% across the whole of the application site and is based on the following interventions:

a) delaying the delivery of affordable housing until after the first 300 units

b) delaying the timing of delivery for Primary Schools 2 and 3

c) broadening the affordable housing mix to include: 30% affordable rent; 30% shared ownership; 20 discounted market sale; and 20% rent to buy

577. The above measures significantly improve the affordable housing offer whilst maintaining the financial viability of the scheme. Other options have been tested such as introducing only shared ownership units in the first 300 units but do not produce the same level of uplift or are less sustainable in social terms. Notwithstanding this, a review mechanism is recommended to be set within the S106 agreement that would guarantee a minimum of 30% affordable housing across the whole site and capture further opportunities to increase the affordable housing offer that might exist post planning consent (such as value uplift or cost savings). This would also include any adjoining landowner contributions from the granting of access rights, which the applicant has committed to convert to affordable housing delivery through the review mechanism, as explained in section 5 (Housing Delivery) of this report.

### S106 Obligation

578. Statutory tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (Regulation 122) require that S106 planning obligations must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly, and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition (para.54 of the NPPF 2019).

579. The contributions required by policy and/or being sought by consultees are summarised in the tables below. Where there is a difference between the policy/consultee requirement and the applicant's offer this is accompanied by further explanation and an officer recommendation. All contributions are to be cost indexed from the date of the consultee request or the relevant date of the cost appraisal. It should also be noted that management, adoption and maintenance of each of the facilities listed below will be sought through the S106 agreement. A comprehensive list of the recommended S106 obligations is provided at the end of this report in **Appendices H and I** including the Key Phase 1 Transport Mitigation.

580. Other relevant matters will be addressed via specific planning conditions.

#### a) Community Infrastructure

Policy Requirement or Consultee Request	Applicant Offer
<u>Community Centres</u>	
111m <sup>2</sup> community floorspace per 1000 additional population (Policy)	Proposed total of <b>2450m<sup>2</sup></b> community floor space comprising four multi-

<p>SC/6). Total provision at 2.8 average household size = <b>2020.2m<sup>2</sup></b></p> <p>SCDC Development Officer request:</p> <p>Triggers for delivery of 4 x community centres (CC) to be:</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> CC – 100<sup>th</sup> dwelling  2<sup>nd</sup> CC – 1850<sup>th</sup> dwelling  3<sup>rd</sup> CC – 4000<sup>th</sup> dwelling  4<sup>th</sup> CC – 5,200<sup>th</sup> dwelling</p>	<p>purpose community centres with the following provisional details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 x smaller centres each up to 350m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• 1 x centre with 2 court sports hall and changing rooms – up to 750m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• 1 x centre with hub library of 1050m<sup>2</sup> size</li> </ul> <p>At early stage (prior to first occupation) community meeting spaces to be made available through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sports hall</li> <li>• Control tower building</li> <li>• Museum building (barracks)</li> </ul> <p>Triggers are agreed</p>
<p><u>Early Community Support Fund</u></p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council request:</p> <p>£1,870,757 towards early community support fund</p>	<p>Financial contribution agreed</p>
<p><u>Community Development Worker</u></p> <p>SCDC Development Officer request:</p> <p>Funding for Community Development Worker for 10 years from first occupation</p>	<p>Agreed. Proposed financial provision of £400,000 (£40,000 per annum)</p>
<p><u>Library</u></p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council request:</p> <p>£28,920 by 1st dwelling towards</p>	<p>Contributions agreed as requested by</p>

interim library provision on site  Provision of new 1050m <sup>2</sup> hub library to be located in multipurpose community centre by 5200 <sup>th</sup> dwelling towards	the Cambridge County Council
--	------------------------------

b) Comprehensive Development

<u>Progress &amp; Delivery Group (PDG)</u>  Requirement for PDG to ensure coherent design across the new town, coordination of infrastructure and formulation of compatible strategies for future management and governance (Waterbeach New Town (p.152)	Agreed. Terms of reference for PDG to be established in S106 agreement
--	--

c) Economic Development

Policy Requirement or Consultee Request	Applicant Offer
<u>Economic Development Strategy</u> Policy SS/6[8b] requires the development of an Economic Development Strategy to ensure the development meets the needs of the town and provides access to local jobs and support the economy of the Cambridge area.	A 'Jobs Brokerage Scheme' is proposed within the S106 to accompany the Economic Development Strategy.

581. The above principle of securing a Jobs Brokerage Scheme is agreed and would complement the recommended Key Phase Economic Development Strategies to be submitted and approved by planning condition (see recommended condition no.11).

d) Education

Policy Requirement or Consultee Request	Applicant Offer
<u>Primary School and Early Years</u>  Cambridgeshire County Council request:	

<p>3 x 3FE Primary Schools (PS) and Early Years provision with potential expansion to 4 FE for Primary School 2 and 3 (11FE maximum) to be delivered by the following estimated times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First Occupation (PS1) Sum of £13,500,000</li> <li>• 1600<sup>th</sup> dwelling (PS2) Sum of £14,130,000</li> <li>• 3300<sup>th</sup> dwelling (PS3) Sum of £14,130,000</li> </ul> <p>Expansion of PS2 and PS3 by an additional 1FE each subject to review. Sum of £4,140,000</p> <p>Total Cost = £45,900,000</p>	<p>Contributions agreed as requested by the Cambridge County Council; however, alternative estimated delivery times proposed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First Occupation (PS1)</li> <li>• 2400<sup>th</sup> dwelling (PS2)</li> <li>• 3800<sup>th</sup> dwelling (PS3)</li> </ul>
<p><u>Secondary School</u></p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council request:</p> <p>1 x Secondary School (6FE with 2FE for existing Waterbeach village and potential to increase to 11FE)</p> <p>6FE sum of £22,500,000 + 2FE sum of £7,500,000</p> <p>6FE to be opened by 2000<sup>th</sup> dwelling 8FE to be opened by 4300<sup>th</sup> dwelling</p> <p>Potential increase to 11FE sum of £13,500,000 to be opened by 5,500<sup>th</sup> dwelling</p>	<p>Contributions agreed as requested by the Cambridge County Council</p>
<p><u>Special Needs School</u></p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council request:</p> <p>£6,970,000 financial contribution towards on or off site provision (49 places) with review of delivery timing to be undertaken between 2000-3000th occupation. 1.7ha land area to be reserved for 110 place facility</p>	<p>Contributions agreed as requested by the Cambridge County Council</p>

<p><u>Post 16</u></p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council request:</p> <p>£7,980,000 financial contribution towards proposed 400 place, Post-16 facility on adjoining RLW Estates site or off site facility with delivery timing to be reviewed between 2000-3000<sup>th</sup> occupation.</p>	<p>Contributions agreed as requested by the Cambridge County Council</p>
<p><u>Education Review Group (ERG)</u></p> <p>Requirement for ERG to review monitoring data of school age population and anticipated need and recommend timing and phasing for the construction of schools across the site (Waterbeach New Town (p.75 and 143)</p>	<p>Agreed. Terms of reference for ERG to be established in S106 agreement</p>

582. Primary school provision on the site is broadly agreed between the applicant and Cambridgeshire County Council. However, the proposed timing of Primary Schools 2 and 3 is indicated by the applicant to be pushed back to improve the financial viability of the scheme and increase the affordable housing offer. The education child yield estimates assume a high child yield based on comparable sites with 40% affordable housing. As the affordable housing offer is below the 40% target the child yield it is anticipated to be lower, particularly in the early phase. Whilst officers agree with the applicant that the anticipated timescales for delivery of the Primary School 2 and 3 are likely to be later on, the S106 will nevertheless need to be in accordance with the County's triggers should the child yield prove higher. The applicant has confirmed willingness to shoulder the financial risk in this regard for the purposes of the viability appraisal.

e) Healthcare

Policy Requirement or Consultee Request	Applicant Offer
<p><u>Interim Health Provision</u></p> <p>NHS request:</p> <p>£300,000 by 250<sup>th</sup> dwelling towards Interim Healthcare Provision on-site</p>	<p>Provision, timing and financial contribution agreed. Potential for provision within first community centre if</p>

	needed.
<u>New Healthcare Facility</u>  NHS request:  £2,055,151 by 1600 dwellings towards new 1810m <sup>2</sup> on site healthcare facility to serve whole site (with pro-rata contribution from adjoining developer)	Provision, timing and financial contribution agreed

f) Housing

Policy Requirement or Consultee Request	Applicant Offer
<u>Affordable Housing</u>  40% on site affordable housing (Policy H/10)	Minimum 30% on site affordable housing (comprising: 30% affordable rent; 30% shared ownership; 20% discounted market sale; 20% rent to buy);  0% affordable housing in first 300 units. Financial viability review mechanism to be carried out at the start of each Key Phase following Key Phase 1 or in exceptional circumstances (to be defined) with open book appraisal and 50:50 share of any exceedance of 20% target developer return between SCDC and developer

h) Indoor Sports

Policy Requirement or Consultee Request	Applicant Offer
Policy SC/7; Indoor Sports Facility Strategy 2015-2031; and consultee requests from Sport England and SCDC Development Officer:  <u>Existing Sports Hall and Squash Courts</u>  a) Retention and improvement of existing sports hall (including studio	Agreed with financial contribution of £200,000 by 1st dwelling towards

space) and continued provision of 2 x squash courts	existing sports hall improvement. Provision to continue unless replaced in the future by new facility/ies.
<u>New Swimming Pool and Sports Halls</u>  b) Land and financial contribution towards on-site Sports and Leisure Centre (4 court sports hall; 4 lane swimming pool with large learner pool; 60 fitness stations and activity halls) by 5,500 <sup>th</sup> dwelling.	Agreed timing, provision of land and financial contribution on pro-rata basis with provisional contribution of £2,586,000 (Total cost split: 50% paid for by both developers on pro-rata basis and remaining 50% by future leisure centre operator)
c) On site provision of 2 court sports hall	Agreed to provide adjacent to/within one of the Indoor Community Centres near to outdoor sports space  Community Access agreement for use of secondary school sports facilities would also be sought where possible

i) Open Space, Sports and Children's Play Space

Policy Requirement or Consultee Request	Applicant Offer
<u>Open Space, Sports and Children's Play Space</u>  Policy SC/7 sets out minimum open space standards. Total provision at 2.8 average household requires: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 29.12ha of formal outdoor sports provision</li> <li>• 14.56ha of children's play space</li> <li>• 7.28ha of informal open space</li> <li>• 7.28ha of allotment/community orchards space</li> </ul> Triggers to be negotiated	Provision of open space, sports and children's play space agreed in accordance with Policy SC/7 standards at each Key Phase. Proposed triggers agreed with SCDC Development Officer, as follows:  <b>Early Phase Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporary use of existing sports pitches near barracks</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> strategic open space no later than 1,601 dwellings</li> <li>• Lakeside indoor sports pavilion no later than 1,000 dwellings</li> </ul> <b>Later Phases of Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> strategic open space no later than 3,500 dwellings</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> strategic open space no later than 4,800 dwellings</li> <li>• 2 sports pavilions linked to delivery and timing of 2 strategic open spaces</li> </ul>
<u>Artificial Grass Pitch</u>  Sport England requires:  1 x Artificial Grass Pitch on site Trigger to be negotiated	Artificial Grass Pitch by 3,500 <sup>th</sup> dwelling

j) Transport

Policy Requirement or Consultee Request	Applicant offer
<u>Existing Station Improvements</u>  Network Rail request:  Staffing of the existing level crossing from first occupation up until mid-2022 – provisionally estimated at £500,000 per annum  A cap of £1,000,000 towards levelling and improvements to station access routes	Financial contribution agreed at 1 <sup>st</sup> dwelling occupation  Financial contribution agreed in staged payments up until occupation of 1600 <sup>th</sup> dwelling or a time when the new station is relocated
<u>Key Phase 1 transport mitigation</u>  Cambridgeshire County Council request:  See list of transport mitigation in <b>Appendix I</b>	Agreed with either direct delivery of transport mitigation measures or a financial contribution to CCC totalling approximately £15m (final cost to be refined). Any unspent S106 contribution to be added to a reserve fund to be used in subsequent Key Phase transport mitigation
<u>Strategic Transport Contribution</u>  Cambridgeshire County Council request:  A proportionate contribution of	Not agreed. Financial contribution of

£64,000,000 towards strategic transport improvements along the A10 corridor	£7,750,000 offered to CCC towards strategic transport to ensure scheme is financially viable and provides sustainable mix of community facilities and affordable housing
<p><u>Transport Strategy Review Group (TSRG)</u></p> <p>Requirement for TSRG to undertaking a ‘monitor and manage’ approach specifically to manage the impact of the proposed development on the capacity of the A10, and formalising the means of communication between the developers (Waterbeach New Town (p.143)</p>	Agreed. Terms of reference for TSRG to be established in S106 agreement

583. The principle of the proposed Phase 1 mitigation scheme and the ‘monitor and manage’ approach is agreed. A Strategic Transport Contribution is required to fund further transport mitigation beyond Phase 1 and contribute towards the A10 corridor improvements. Cambridgeshire County Council has considered the costs of the strategic transport package, as set out in the Ely to Cambridge A10 Study, alongside the proportional impact of the proposed development. The requested strategic sum of £64m, when taken together with other S106 infrastructure costs, would total approximately £197m and render the scheme financially unviable.

584. The financial viability appraisal has confirmed that the scheme can offer a total of £23.7m towards transport mitigation including a significant early phase transport package (approximately £15m). Whilst this contribution falls short of the request by Cambridgeshire County Council clearly the proposed development must be financially viable and cannot fund the entirety of the A10 corridor improvements (the A10 dualling is estimated at £285m-£500m - as presented to the Combined Authority Board in February 2017). To this end, funding of strategic A10 transport measures will be of importance to the wider area and will be dependent on the Combined Authority advancing its Strategic Outline Business Case for the A10 dualling project over 2019/20 and Greater Cambridge Partnership’s commitments to develop improved public transport, cycling and walking journeys on the A10 north to Waterbeach and Newmarket Road.

k) Household Waste & Recycling

Policy Requirement or Consultee Request	Applicant offer
---	-----------------

<p><u>Householder Waste Receptacles</u></p> <p>SCDC Waste Officer request:</p> <p>Household Waste Receptacles to be provided for each dwelling £75 per house £160 per flat</p>	<p>Financial contribution agreed</p>
<p><u>Cardboard Skips</u></p> <p>SCDC Waste Officer request:</p> <p>1-2 cardboard waste skips to be installed on site. Required by 1<sup>st</sup> dwelling and relocated through phasing until final occupation. Approximately £360 per skip and £17 per empty/collection</p>	<p>Financial contribution agreed</p>
<p><u>Refuse Vehicles</u></p> <p>SCDC Waste Officer request:</p> <p>£61.67 per dwelling towards refuse collection vehicles from 1<sup>st</sup> dwelling</p>	<p>Financial contribution agreed</p>

585. For clarity, whilst each development must mitigate its own impacts there are certain elements of infrastructure listed above required to serve the wider allocation but which will be provided wholly within either the DIO/U&C site or the adjoining development site. In such circumstances it is appropriate that the adjoining developer not responsible for physically providing the relevant infrastructure, nonetheless provides its pro-rata financial contribution towards its provision. Accordingly the S106 will need to ensure that proportionate contributions are secured from each development site to ensure fairness; those shared infrastructure items include:

- a. for additional forms of entry at schools, these will be looked at across the new town and an appropriate mechanism will be included within the S106 to enable the County Council to ensure proper provision is made and that there is fairness between the developments.
- b. the Hub Library will be delivered on the DIO/U&C site and any development permitted on the adjoining site will be expected to make its pro-rata contribution to the delivery cost. This is likely to be held by the County Council and paid across to DIO/U&C at the relevant time
- c. the health centre will be provided on land made available on DIO/U&C land, with a pro-rata contribution made by DOI/U&C towards its

provision, via SCDC, to the health provider. It is expected that any development permitted on the adjoining site will also be required to make a proportionate contribution towards a new health facility to SCDC again for payment to the health provider

- d. the sports centre (including swimming pool) will be provided on land made available by DIO/U&C with a pro rata contribution towards its delivery. A strategy will need to be submitted in future making more detailed provision and giving opportunity for discussion with commercial operators and other stakeholders.
- e. The Post 16 facility is proposed on the adjoining development site and the Special Education Needs facility on DIO/U&C land. The land requirements are broadly the same and each owner will make their own respective pro-rata financial contribution direct to the County Council.

586. To the extent there is an imbalance between the two development sites as to land being made available for the provision of site wide infrastructure, this is a matter to be taken into account between the respective developers when discussing the terms for provision of links/access rights between the two development sites.

587. Subject to the above principles set out within the proposed S106 agreements, the proposed development is considered to accord with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 and the delivery principles set out in Section 6 of the new town SPD (p.120 onwards).

## **9) Other material planning considerations**

### Equalities Act

588. The application has been assessed against the relevant sections of the Equalities Act 2010, and it is not considered that the application discriminates against people with protected characteristics specified in the Act. The protected characteristics are:-

- age
- gender reassignment
- being married or in a civil partnership
- being pregnant or on maternity leave
- disability
- race including colour, nationality, ethnic or national origin
- religion or belief
- sex
- sexual orientation

## **10) Planning Balance and Conclusion**

589. Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). The National Planning Policy Framework represents up-to-date government planning policy and is a material consideration that must be taken into account where it is relevant to a planning application. This includes the presumption in favour of sustainable development found at paragraph 11 of the Framework, which requires approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay. Section 2 of the NPPF lists the three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These roles are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways to achieve sustainable development. These roles will now be considered in weighing up the benefits and dis-benefits of the proposed development relative to all material considerations discussed in this report.

#### a) Environmental Impacts

590. The proposed parameters of development demonstrate that the site can appropriately accommodate the development, make effective use of land and maintain the exceptional historical landscape context of the site. Whilst concern has been raised in relation to height, massing and density, the proposal is considered to align with Policy SS/6 objectives in creating a new town of high quality development responding to local character whilst also having its own identity (as guided by the new town SPD). Subject to conditions, there are sufficient safeguards to ensure commitments set out within the DAS supplement to mitigate impacts on the setting of Denny Abbey, surrounding landscape and local character, including the identity of Waterbeach village, are followed through to detailed design.
591. The development would also contribute to a net gain in biodiversity at the site including protection of important habitats and species. Provision is made within the recommended conditions to ensure prudent use of natural resources at the site such as sand and gravel, as well as measures to minimise waste and pollution. Mitigation and adaptation to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy would be facilitated through the proposed site-wide sustainability strategy, which is to be updated at each Key Phase to demonstrate excellence in sustainable development in accordance with Policy SS/6.
592. The early, scheme-led transport mitigation package and Framework Travel Plan begin the process of implementing the Ely to Cambridge A10 corridor solution and prioritising sustainable travel modes in the development. This approach would support a first phase of 1,600 units and build the foundations of a broad-based and more sustainable transport solution for the whole corridor. The proposed S106 financial contribution towards strategic solutions to unlock future phases through a 'monitor and manage' approach would ensure an appropriate level of mitigation to meet actual highway conditions at the relevant

future time in collaboration with the Combined Authority (CA) and Greater Cambridge Partnership. The proposed transport strategy also aligns with the adjoining RLW Estates proposed transport strategy to facilitate comprehensive development across the strategic site. Highway safety, access, parking and travel plan measures are also considered acceptable and accord with Policy HQ/1 and SS/6 objectives and paragraphs 110 and 111 of the NPPF.

593. Overall, whilst moderate weight can be attached to the harm of the development to the existing landscape and local character, mitigation addresses the predicted impacts. There would be no material harm to heritage assets or to other interests that cannot be mitigated by the imposition of conditions or terms of the S106 obligation. The environmental benefits of the scheme are considered to be very high given the provision of a net gain in biodiversity at the site, provision of sustainable travel modes and measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change. As such, significant weight can be attached to the environmental benefits of the scheme.

#### b) Economic Impacts

594. National Planning Policy places a clear emphasis on the importance of economic growth and delivering economic benefits as a key component of sustainable development. The proposed development would generate a sustainable level of job creation at the site both during construction and at occupation stage. It is estimated to create 800-1000 direct and indirect construction jobs per year; 2,431 on site jobs associated with non residential uses; 2,026 on site jobs associated with residential uses; 1,591 homeworkers and 2,475 additional employment at Cambridge Research Park and Stirling House. This would further promote sustainable travel movements within the site and the surrounding area in accordance with the environmental objectives of sustainable development.

595. The generation of skills and enterprise would be delivered through on-site Jobs Brokerage Scheme and an Economic Development Strategy to be secured by S106 agreement/planning condition to fulfil Policy SS/6 objectives. The development's impacts have also been considered in relation to surrounding communities and in particular the impact on the viability and vitality of surrounding centres. No adverse impacts have been identified that warrant change to the development's scale or description. As the majority of retail, services, community and employment uses will be located within the town centre, a Town Centre Delivery Strategy will be secured by planning condition to ensure delivery of a sustainable and dynamic centre to the new town in accordance with the economic objectives of Policy SS/6. Given the strategic importance of the new town within the wider area and the proposed level of job and skills creation it is considered that significant weight can be attached to the economic benefits of the scheme.

## c) Social Impacts

596. The proposed quantum and mix of uses is considered to positively contribute to Policy SS/6 objectives of achieving a range of uses appropriate to the new town and supporting a sustainable and vibrant new community. The amended early phase proposals are considered to address concerns raised in relation to integration of existing and new communities and conform to the indicative first phase of development set out in the Waterbeach New Town SPD. Subject to recommended conditions and S106 legal obligation, the development is found to accord with the social and community objectives of Policy SS/6 and SC/4 by providing a range of uses appropriate to the new town including community services and facilities, open space provision and measures to assist the development of a new community. Significant weight can therefore be attached to the social benefits arising from the proposal.
597. The development would also deliver a significant quantum of housing to meet the district's housing needs during the Local Plan period and beyond to which significant weight can be attached. It includes a minimum affordable housing provision of 30% (1950 homes) on site, which has been subject to financial viability testing and includes an affordable housing review mechanism to increase affordable housing provision should viability improve over time. The proposed affordable housing package comprises a suite of affordable housing options to help meet the needs of varying household incomes in the area and facilitate a more diverse and balanced community in accordance with Policies H/9 and H/10. Additionally, conditions are recommended to ensure accessible homes, residential space standards, and opportunities for Gypsy and Traveller sites, self/custom build sites and community-led housing are captured at key stage approval in accordance with Policies H/9, H/12 and H/21.
598. Overall, the proposed development would bring significant public benefits that accord with the three strands of sustainable development set out in the NPPF. Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, the policies in the NPPF, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for approval subject to planning conditions and a S106 Obligation.

### **Recommendation**

- a) DELEGATED APPROVAL of outline planning application, as amended, subject to:
- b) Planning conditions as set out below (including Explanatory Notes and Terms), with the final wording and/or any amendments to these to be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair prior to the issuing of planning permission;

- c) Contributions to be secured by way of a Section 106 legal agreement as set out in Appendices H and I – final wording and/or amendments to be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair prior to the issuing of planning permission.
- d) Summary/progress report on S106 obligation to be referred to Planning Committee after six months from 13 May 2019

### **Conditions**

See Appendix L

### **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
- Waterbeach New Town SPD
- Planning File References: S/0559/17/OL, S/1274/15/FL, S/1305/15/FL, S/2770/16/FL, S/3204/16/FL, S/3247/16/VC, S/3372/17/CW, S/0791/18/FL and S/2075/18/OL

<b>Report Author:</b>	Andrew Winter	Principal Planning Officer
	Telephone Number:	01954 713082