



29 January 2021

**Report to:** South Cambridgeshire District Council  
Planning Committee

**Lead Officer:** Joint Director of Planning and Economic  
Development

**Application Number:** S/2075/18/OL

**Parish:** Waterbeach

**Proposal:**

Outline Planning Application (with all matters reserved) for development of up to 4,500 dwellings, business, retail, community, leisure and sports uses; new primary and secondary schools and sixth form centre; public open spaces including parks and ecological areas; points of access; associated drainage and other infrastructure, groundworks, landscaping and highway works

**Site address:**

Land adjacent to Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield Site, Waterbeach, Cambridgeshire

**Applicant:**

Mr Chris Goldsmith, RLW Estates Ltd

**Recommendation:**

Approve, subject to section 106 agreement

**Key material considerations:**

Principle of development

Amount, use, indicative layout, and scale parameters

Access and transport

Housing delivery

Social and community infrastructure  
Education  
Environmental considerations  
Financial obligations / section 106  
Other material planning considerations  
Planning balance

**Committee Site Visit:** n/a

**Departure Application:** No

**Presenting Officer:** Mike Huntington, Principal Planner

**Application brought to Committee because:** Large scale development of strategic importance.

**Date by which decision due:** 29th January 2021 (by agreement)

## **Waterbeach Parish Council**

**additional comments from re-consultation not originally added to report –**

The Parish Council has included comments that refer to comments that other consultees have made.

These additional comments are as follows –

1. Link between Denny Abbey and the New Town – Officer comment – a planning condition has already been added to secure this link.
2. The raising of the land around the station area will further impact the visual appearance from the River Cam and Long Drove. Officer comment – it is considered that the limited raising of land in this area will not have a significant impact on the visual appearance of the area. The parameter plans fix the maximum height of the buildings in this area above ordnance datum.
3. Supports concerns of Highways England – Officer comment, Highways England no longer object.
4. Supports concerns of East Cambridgeshire District Council on capacity of A10.
5. Concerned that the Environment Agency had not seen the amended flood risk and surface water assessment. Officer comment – the EA have seen the amended assessment and have no objection.

6. The Internal Drainage Board supports the scheme on the understanding that appropriate drainage infrastructure is implemented. This will involve a process that needs to be agreed with the EA. Officer comment - agree. The IDB and the EA will both be involved in the next stage of the process, should planning permission be granted.
7. Concerned that Anglian Water have said that there is no additional capacity at Waterbeach Wastewater treatment works. The Parish Council would like to know what plans there will be to tanker excess in and out. Officer comment – AW have commented on their future plans. A planning condition will require a strategy to deal with the issue.
8. Cody Road is not suitable for vehicular access. Officer comment – agree, with the exception of up to 50 dwellings which can be accessed off Cody Road, restricted by planning condition.
9. Comments regarding footfall on footpaths. Officer comments – all public footpaths will be retained.
10. In conclusion, despite the existence of a current Local Plan and an SPD, Waterbeach Parish Council UNANIMOUSLY recommends REFUSAL of this planning application. Results of current consultations by Anglian Water and the Greater Cambridge Partnership should also be addressed before the application can be approved. Officer comment – the Anglian Water and Greater Cambridge Partnership consultations are separate from this planning application process. Foul water and strategic transport are referred to in the report.

## **Further Consultation Responses - External Consultees**

### **Cambridge County Council (13<sup>th</sup> January 2021)**

Writes to highlight the Local Highway's objection to the application.

#### **Relocated Railway Station**

The developer's proposed Monitor and Manage approach is dependent on the relocated railway station, to unlock phase one of the development.

Although consented, the developer has not identified a funding source for the railway station. This follows unsuccessful approaches to the Department for Transport and Greater Cambridge Partnership.

Without certainty on the station funding approach, it is not possible to (i) unlock phase 1, or (ii) gauge how much funding would be available for future phases, and therefore whether these could plausibly be unlocked.

It is recommended that the developer undertakes further work to identify/secure a workable funding model for the railway station.

### **Other Unlocking Transport Infrastructure**

The Monitor and Manage approach requires flexible funding to unlock future phases. Presently the developer has offered 15-17m for phases 2+ (potentially increasing through a viability review mechanism).

As acknowledged by the SPD, and Ely - Cambridge Transport Study, future phases of the development will be dependent on multi-modal strategic measures on the A10 corridor. These 2 schemes require a blended funding approach of which developer contributions are a critical component.

The County Council has two major concerns about the strategic sum offered-

The figure offered is low and therefore unlikely to be effective in enabling the required transport infrastructure to come forward.

A figure cannot credibly be offered until there is a known funding strategy for the railway station. A third-party station funder may require some developer 'match' and this could leave the developer with insufficient funding to support future phases (i.e. insufficient funds for a credible Monitor and Manage approach).

## **Further Consultation Responses - Third Party Representations**

### **15 further representation:**

1 raised issues that are already discussed in the committee report in relation to- surface water drainage, sewage provision, loss of agricultural land, biodiversity, archaeology, use of Cody Road, health provision, loss of village community.

Other representations made comments relating to the following issues (some people made similar comments to each other) –

2. Vehicular and construction traffic not going through the village – Officer comment - agree, this is discussed in the report.

3. The Requirement for a fully funded sustainable transport plan rather than a monitor and manage approach - Officer comment – transport has been covered in the report.

4. That SCDC oversees the delivery of utilities such as potable water, electricity, sewage – Officer comment - this is the responsibility of the various statutory undertakers, not SCDC.

5. That SCDC engages an independent body to work with U&C and RLW to remove the ransom land to enable both developers to access each other's land to protect the residents and amenity of Waterbeach village – Officer comment - this issue is addressed in the 'links protocol' in the s106 agreement for the adjacent U&C site and will be replicated in the RLW s106 agreement.

6. That non-motorised transport routes include provision for all non-motorised users not just pedestrians and cyclists. Horse riders must be included as well – Officer comment - this is included in the report.

7. That all drainage ditches and balancing ponds proposed by RLW in their designs are safety fenced – Officer comment - this is included in the report.

8. Paths that run alongside these water hazards must be designed to be accessible to emergency services in the event of any non-motorised user finding themselves in deep water - Officer comment - this will be included as a requirement for any reserved matters planning application, see amendment to condition 9.

9. Where will the water come from to supply the proposed 4,500 houses, particularly in view of the recent Stantec Report, which states on page 17 "There is no environmental capacity for additional development in the new Local Plan to be supplied with water by increased abstraction from the Chalk aquifer - Officer comment – this report refers to discussions on the next local plan.

10. Has the Environment Agency been consulted on water supply - Officer comment – the comments of the EA have been published. They have referred to abstraction in their comments.

11. Has the council also taken into account projected sea level rise resulting from climate change which could render these properties unsaleable? Officer comment – yes climate change has been taken into account.

12. Has SCDC explored options relating to transport routes that cross the river, so that all transport does not need to be directed down the A10. Officer comment – the local plan allocation and the SPD require the development to be access by vehicles onto the A10.

13. If the sports fields to the north of the site will not be lit, adequate all-weather facilities with proper floodlighting will be required elsewhere. Officer comment – Sport England have not objected to the proposals subject to a strategy to deliver playing fields to an appropriate standard in phases throughout the development.

14. Why are existing facilities within the village for health, education and community provision not being expanded as a result of the development of the new town. Officer comment – the development has to mitigate for its own impact, and will be providing health, education and community facilities within the new town.

15. Health impacts – anxiety Policy SC/2. Officer comment – Policy SC/2 requires a Health Impact Assessment to be submitted. A report has been submitted and found to be acceptable. Condition 41 requires developers to submit Health Impact Conformity Checklists to accompany any application.

16. Lack of affordable housing – 30% is unacceptable, look for a new partner who could deliver 40% affordable housing – Officer comment – the applicant has undertaken a viability review in accordance with the NPPF, and this has concluded that 30% affordable housing is viable on the site, taking into account all other s106 and planning requirements.

17. Car Dyke junction to be made safe before any development commences – Officer comment – the County Council will endeavour to bring the junction forwards in consultation with the applicant.

18. Railway relocation - Officer comment. A planning condition requires no occupation before either the railway station or the CAM/GCP scheme is open and ready for use.

19. Health provision – the NHS have responded to the application, and set out their requirements, and is in the s106 Heads of Terms.

20. Burial ground – This was covered in the U&C report, but if required, then this can be covered by an additional pre-occupation condition requiring the submission of a scheme to provide a burial ground.

21. Impact on Cam Washes, Wicken Fen and Bottisham Lock. Upware and Burwell have free car parks that will provide greater pressure on Wicken Fen. The lane to Bottisham Lock should be lit and the car park should be improved. – Officer comment – see report. Upware and Burwell are further away from Waterbeach by car than the Wicken Fen visitor centre. The road to Bottisham Lock is a rural lane.

22. Overall number is too high – Officer comment – see report

23. Impact on Denny Abbey – Officer comment – see report

24. Loss of agricultural land - Officer comment – see report

## **Amendments to report**

### **Executive summary**

Paragraph 7 – remove ‘with a 30/70 tenure split’.

### **Description**

Paragraph 33 – remove ‘on a site of up to 8 hectares with up to 1.9 hectares safeguarded for future expansion’ with ‘on a site of 1.9 hectares’.

### **Environmental Impact Assessment**

Paragraph 50 – replace 2011 with 2017.

Paragraph 54 – rename and reorder some of the topics. The correct order of the ES contents page is –

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Ecology and Nature Conservation

Traffic and Transport

Air Quality

Ground Conditions

Hydrology and Flood Risk

Noise and Vibration

Population and Human Health

Paragraph 69 – replace 2011 with 2017.

### **Amount, land use and scale parameters**

Paragraph 429 – renumber up to 24,000 sqm to up to 24,800 sqm.

### **Scale**

Paragraph 456 – replace sentence beginning ‘The LVIA judges ...’ with the following sentence – ‘The LVIA judges the effects of the proposal to be at most of moderate significance on the Fen Edge Landscape Character Area, with effects on visual receptors to be of major significance.’

Paragraph 498 – replace ‘area’ with ‘context of the site’, and add ‘with the final design response subject to further assessment through the design code process to be secured by condition’.

### **Section 106 contributions and the viability process**

Paragraph 578. Add text.

‘The Transport Enhancement Fund is accepted on the basis of it being a fully flexible transport enhancement fund. Some of this fund may be required as part of any railway station funding package but this could be drawn down over later phasing of the development, with the detail to be agreed in the s106 agreement.’

### **Site access (construction and post construction)**

Paragraph 581 – add ‘the Transport Assessment (TA) states’ before ‘that construction vehicles ...’.

Paragraph 588 – add ‘and the TA’ after ‘the ES’.

### **Environmental Considerations**

Under ‘Archaeology and Heritage’.

Correction to Paragraph 735, add the following text after ‘application’. -  
‘Preservation in this context means not harming the interest in the building as opposed to keeping it unchanged. Decision makers should give considerable important and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed building when carrying out the balancing exercise.’

Correction to Paragraph 753, delete ‘most of’.

At the end of Paragraph 766, ‘including the tests in paragraphs 193, 194 and 196’.

At the end of Paragraph 766. Add at the end. ‘Overall, subject to conditions, the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to designated and non-designated heritage assets which would be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme summarised at the end of this report.’

### **Summary Conclusion**

Under paragraph 1111, remove ‘referral to the Secretary of State’. The application does not need to be referred to the Secretary of State, in accordance with the Town and Country (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009.



**Recommendation**

Amend wording at recommendation a) to read:  
DELEGATED APPROVAL 'to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development' of outline permission, as amended, subject to:

This proposed change aligns with the recommendation of the U&C scheme.

**Conditions**

9 Reserved matters applications

Add section (r) Details of any emergency access arrangements.