

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

6th September 2006

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Head of Planning Services

S/0032/06/F – LANDBEACH, MILTON AND WATERBEACH

Change of Use of Land to Create a Multi-Sport Park, Construction of Lakes with Water Storage, Canal, New and Changed Roads, Cycling and BMX Tracks, Bridges (3), Engineering Operations, Embankments and Landscaping and Outline Permission to Construct a Sports Centre, Boathouse, Finish Line Towers (2), Warden Accommodation (2) and Amenity Blocks (3) at Land Between Milton & Waterbeach In the Parishes of Milton, Landbeach & Waterbeach for Cambridge Sport Lakes Trust

Recommendation: Delegated Approval

Date for Determination: 11th April 2006 (Major)

Conservation Area

Members will visit the site on Monday 4th September 2006.

Site and Proposal

1. The site is located between Milton Country Park to the south and the village of Waterbeach to the north, about 3 miles north of Cambridge, and close to the A14. The site is a narrow triangle joined to the River Cam at the south end and running north easterly, widening towards Waterbeach. The site runs parallel and adjacent to the Cambridge/Ely railway line on the south east side, and is about a field's depth away from the A10 trunk road on the northwest side.
2. The Eastern end is bounded by the Car Dyke, which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The site falls partly within the Baits Bite Lock Conservation Area, in particular the southernmost end, where the proposed canal links to the River Cam. The site is generally low-lying, flat and open. It is dissected by several man-made drainage channels including Award Drains 288, 291 and 393. There are a few hedgerows, trees and tree belts within the site. The current land uses are agricultural. The total area of the application site is 95.1 Ha (235 Acres), although the site area has been amended to include a small area of Fen Road, Milton to provide a safe approach to the railway crossing from the proposed bridge.
3. The application is submitted in part full, part outline and proposes:
Full planning permission for use of the land for the development of:
 - a) two connected lakes for rowing, canoeing, kayaking and associated sports;
 - b) a storage lake designed to assure water quality which can also be stocked for angling;
 - c) a canal to link the lakes to the River Cam,

- d) BMX, cycling and triathlon tracks,
 - e) a sports centre,
 - f) a country park,
 - g) three bridges,
 - h) associated engineering operations, embankments and landscaping,
 - i) new and changed roads.
4. The embankments are designed to provide the essential windbreak for the rowing lakes as well as opportunities for other activities such as walking and jogging. Allowances have been made for appropriately designed external areas to cater for the identified sports.

Outline planning permission for:

- a) construction of a sports centre,
 - b) a boathouse,
 - c) two finish line towers,
 - d) two dwellings to provide for warden accommodation,
 - e) and three amenity blocks.
5. The application has been amended to withdraw all the concept drawings for the aqueduct, railway culvert, Cam Towpath bridge, start bridge, a typical cross section and the Fen Road bridge. It is intended, following discussions with the Environment Agency, that details for all these structures would be developed as a consequence of the stage 2 Flood Risk Assessment.
6. The application is accompanied by a Planning Statement, Environmental Impact Assessment and draft Section 106 agreement.

Planning History

7. **S/0810/92/F** for change of use of land to rowing lake and country park was withdrawn, as it had been superseded by the application below. It had been resolved at Committee in August 2002 that the principle of a rowing lake was accepted however a number of issues needed to be resolved.
8. **S/0917/93/F** for change of use of land to rowing lake and country park, construction of new and changed roads, a canal, bridges, embankment and boathouse including wardens accommodation (2 residential units) was refused in 2005 on grounds that a Section 106 had not been signed and the Environmental Impact Assessment had become out of date in the intervening period.

Planning Policy

9. **Policy P1/2 – Environmental Restrictions on Development** of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (The Structure Plan) restricts development which is likely to adversely affect amongst others, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and flood plains. It also restricts development in the countryside unless the proposals can be demonstrated to be essential in a particular rural location; where there is an unacceptable risk to the quality of ground or surface water; where the best and most versatile agricultural land would be significantly affected; to prevent sterilisation of workable mineral deposits; where there could be damage, destruction or loss to areas that should be retained for their biodiversity, historic, archaeological, architectural, and recreational value.

10. **Policy P1/3 – Sustainable Design in Built Development** of the Structure Plan requires a high standard of design and sustainability for all new development which minimises the need to travel and reduces car dependency and provides a sense of place which amongst others responds to the local character of the built environment; is integrated with adjoining landscapes; creates distinctive skylines, focal points, and landmarks; includes attractive green spaces and corridors for recreation and biodiversity; conserves important environmental assets of the site; and makes efficient use of energy and resources.
11. **Policy P4/1 – Tourism, Recreation and Leisure Strategy** of the Structure Plan states that new or improved tourism, recreation and leisure development should, amongst others, maintain or increase employment opportunities; meet the needs of local communities as well as visitors; be accessible by a choice of sustainable transport modes; protect or improve the local environment, landscape and residential amenity.
12. **Policy P4/2 – Informal Recreation in the Countryside** of the Structure Plan requires Local Plans and major new developments adjoining the countryside to include proposals for informal leisure and recreation, including country parks and routes for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Such proposals should be accessible to the main centres of population and reached by a choice of means of transport. Provision will form part of a network of safe routes in the countryside and will be suitable for use by people with disabilities.
13. **Policy P4/4 – Water-Based Recreation** of the Structure Plan encourages the development of appropriate strategies for the enhancement of the recreation and the tourism potential of the River Cam where there is sufficient environmental capacity.
14. **Policy RT1 - Recreation and Tourism Development** of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (Local Plan) sets out the requirements for proposals to develop recreational facilities including the need for such facilities and the benefits which might accrue. It states that proposals will be resisted that would:
 - a. result in the irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a);
 - b. not be in close proximity to and not be well related with an established settlement and its built-up area;
 - c. result in buildings and other structures not directly related to the proposed use;
 - d. by reason of its scale, form, design and materials of the proposal, together with any associated development such as clubhouses, pavilions, and other buildings and structures would create an intrusive feature in the landscape or surrounding area;
 - e. result in the loss of ecological, wildlife and archaeological interests;
 - f. generate significant motorised traffic movements;
 - g. have inadequate provision for parking and manoeuvring of cars and service vehicles to the District Council's standards;
 - h. not provide appropriate provision for screening and to minimise the visual intrusion into neighbouring development and the countryside;
 - i. not undertake adequate measures for the screened storage and safe disposal of refuse.
15. **Policy RT13 – The River Cam** of the Local Plan sets out the issues for development of the River Cam. It is now slightly out of date, as the 2002 application was subsequently refused (see paragraph 7 above). Paragraph 9.38 of the supporting text states:

The River Cam is a major recreation resource and has a variety of users. There is a very real danger of overuse and management is therefore important. The River Cam is navigable from its junction with the Ely Ouse at the “Fish and Duck” to Jesus Lock at Jesus Green in Cambridge. Boats may progress further upstream towards the Mill Pond at Silver Street with permission, but restricted to winter months. Extensive use of the river is made by rowers from both the university colleges and a number of rowing clubs in the City. The District Council has approved plans for a new purpose built 2,000m rowing lake between Milton and Waterbeach. The legal agreement concerning this development has not yet been signed. If the development proceeds, pressure from rowing on the River Cam may be eased.

16. **Policy P6/1 – Development Related Provision** of the Structure Plan and **Policy CS1 – Planning Obligations** of the Local Plan permit development only where the additional infrastructure and community requirements generated by the proposals can be secured, which may be by condition, legal agreement or undertaking.
17. **Policy P6/3 – Flood Defence** of the Structure Plan and **Policy CS5 – Flood Protection** of the Local Plan will not allow development in areas where flood protection is required unless flood defence measures and design features are included that give sufficient protection to ensure that an unacceptable risk is not incurred, both locally and elsewhere. The provision and maintenance of flood defences that are required because of the development will be funded by the developer. It is vital that appropriate arrangements are made for the adoption and long-term management of such defences.
18. **Policy P6/4 – Drainage** of the Structure Plan requires all new development to avoid exacerbating flood risk locally and elsewhere by utilising water retention areas and other appropriate forms of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the disposal of surface water run-off. SuDS may include such methods as swales, soakage lagoons, reed beds, retention ponds, filter strips, infiltration and permeable paving. In designing SuDS, agreement must be reached between the Environment Agency, Local Planning Authorities, Anglian Water, relevant Internal Drainage Board and the developer regarding the adoption and maintenance of such systems. Where appropriate, developers will be expected to make financial provision towards the long-term maintenance of the system through a Section 106 agreement.
19. **Policy P7/2 – Biodiversity** of the Structure Plan seeks new developments that conserve and enhance the biodiversity value of the areas which they affect. Landscape features of major importance to wild fauna and flora will be retained, managed and enhanced. Where damage is unavoidable agreements will be sought to re-create features on or off-site. This is reiterated in **Policy EN12 – Nature Conservation: Unidentified Sites** of the Local Plan.
20. **Policy P7/4 – Landscape** of the Structure Plan and **Policy EN1 – Landscape Character Areas** of the Local Plan state that development must relate sensitively to the local environment and contribute to the sense of place, identity and diversity of the distinct landscape character areas. In paragraph 7.14 of the supporting text it adds:
21. Where development is intrinsically unsuited to the character of a particular area it should be resisted. Proposals for prominent structures will only be permitted if they are essential in the countryside and if the location, siting and design minimise adverse impact on the environment. Special attention needs to be paid to:

1. the need to integrate proposals with existing landscape features to conserve and enhance local character;
 2. the scale of the development, its siting, design and the materials and colours used, which must be in sympathy with the surroundings.
22. **Policy EN2 – The River Valleys** of the Local Plan states that development which has an adverse effect upon the wildlife, landscape and the countryside character of the River Valleys of South Cambridgeshire' will not be permitted.
23. **Policy EN3 - Landscaping and Design Standards For New Development in the Countryside** of the Local Plan states that in those cases where new development is permitted in the countryside the Council will require that (a) the scale, design and layout of the scheme (b) the materials used within it, and (c) the landscaping works are all appropriate to the particular 'Landscape Character Area', and reinforce local distinctiveness wherever possible.
24. **Policy EN5 – The Landscaping of New Development** of the Local Plan requires trees, hedges and woodland and other natural features to be retained wherever possible in proposals for new development. Landscaping schemes will be required to accompany applications for development where it is appropriate to the character of the development, its landscape setting and the biodiversity of the locality. Conditions will be imposed on planning permissions to ensure the implementation of these schemes
25. **Policy P7/6 – Historic Built Environment** of the Structure Plan requires Local Planning Authorities to protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the historic built environment.
26. **Policy EN4 – Historic Landscapes** of the Local Plan restricts development that 'would adversely affect or lead to the loss of important areas and features of the historic landscape whether or not they are statutorily designated. The supporting text lists Car Dyke in its examples.
27. **Policy EN15 – Development Affecting Ancient Monuments or Other Archaeological Sites** of the Local Plan seeks to protect, preserve and enhance known and suspected sites and features of archaeological importance and their settings by requiring, where possible, assessment and retention in situ of remains, or if not possible, a programme of excavation and recording remains prior to the commencement of development by a suitably qualified individual.
28. **Policies EN30 and EN31 - Development in Conservation Areas** of the Local Plan set out standards of design, materials and landscaping f developments in Conservation Areas. Proposals will be expected to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of Conservation Areas.
29. **Policy P8/1 – Sustainable Development - Links between Land Use and Transport** of the Structure Plan requires new development that:
- a. is located in areas that are, or can be made, highly accessible to public transport, cycle and on foot;
 - b. is designed to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car;
 - c. provides opportunities for travel choice;
 - d. provides for the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users;
 - e. provides appropriate access from the highway network that does not compromise safety.

30. **Policy P8/2 – Implementing Sustainable Transport for New Development** of the Structure Plan and supported by **Policy TP1 – Planning for More Sustainable Travel** of the Local Plan require new development to make provision for integrated and improved transport infrastructure to increase the ability to move by cycle, public transport and on foot. Travel Plans are required to accompany new non-residential developments as a means of reducing car dependency and promoting alternative modes of travel.
31. **Policy P8/8 – Encouraging Walking and Cycling** of the Structure Plan states: ‘The capacity, quality and safety of walking and cycling networks will be increased to promote their use, minimise motorised travel and to realise health improvements. All new development must provide safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle environments including adequate cycle parking, and contribute towards the wider encouragement of cycling and walking’.
32. **Policy TP5 – People With Disabilities and Limited Mobility** of the Local Plan requires suitable provision to be made in new developments for the safe and convenient access for people with limited mobility or those with other impairments such as of sight or hearing.
33. **Policy P9/2a – Green Belt** of the Structure Plan and **Policy GB2 – General Principles** (Green Belt) of the Local Plan set out the extent and purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These policies establish development types that are acceptable within the Green Belt, including changes of use and developments that are required for agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport, cemeteries, or other uses appropriate to a rural area.
34. **Policy GB5 – Recreational Role of The Green Belt** of the Local Plan states that the Council will not support proposals for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation in the Green Belt which require substantial buildings, car parks, floodlights or which frequently attract large numbers of participants or spectators or which would result in the loss of the best and most versatile grades of agricultural land.
35. **Policy GB6 – Access to the Countryside - Footpaths, Bridleways and Cycleways** of the Local Plan states that the Council will, in partnership with the County Council, will investigate the opportunities to improve and maintain access to the countryside through the maintenance of existing rights of way and the provision of new footpaths, bridleways and cycleways, including circular routes.

Consultations

36. **Horningsea Parish Council** – no response received.
37. **Landbeach Parish Council** – makes no recommendation but comments:
 - a) The Parish Council has no objection in principle to the Multi-Sport Park, but is concerned that the increased traffic movements created by this development would have traffic implications on the A10 that already has to cope with substantially more traffic than the road was designed for.
 - b) Our other concern would be the Slap-Up junction on the A10, this is already an accident black spot. If the park is approved we would like to see incorporated in the plans an initiative to improve the junction, as the extra traffic that will be generated by the park will only lead to further accidents at this point as the

current junction is not planned well enough to take additional movements.
This is an issue which Highways should look to address.

38. **Milton Parish Council** – Recommend that the application be refused. It raises a number of specific concerns, summarised below:

- a) As the scheme will have a major impact upon Milton and Waterbeach queries whether a Public Inquiry should be held.
- b) Traffic management at the A10/Car Dyke Road.
- c) There is a need for speed restrictions for the full length of Car Dyke Road.
- d) Improved pedestrian and cycle access from the site to Waterbeach Station is required.
- e) Some free parking will be required on site in order to prevent car parking on the road.
- f) Details required for access to the drove road near the bridge as it is not clear whether there is any access.
- g) It is concerned about parking at, access for and services to the crossing keeper's cottage and the lock cottages and it notes the observations & objections in a letter dated 28 June 1993 sent to SCDC by the resident of the crossing keeper's cottage.
- h) It is concerned about different levels between Fen Road and the drove. The bridge is 1.5m above the existing road level which is close to what will be the water level in the Training Lake under the bridge. As the headroom is only 1.5m and if the towpath continues under the bridge it would need to be sunk down below water level in order for people to walk along it.
- i) The road will apparently slope at 1:20 (max) on the approach to the bridge, so 30m of road approaching the bridge will form a slope:
 1. This should be shown in the red line area (this has now been amended to show this).
 2. The access to the last field on the left before the lake must be maintained. It is concerned about the level of slope from the road into the field.
 3. Either another 30m length of the Drove Road should possibly be within the red line area, or a parallel flat access to the field and the Drove Road needs to be within the red line area. (This will also mean altering drainage ditches and channels under the road.)
 4. Access to the land opposite will be affected.
 5. Paragraph 9.7.1 of the Environmental Statement says that there will be pedestrian access from Fen Road to the site. A very informal and not publicised pedestrian entrance in Fen Road for residents of Milton should be provided - to prevent car parking on Fen Road (in the same way that parking for the Country Park is provided at the official car park while Milton residents use other entrances to access the park).
- j) It is concerned as to how the construction traffic will access the cut between the railway and the river without using Fen Road.
- k) Noise levels must be kept to a minimum early & late in the day.
- l) Work should be restricted to half day on Saturdays and none on Sundays / Bank Holidays.
- m) A detailed construction plan is required so that we can be reassured that no construction traffic uses Fen Road. Large articulated lorries using Fen Road is a scenario that we cannot even contemplate. A condition should be imposed that "no construction traffic should use Fen Road."
- n) Consideration should be given for a local archaeology display to be incorporated in the development. (A condition of the "golf club" permission allowed for part of a Heritage Centre).

- o) It wishes to see a detailed drainage plan. Landowners and farmers in the village need to know how the drainage will work.
- p) Milton currently enjoys drainage under gravity to the river. It trusts that proposals are being put forward to ensure that this is maintained.
- q) Under this scheme it wishes to know whether the watercourses which are intercepted will be able to drain under gravity to the river via the perimeter drain
 - a. in normal conditions
 - b. in 1 year in 100 flood conditions
 - c. in 1 year in 100 + climate change conditions.
- r) It is concerned that the informal, natural underground drainage could be impeded by the lake's clay basin.
- s) If the scheme for drainage relies on the Pump House being operational it is concerned as to the management arrangements to ensure that it remains operational at all times in the future. It needs assurance that the CSL will manage the drainage of the village.
- t) There must be a sluice gate at the railway culvert;
- u) Vehicle access to the Award Drain for maintenance between the aqueduct and the railway.
- v) A stand by / back up for pumps in event of a power failure, seepage; and run off from the lake after heavy rainfall. The main flash flood water from Milton is intercepted by this project. The climate is changing. During the last heavy rains (4.5" two years ago) Milton's drainage struggled to cope then.
- w) Queries the capacities of the perimeter drains.
- x) If the gradients of banks are greater than 1 : 3 we are concerned that there may be a slip as has happened on more than one occasion at the A10/A14 interchange embankments.
- y) There appear to be numerous drainage problems yet to be resolved.
- z) Planning Officers should ensure that Planning policies are not breached.
- aa) Conservation Officers should consider any conservation area problems.
- bb) It wants the trees along the drove road near the new bridge to be maintained.
- cc) Requires clarification on the opening days and that the maximum 65 days closure for events includes the 50 days for management exclusions.
- dd) A condition should be imposed requiring that no power boats will be used on the water.
- ee) A condition should be imposed requiring that the BMX track will be for push bikes only.
- ff) There should be some control over and protection from noise levels from the site at all times.
- gg) The Cambridge Sport Lakes Trust should have to submit a business plan to demonstrate that they can maintain the park as envisaged and not merely for the foreseeable future.
- hh) It is unhappy that the consultation committee has no power - Sections 3(a) and 3(c) of the third schedule define the maximum number of days when the park can be closed to the public. The scope of the consultation committee defined in the second schedule implies that the Owners can vary the rights of public access by consulting with the committee [second schedule, section 2(a)(iv)]. However, the agreement gives the consultation committee no veto whatsoever. The owners, therefore, can override sections 3 (a) and 3(c) of the third schedule simply by consulting with the committee but can choose to ignore the committee if it disagrees with them. It would like reassurance that the consultative committee is set up to ensure its views are not overturned.
- ii) It requires reassurance that certain conditions are attached to the land purchase.
- jj) The 6th Draft of the Section 106 is much stronger than the 10th and it prefers the statements in the 6th Draft concerning:
- kk) Guarantee to Complete or Reinstate

- ll) Management and
- mm) Public access.
- nn) The Environment Statement Volume 4 Annex E 1.10 Badger - there are two badger setts -1 active - within 30 metres of the site.

39. **Waterbeach Parish Council** – In principle the Council is in favour of the concept of the facility of a multi-sport park however after careful consideration it was agreed that this application should be refused as the access to the site from Car Dyke Road is unacceptable. The Council are of the opinion that there will be considerable nuisance and disruption to the village and its residents particularly on event days. Furthermore the Council already have reservations about the safety of the A10/Car Dyke Road junction and consider that an increase in traffic will exacerbate the situation. The Council believe that it would be preferable for the vehicular access to be off the A10 into the middle of the site thus causing less congestion in the village of Waterbeach and at the junction of Car Dyke Road and the A10. In the event that this application is granted planning permission the Council would want to see:

1. some works to improve the Car Dyke Road/A10 junction
2. no left turn from the village into the site off Car Dyke Road
3. no right turn out of the site onto Car Dyke Road towards the village
4. a footpath/cycleway on the south side of Car Dyke Road from the site entrance to the A10

40. **East Cambridgeshire District Council** – has raised the following concerns:

- a) Traffic impact upon the A10.
- b) The cycle track, BMX circuit, amenity block and accommodation would be better located nearer to concentrations of population in order to be sustainable.
- c) There does not appear to be extensive public transport to the site, and the cycle link to Cambridge has not been clearly identified.
- d) The impact upon the open rural landscape could be extensive, and would need to be the subject of a full landscape impact assessment with the proper consideration of mitigation measures and whether or not these can in fact be effective.
- e) The development merges Milton and Waterbeach, potentially contrary to the preservation and development of individual settlements.
- f) Is there a demonstrable need for the development, both in general recreational strategy and / or in terms of this particular location?
- g) Is there a clear functional justification for the accommodation on site?

41. **Cambridge City Council** – Comments:

- a) This is an exciting proposal which we strongly support.
- b) The River Cam suffers from congestion and this proposal would relieve this pressure.
- c) It meets a recognised need for additional facilities for rowing in the sub-region and is supported in the Draft Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region.
- d) It would also improve the range and quality of recreational opportunities in close proximity to Cambridge, and help meet the needs of this major growth area.

42. **National Federation of Anglers** – no comment received.

43. **Cambridge Fish Preservation and Angling Society** – no comment received.

44. **National Federation of Anglers** – no comment received.
45. **British Cycling** – no comment received.
46. **British Triathlon** – Support the proposals commenting that the facility will provide an outstanding venue for Triathlon competition and training from grass roots to international level. The Lakes will make Triathlon much more accessible to those in the Cambridge Area – especially children, for whom safe places to cycle and compete are particularly difficult to find.
47. **British Canoe Union** – Support the proposals which will cover all classes of both canoeing and kayaking including Olympic disciplines. There are only three sites in England and Wales at present and one in Scotland that are capable of holding training and events over 1 and 2 kilometre distances. As a result, there is little water time available and more is sorely needed.
48. **Drainage Manager** – comments:

This is a very substantial development that impacts on a number of award drains in the immediate vicinity and upstream including locations in the Cambridge City Council area. The following is relevant:

a. *Legal*

The Section 106 must contain clauses that will indemnify the Council against possible claims for negligence as a result of inadequate maintenance by the owners within the development area.

b. *Access and maintenance*

The developer must ensure that the Council's 5-metre access strip is available at all times both during the construction phase and in the future so that maintenance may take place along the award drains affected by the development. The Stage 2 FRA must show access routes to all award drains with a clear indication on drawings giving dimensions of any obstructions including trees, shrubs and other planting, fences, buildings or any other impediments to access. The location of all bridges or culverts must also be included so that the permanent access routes are clearly defined.

c. *Proposed siphon on award number 291*

This is a vital aspect of the entire development and failure to demonstrate that the proposed siphon is suitable will mean the scheme is unworkable. The Stage 2 FRA is expected to provide details of the siphon at the junction of award 291 and the Canal. This proposal represents a major obstruction along the award drain and is likely to require substantial maintenance over and above the present level. Additionally, the Council is concerned to ensure that the proposed siphon will not cause upstream flooding along the award and the developer will be expected to demonstrate this to the Environmental Agency. It will be necessary for the Council's Land Drainage Advisory Group to consider all aspects of the proposed siphon and advise the Environmental Health Portfolio Holder on its acceptability, future maintenance requirements and any other drainage related issues.

I have had some discussions with the Environment Agency regarding the proposed siphon and its future maintenance. As the watercourse is awarded to the Council, it seems that the Agency is reluctant to carry out the checking on the hydraulic design of the siphon in order to ensure it will not impact on the

award drain. The Environment Agency will expect the Council to ensure that the proposed siphon will operate in line with parameters as set out by the Council - e.g. for flood events of a certain return period, the acceptable degree of increase in upstream water level, flood protection works upstream etc. Up to now, this is something that was always advised by the Environment Agency - as statutory consultee. However, the Agency view now is that if aspects of the design prove faulty, then the Agency may be held liable for approving faulty design concepts.

The two proposals put forward at the last meeting with the developers represented hydraulic solutions that were likely to be problematic. The Agency's advice at the time was that the preferred solution would involve the siphon and the developer's consultants felt this could be justified. On that basis it would seem reasonable to allow the developers to produce a design solution that would be hydraulically acceptable. However, if the Environment Agency is not prepared to approve the design, the Council will need to appoint consultants to advise on the proposals.

In order to produce a suitable design, it will be necessary to carry out computer modelling on the existing system. It will then be necessary to check this model with the siphon included. The Agency have advised that this is a time consuming and expensive process and the final design may involve off-site improvement works upstream or downstream of the siphon.

d. *Maintenance and commuted sums for future expenditure*

It will be necessary for the developer to pay a suitable commuted sum of money to cover all future expenses that will be incurred by the Council on the award drains as a result of the development. This figure shall be written into the S 106 agreement following negotiation and agreement with the developer.

e. *Structures*

All new structures associated with the development shall be the responsibility of the developer/owner of the site and must be maintained in a sound and reasonable condition at all times in the future. These shall include all access ways, bridges, culverts and the proposed siphon at award No. 291.

49. **Cultural Services Manager** – Supports the proposals, commenting:

- a) It is an ambitious project but will cater for all ages and abilities and will provide great community benefit within the sub region.
- b) The Draft Major Sports Facilities Strategy is now in its final stages and identifies a multi-lane rowing facility for training, sports development activities and events as a priority and is needed.
- c) Rowing has a strong history in the area and in recent years interest in rowing has extended and the Olympics has raised its profile
- d) The Cambridge Sports Lakes Trust has a very well established and successful sports development programme in South Cambridgeshire.
- e) Sport England and the Government are currently pushing for more active lifestyles and also the added value that multi-sports venues offer.
- f) This venue is important not just for elite athletes but also for informal recreation and physical activity.
- g) Other similar facilities (e.g. Holme Pierpoint Water Sports Centre in Nottingham) is often full of families, older people and young children enjoying an active walk around the perimeter of the lake that is clean and dry under foot in winter and offers a safe environment for family walking and cycling activities. This linked to a

- cafe facility provides an excellent afternoon out for families and would greatly enhance current opportunities in and around Cambridge.
- h) The Council along with Cambridgeshire County Council is signed up to the Local Area Agreement target of increasing physical activity of the population by 1% per year. This provision will help achieve this target.
 - i) The links to Milton Country Park offer great potential for combined management and economy of scale with the potential for jointly funded ranger services and close working between the Council and the Trust.
 - j) She emphasises the importance of public rights of way linking up and ensuring that existing rights of way are not badly affected by the proposal. Cycling is very popular in Cambridge and safety for recreational cycling and also competitive activities is of great importance. The velodrome will provide an invaluable, low cost and easily maintained and managed facility for cycling. This, added to the BMX facility, offers real added value to the community as well as for existing clubs and groups.
 - k) The facilities will be of particular interest to young people and offer great opportunities to attract more young people into sport. The sports of cycling and rowing are both likely to attract medals in the next Olympics in China. With the 2012 Olympics approaching the sports of cycling and rowing are expected to enjoy even greater interest and success rates within the UK and the provision of new and purpose built facilities in South Cambridgeshire will help ensure that potential local elite participants are properly provided for.
 - l) The proposed earth grandstand is illustrated at being approximately only 4m above ground level. This will help improve the facility in a number of ways:
 - m) It will help reduce side wind and therefore the potential for accidents on the lake. A number of years ago there was a fatal accident at Holme Pierpoint due to high winds and the orientation of the lake. The earth grandstand will help make the lake safer for users.
 - n) It will also offer a very valuable spectator grandstand where families can sit and enjoy the activities, picnic and support the competitors.
1. Notes concerns about traffic and access by residents of Waterbeach however, the facility will be used largely outside of "peak" traffic times such as weekends and evenings.
 2. Angling organisations need to be consulted as there is a need to ensure that the facility meets their requirements. There is an assumption that the income from Anglers will be substantial and help meet the operating costs.

50. **Landscape Design Officer** – Summary of comments:

- a) The general landscape character of the area is large, flat and open, this scheme would significantly change the character over a large area. If everything is to be up by 5m and all facilities are at least 7m up this will result in built forms and lighting being significantly higher and long distance views will be lost. How tall are all the proposed buildings?
- b) There is lack of detail in several areas which affect the landscaping for example:
 1. Extent of lighting both in the approach roads and within the site, will the cycling track have lighting e.g. for evening events.
 2. Surfacing of roads is not detailed i.e. will they all be tarmac?
 3. Clearer detail of car parking areas is required in order to avoid large expanses of tarmac in such a rural location. Cross sections and layout plans appear to give differing treatment.
 4. Cars appear to be being parked on some of the highest areas and presumably will require lighting in areas where they are proposing shrubs due to difficulty of planting establishment. Queries why the car parks could not be lower down and therefore better screened?

5. The management of planting and watering needs to be specified.
 6. Size of tree stock is not referred to and densities etc. will depend on this, some areas may require under storey planting.
 7. Concern is raised that evergreens proposed will dominate the skyline.
 8. It will be appropriate to establish some planting in ditches.
 9. Hedges should have the trees within them clearly marked from day one so that they are not cut in the early years, as it would be preferable to have standards rather than stooled trees.
 10. Queries how much of the vegetation on Car Dyke is to be lost to the visibility splays - looking at drawings this will be significant.
 11. Queries that all the trees adjacent to the training lake can be kept as indicated.
 12. There definitely should be a link to Milton Country Park and is the footpath link at the side of the golf course still being proposed?
 13. Questions the practicality of retaining the hedgerow along the access road.
 14. There is a need for the car park areas to be broken up
 15. There do not appear to be any details about the cycle track and BMX track, in particular levels. Are spectator areas to be banked etc.?
 16. Queries what is to be parkland or woodland and how much of each.
 17. In previous discussions there have been inferences that the planting could be significantly reduced if budgetary restraints required this – we need full and clarified details of the landscaping ideally prior to permission being granted rather than as condition.
 18. There are conflicting statements about the types of planting between the differing sections.
- c) If it is to be constructed in two phases and the spoil has to remain on site, how will much of, if any of the planting can be implemented in the early stages? It is unclear with the proposed phasing as to how much of the planting can be carried out early or at the end of phase one as it is likely that spoil from phase two will still need to be spread on site.
- d) The appropriateness of some of the species proposed is questioned. For example:
1. Woodland is an issue in terms of initial loss and as the type of tree planting proposed in some areas is not ideal from landscape or eco aspects- some replacement could be less than positive.
 2. Dense conifers are inappropriate.
 3. Gorse and Broom are not local species - they tend to be found more in heathland.
- e) The photo montage points selected do not realistically show the impact and other sites should be included:
- View 1 does not include view of churches
 - View 2 no mention of the longer views or the loss of the wider panoramic vistas. This indicates a total change - not necessarily better.
 - View 3 taken from a point where the intervening tree belt was average., several sections are very poor giving wider views. Also there does not appear to be any recognition of the poor state of many of these trees many of which have been pollarded or fallen in the last year.
 - Whilst summer views are of value winter ones should also be provided.
 - The applicants have not considered views from several key points e.g. Fen Road, the footpath cycle way further up towards Waterbeach, the caravan park, the Slap Up pub (as was).
- f) Concern about the height and massing of the mounding proposed. The site may currently have good drainage but even with new drains being created how are

they intending to retain the structure of the sub soils with all the earth movement and compaction that will occur. Will the increase in mounding to 10m high for substantial areas have an impact on the underground water levels and immediate vegetation off site. How big are and where are the settling basins? Some areas the slopes appear quite steep – practicality of establishment and what means of stabilization are being considered?

- g) Top soil must NOT be piled high as possible but stored in accordance with Good BS practice to ensure retention of structure.
- h) The loss of all existing features on the site, and the potential impact to adjoining ones:
 - 1. Habitats - vegetation that is to be lost, whilst this is of varying quality they provide linkages and are the only features currently on the site.
 - 2. How can they state that grassland impact is neutral if the majority of not all is being lost?
 - 3. Queries how are they going to ensure that it is the local species that are returned - will seed collection, cuttings and temporary transplanting be required
 - 4. Will archaeology restrict planting and if so details are required this now?

51. **Trees and Landscape Officer** – Is concerned that there is a lack of detail with regard to the extent of trees and hedgerows which will be removed. A detailed tree survey is required for further comment to be made.

52. **Ecology Officer** – Following an initial objection a revised ecology report was received. Preliminary comments on this are as follows, further comments as necessary will be reported verbally at Committee:

- a) This proposal has the potential to create a significant amount of new habitats to make a significant contribution towards county BAP targets. The second paragraph of the *Update on ecologist assessment and response to planning*, CSL 2006 states, “The proposed Cambridge Sports Lakes development provides an opportunity to significantly enhance the ecological importance of the region.” However, the submitted information fails to clarify how this will really be achieved as no figures for habitat creation are provided. Whilst I appreciate that the scheme is yet to be produced to the detailed design stage it should have been possible to provide indicative figures for expected hedgerow planting, standard trees, scrub, grassland, open water, new ditches.
- b) Summary of remaining areas of concern:
 - 1. Mitigation strategy against impact on known Badgers sett/s needs to be checked. Clarify if an artificial sett will need to be provided to compensate for the one that will be lost. A badger mitigation strategy could be requirement by condition if we are in agreement with the 2006 findings.
 - 2. Water vole distribution is reported as unchanged. The survey data from May 2006 should be provided in the update. It is stated that re-surveys will be undertaken prior to the start of construction, this is acceptable. It is also stated that the habitat creation measures are likely to occur 2 years in advance of the construction (this is good and a firm commitment to advance habitat creation works is needed along with details of the new ditch shapes and bankside seeding/planting. Indicative ditch cross sections should be provided. A commitment to advance creation of the new habitats at least 1 year prior to the destruction of the present watercourses. This could be conditioned as part of an agreed strategy for water voles).

3. There is concern that the survey of wintering birds has not been carried out, but it is appreciated that there is seasonal nature to the survey. The update acknowledges the survey's need and states that it will be undertaken if planning permission is obtained (thus it could be conditioned as part of the site's on-going monitoring work)
4. Further mitigation could be proposed for Nightingale and Grass Hopper Warblers – it is felt that in the form of control on the timing of works in the area of sensitivity to avoid April to August needs to be confirmed. Also, the triathlon track could be moved a little away from the boundary to provide more space for screen planting. We should request more clarification on the proposed scrub planting near to the Car Dyke SAM, in particular, will it be allowed, is it on the valuable grassland? The landscape plans should be checked to see if habitat creation measures could be include grassland areas.
5. Reptiles – the proposed approach is acceptable.
6. Amphibian – the proposed approach is acceptable.
7. It is accepted that on programme of on-going monitoring will be required. However, it is also important to formally agree the post-project monitoring for a 10 year period in order to report on the biodiversity successes of the scheme. Could this be included in a Section 106?
8. The provision of various nest boxes and bat boxes is welcomed. Further details should be sought through condition.
9. The provision of otter holt(s) has not been taken forward and should be.
10. The retention of large standing deadwood (i.e. the re-erection of cut oak tree trunks) should be undertaken to compensate for the loss of large standing deadwood. This could be undertaken in a quiet area where the public will be excluded (so as to reduce the risk of falling timber). Furthermore, the placement of felled scrub in selected areas will provide short to medium term nest sites and mitigate for some of the scrub loss.
11. A commitment must be secured to achieve monitoring of the site's biodiversity not just through the construction phase but for 10 years following the project's completion (this could incorporate the wintering bird surveys and continuing walk over surveys for protected species).
12. The creation of new grassland is welcomed, but an enforceable management commitment is required in order to ensure that an ecologically valuable habitat is created and maintained for at least 10 years.
13. Habitat creation – little suitable habitat is provided that will be suitable for skylarks, perhaps off-site habitat works could address this such as on the CCC land near to Waterbeach Station car park. No commitment is given to the provision of otter holts. No commitment is given to retaining deadwood habitats through the use of the cut oak trees or removed scrub. The amount of habitat creation has not been clarified within the 2006 Update. Concern still remains that this area of undisturbed farmland is significantly changing and that little actual provision for biodiversity in proportion with the scale of the development is being provided.
14. Policy context - PPS 9 seeks habitat enhancement and restoration, EN13 seeks to protect protected species, EN12 seeks to protect unidentified nature conservation, EN5 – biodiversity in landscape schemes, P7/2 – biodiversity conservation and enhancement).
15. Not all of the points of previous concern have been satisfactorily addressed following the Update 2006.

53. **Conservation Officer** –comments to be reported verbally.

54. **Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology** – Comments:

- a) Car Dyke Scheduled Ancient Monument should be afforded protection by fencing during the construction process - in areas where a new bus shelter and road works are to take place and also along the Access road into the site. English Heritage should be consulted further on this issue.
- b) It confirmed that it accepts the revised project design for the combined mitigation scheme and investigation and protection for the extensive archaeological landscape known to be within the site area.

55. **English Heritage** – does not object subject to the following comments:

- a) The excavation of the proposed large Sport Lakes is likely to lower the water table in the adjacent Roman canal known as the Car Dyke, which is a scheduled ancient monument of national importance (Cambs no.3). A small evaluation excavation in 1993 revealed the presence of waterlogged fills which were apparently Roman, and which have great potential for environmental remains. It is important to mitigate the impact of the Sport Lakes construction so that there is minimum impact to the level and characteristics of the groundwater level in the infilled Car Dyke. There is a presumption, expressed in PPG16 on Archaeology and Planning, that scheduled ancient monuments should be physically preserved. Our position is that we do not object to the proposal provided that a mitigation scheme regarding the Car Dyke is put in place, as set out in the Environmental Statement.
- b) The mitigation scheme set out in section 5.2.7 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement should be implemented in full. English Heritage should be consulted on each stage of the scheme, in order to ensure that the waterlogged deposits in the scheduled Car Dyke are safeguarded.
- c) It would also like to be consulted if the method statement describing the construction of the clay seal around the perimeter of the proposed water features is amended, so as to be able to advise the applicant on how to avoid inadvertent damage to scheduled waterlogged deposits.
- d) It recommends that appropriate conditions regarding the dewatering mitigation scheme are attached to any planning consent.

On receipt of the matrix it further comments:

- a) Page 8, first comment from Cambridgeshire County Council - Archaeology. Because of English Heritage's statutory role in advising on the management of scheduled ancient monuments such as the Car Dyke, I suggest the following addition after "Authority" in the seventh line of the suggested condition: ", following consultation with English Heritage".
- b) We have no comments on the proposed amendment regarding the red line extension (Fen Road).

56. **The Wildlife Trust** – objects, commenting:

- a) The proposed development is being strongly marketed as a great enhancement for biodiversity; it is our opinion that the biodiversity enhancements the scheme is offering are greatly over-stated, and the plan is out of keeping with the local landscape.
- b) Of the total site area just under half will become open water, the plan makes a point of stressing the great value of these new water bodies for wildlife. The rowing lakes, because of their intended use have completely uniform linear edges not sympathetic to the surrounding landscape, nor wildlife. Because of the need to maintain completely clear channels for rowing, the new lakes will have limited

biodiversity value. There will be no aquatic vegetation in the main rowing lakes, and limited marginal vegetation in the storage lake. The proposed annual flushing of the rowing lakes with water from the storage lake, will also limit the development of wildlife in the storage lake. Therefore overall the lakes are likely to have questionable value for wildlife.

- c) Despite this proposed annual flushing, the water in the lakes may still quickly become nutrient enriched with the likelihood of nuisance eutrophic weed growth. In such a scenario how would this nuisance be controlled; would chemical management be required? If so there are potential pollution concerns over discharge of chemicals into the River Cam.
- d) The development will result in loss of existing ditch habitat for water voles, the plan does make provision for the creation of new habitat (the new ditch extending around the perimeter of the development), however, the landscaping design suggests to us that this new ditch is unlikely to be particularly suitable for water vole use.
- e) A hedgerow is planned for one side of the ditch, and cantering track and trees will be planted very close (within 5m) on the other side. There is a need for open bank aspects to allow water vole food plants to grow. We would recommend a wider margin on either side of the ditch to create a more desirable vole habitat; this will allow diverse marginal and bank side vegetation to establish and reduce the chances of the banks scrubbing up with woody vegetation. We would like to know what construction profile is planned for the ditches and what materials will be used.
- f) We also have concerns over the proposed translocation of water voles from the existing ditches that will be destroyed in the construction of the lakes. The Environmental Statement makes no mention of translocation methods that would be used, nor gives details of a suitable receptor site for the removed animals. We suggest a more thorough water vole survey of the site is required to ascertain water vole numbers; this information is crucial for any translocation plan. There also needs to be a plan for monitoring the results of any vole translocation.
- g) The development will result in significant loss of mature scattered trees together with some hedgerows considered to be of importance under the Hedgerow Regulations. This loss is particularly pertinent in the Cambridgeshire landscape where such features are currently in short supply. The plans for replacement planting includes a significant proportion of exotic tree species; this includes coniferous waterside planting to act as a wind break with limited leaf fall. A significant proportion of the tree types and planting density are chosen to have the most effect in reducing the influence of the wind and are not chosen for their biodiversity value or naturalness in the local landscape. The Focal Specimen clusters of trees (mainly exotic species) are not considered appropriate for the site; we suggest these should instead be native local species such as Oak, Ash, and Willow species.
- h) The plans for grassland areas on the site comprise of unimaginative grass seed mixes which are to be used throughout the site. The emphasis is on non-native hardy grass species (that can take visitor/spectator wear and tear; this also applies to newly created woodland areas). Whilst we appreciate the need for hardier swards for spectator and formal recreation areas, we believe it is important that some provision should be made for creating areas of wildflower species rich grassland. In addition, rides in the newly created woodland could instead be created using an appropriate woodland seed mix that would encourage a more varied and interesting mix of flora. Such simple measures would assist the establishment of wildlife, and make for a more attractive site for visitors to enjoy.
- i) The project's aim to increase opportunities for informal recreation for local people is a commendable one; this is indeed very important for Cambridgeshire which

has limited open countryside for such recreational use.

The plan vaguely mentions the possibility of a potential link with Milton Country Park. We believe this should be a key component in the scheme, and would like to see some concrete suggestions for how this link will be created.

- j) As the plan currently stands we consider the biodiversity proposals for such a large development to be wholly inadequate, and overall believe the scheme would make a very questionable contribution to the local BAP. We therefore object to the planning application.
- k) We believe there is a good opportunity to greatly improve the quality of the environmental contribution of the scheme, by creating a link between the planned development and fields to the north-east of the development site (on the east side of the railway line, an area known as Waterbeach Meadows). Linking this area into the scheme would allow the opportunity to create a true green corridor for northern Cambridge, creating a natural link between Waterbeach and Milton. The meadows have the potential for habitat creation and would offer an accessible green space for the nearby community. It would also provide another point of access into the newly created "Country Park", and by linking up with the River Cam tow path would form an attractive "green" circular walk linking Waterbeach, Milton Country Park and Milton itself. Incorporating these meadows into the scheme, therefore, has the potential to greatly enhance the biodiversity value of the overall project, and improve access and recreation opportunities for local people, producing a "Country Park" of real benefit.

57. **Network Rail** – no comment received.

58. **GO- East** – no comment received.

59. **Anglian Water Services** – Require a condition that details of foul and surface water drainage be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing on site.

60. **The Ramblers Association** – comments:

- a) The project will occupy a large area of countryside which lies within the Cambridge Green Belt, but to which there is currently very little public access. To this extent, any additional access to the site will be of advantage to walkers, riders and cyclists. However there will also be environmental damage and loss of amenity due to parking, traffic flow on the A10, noise, appearance of buildings in an otherwise open landscape, and particularly increased cycle traffic on the popular Fen Rivers Way footpath along the River Cam towpath. There is also potential detriment to the neighbouring village of Horningsea, itself a conservation area (see Environmental Statement, Para. 2.4). We would expect to see considerable improvements in public access to the site, in compensation for such collateral losses, as well as in recognition that public money is likely to be expended on the development, from which the wider public ought thus to benefit.
- b) Accordingly we are encouraged to note (Environmental Statement: Executive Summary) that "Pedestrian & cycle access to the site for the public would be improved with new paths that link Waterbeach to Milton & Cambridge". However such access must be on public rights of way, in order to be effective. We would not wish to see a scheme resembling some other "recreational" facilities, such as the fishing lakes by Marsh Lane near St. Ives, where only local people have access, and the general public are left to walk along a busy road with no footway.
- c) (see Planning Statement, para. 2.2.4) Policy RT4 seeks to extend the network of routes for recreational walkers including circular walks. See also SCLP Section 9.16 "Changes to the path network", and Environmental Statement Para. 2.8

which states that "The Structure Plan encourages developing strategies for enhancing informal countryside recreation". Details of the proposed internal pathways are not readily apparent from the tiny plans with the application, but provided that these pathways are freely available to people at all times, and adequate connections are made with the external path network, the scheme will serve both Policy RT4 and the Structure Plan objective reasonably well.

- d) (see Environmental Statement, Para. 2.3.8) "The impact upon existing public rights of way should be examined, both during construction and operational phases, and mitigation measures identified," We support this statement.
- e) Links would be needed with Milton Country Park (which is itself readily accessible from Milton village) and also with Waterbeach village, and with the River Cam towpath especially through the new Cow Hollow Wood at Waterbeach. They should be public rights of way. The Design Statement, Scheme Context, Para. 4.7.1 refers to "Designated footways for walkers, bird watchers et al.", to be provided around the sides of all the lakes. These interconnect within the park and at the south end connect to the Cam towpath and Milton Country Park. At the north, they connect with Waterbeach. Again, all such links should be public rights of way. (cf. Environmental Statement, Para. 2.3.8- "Potential new linkages to Cambridge City Centre and Milton County Park should be explored and proposals for provision, maintenance and management of public access in the new Country Park should be identified" (See also Design Statement - Scheme Context, Para. 4.4.1 "A network of walking and cycling paths with a connection to the Milton Country Park".) We support these statements - subject to para. 3 below regarding public access.
- f) Free entrance: the Planning Statement, para. 1.4.3 refers to a "regional facility open to the general public"; see also Environmental Statement, Para. 1.1.2 "100 acres of wooded parkland & 10 miles of bank habitat for the public to enjoy". The value of this will be small unless it is freely available. If any charge is made, inevitably it becomes high because of the cost of collection, with the result that it may be hardly used except by "one-off visitors from outside the area - as has happened for example with the Cambridge University Botanic Garden which is rarely used by ordinary local people outside the winter period when it is free on weekdays.
- g) Separation of routes for walkers, riders and cyclists: again, there is insufficient detail in the application to show whether any kind of segregated routes are to be considered. Experience with shared routes on Cambridge City's commons, and particularly along the Cam towpath, shows that walkers, cyclists and horse riders just do not mix well. We would regard the provision of separate routes for walking and riding as an important asset in the proposal - see for example SCCP Section 9.15 "The aim is to balance and reconcile these recreational interests and environmental interests through appropriate management measures."
- h) In the Planning Statement, Para. 2.2.1 refers to CPSP 2003 Section 4.2 on walking and cycling, but there is very little mention of walking in the present document. Further, in the Design Statement - Scheme Context, Para. 4.4.1, walking is at the bottom of the list of recreations. We are also disappointed to note that the Ramblers' Association was not included in the consultation during preparation of this application. Several aspects of the Environmental Statement Volume 6 - Transport Assessment are relevant:
 - i) Chapter 4 is mainly concerned with access to the site, rather than movements within it. There is no explicit recognition that people may wish to visit the site just to walk within or through it - despite the fact that its environmental advantages and attractions are much trumpeted.
 - j) Chapter 5, Para. 5. 1 "Pedestrian & Cycle Provision" refers to access to the site via the Fen Rivers Way (which is legally of footpath status only), through a connection to Milton Country Park, and via Car Dyke Road in Waterbeach, part of

which lacks a footway. Proposals to designate the Cam towpath as part of an extension to National Cycle Route 11 are a cause of considerable concern to the Ramblers' Association.

- k) Chapter 7 "Sustainability and Accessibility Appraisal" recognises that access to the site from remote locations is likely to be principally by road or by cycling routes, because of the distances involved. Pedestrian access is likely to be largely from Waterbeach Station, from which improved walking and cycling provision will be needed.
- l) Much of the thought and comment made here results from the long experience and commitment of our footpath secretaries, and we hope you find our comments helpful.

61. **Countryside Agency** – no comment.

62. **English Nature** – objects to the current proposals, as inadequate detail has been provided. It has not been demonstrated that there will be no construction and operational impacts upon the biodiversity in the River Cam, or that any potential effects would be avoided or satisfactorily mitigated. It also has concerns that the applicant has provided insufficient information regarding mitigation for protected species, and enhancement measures for ecological benefit. A summary of the concerns it raised initially are:

- a) Hydrological impacts of the proposals, including effects of water being discharged from the lakes into the river system, in terms of water quality and flows.
- b) Full mitigation measures should be set out for birds, water voles, reptiles and amphibians, and monitoring of other species over time.
- c) The potential to provide nature conservation enhancements should be clearly distinguished from measures to mitigate or compensate for harm to nature conservation interests.

63. **Environment Agency** – Confirms that it is in broad agreement with the conditions recommended by CSL and subject to agreeing the precise wording of these and securing a Section 106 agreement. Whilst the original conditions put forward in its letter dated 17th October 2005 still stand (see below), it is of the opinion that the two further conditions put forward in the CSL letter of 28th July 2006 to deal with design, construction and operation of the penstocks, telemetry system, perimeter drains, culverts and any other hydraulic structures do need to be reworded for reasons of clarity. This would benefit all parties in so much that the conditions would be clear and not encompass too many parameters which may be difficult to discharge.

- a) The issues of Ownership, Maintenance, Review of System and Replacement and Commuted Sums still need to be addressed within a revised Section 106 agreement. Unless it is satisfied that these matters are fully covered at the eventual planning determination stage, it will object to this proposal to ensure that third party, and Environment Agency, interests in terms of flood risk and land drainage are fully protected.
- b) It sets out the recommended additional conditions (below). It must be noted that the Stage 2 Flood Risk Assessment, and all technical information submitted in respect of the development, must take account of current government guidance and legislation in respect of flood risk and land drainage etc:
 - 1. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation for the Operational Strategy of the Telemetry System shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Authority. The

works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.

2. Prior to the commencement of any development, the Stage 2 Flood Risk Assessment shall set out the proposed operation of the Penstocks and Pumping Systems associated with perimeter drains. The agreed operation shall be in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.
3. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of the Penstock Telemetry System shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the Local Authority. The scheme shall include a Detailed Contingency Plan to provide for the eventuality of electro-mechanical failure. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.
4. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of the Railway Culvert and Award Drain Siphon shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.
5. Prior to the commencement of any development, the Stage 2 Flood Risk Assessment shall include a full Topographical Survey (to ODN) of both Existing and Proposed Ground Contours. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.
6. Prior to the commencement of any development, The Stage 2 Flood Risk Assessment shall include Full Details and Calculations of the Railway Culvert and Award Drain Siphon. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.
7. Prior to the commencement of any development, the Stage 2 Flood Risk Assessment shall include Full Details for Site Evacuation in the eventuality of flood. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.
8. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of surface water drainage works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall be completed in accordance with the details and timetable agreed.
9. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the maintenance of surface water drainage system, including pump systems has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The satisfactory maintenance scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the details and timetable agreed.
10. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a stage 2 Flood Risk Assessment is submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall include that recommended within Stage 1 Flood Risk Assessment (August 2005).
11. Development approved by this permission shall be constructed in accordance with full details approved in satisfactory Stage 1 and Stage 2 Flood Risk Assessments.
12. Before commencement of the development a satisfactory flood contingency plan must be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the Stage 2 Flood Risk Assessment and held on

site for use at all times.

- c) In response to the matrix and letter submitted by CSL letter dated 2 August 2006:
1. It accepts that the drawings of bridges and engineering structures are now no longer part of the planning application and such works shall be subject to approval by us by way of planning conditions and written consent required under our own legislation, the Water Resources Act 1991 and Land Drainage Act 1991 and our Byelaws. These consents are required irrespective of any planning approval or approval from Cam Conservators. Works which commence without our prior written consent will be subject to enforcement action.
 2. Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Byelaws, the prior written consent of the Agency is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 9.00 metres of the top of the bank of the main river (Cam).
 3. Any culverting or works affecting the flow of a watercourse requires the prior written Consent of the Environment Agency under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991/Water Resources Act 1991. The Environment Agency seeks to avoid culverting, and its Consent for such works will not normally be granted except as a means of access. The granting of planning approval must not be taken to imply that consent has been given in respect of the above.
- d) The responsibilities and duties of the Environment Agency, River Cam Conservators and the SCDC Drainage Engineer overlap in terms of legislation and responsibilities. It recommends that all parties be included within the matrix 'Consu'tee' column, and be consulted simultaneously where/when such matter arise. The above paragraphs, under the heading CSL Consultee Matrix, should be noted and included within the matrix.
- e) It comments further to a meeting on JulyJuly 2006 that it was not of the opinion that SCDC gave any indication that flood risk and drainage could be adequately dealt with by S106 and Conditions. It understood that SCDC merely suggested that this meeting was a way forward, and that further work was needed to ensure that flood risk and drainage were dealt with in s106 and conditions. The minutes should be amended accordingly.
- f) It is concerned that the inclusion of the Penstocks may have resulted in the impounded lake structure falling within the legislative scope of The Reservoirs Act 1975. It is advised that CSL investigate this issue fully.
- g) The above comments are based upon the application as currently being considered for committee, which includes the penstocks. If it is subsequently found approval under the Reservoirs Act is required, or the penstocks are removed, a further review of the application would be necessary.
64. **Arts Development Officer** – There is huge scope for integration of public art to enhance the design, sustainability, environmental awareness and interpretation of the scheme. The Council has a public arts policy under which this development falls. The Council would welcome sight of a public art plan, possibly including a sculpture trail, as part of the development.
65. **Legal Officer** – no comment at this stage.

66. **DEFRA** – no comment.

67. **County Development, Minerals and Waste Group** – comments:

- a) SCDC must satisfy yourselves that the highway infrastructure and amenity aspects of any importation of material during construction are acceptable and recommend that a condition be imposed that requires the applicant to demonstrate that all imported materials used in the construction of the site are free from contamination and suitable for the purpose, the reasons being; In order to demonstrate that any waste materials used in the construction of the restoration scheme do not cause harm to the environment, human health or other amenities, in accordance with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan (2003) Policy WLP9 and WLP15.
- b) From Figure 3.9 of the ES it appears that there is a net deficit of suitable material required for site restoration.
- c) Any proposal to remove the mineral resource from the site would require a separate planning permission from the Mineral Planning Authority and would have to be pursued as a Departure from the aggregates development plan.
- d) Given the lack of detail with the ES we recommend that the applicant provides full details and assessed environmental impacts including a plan, indicating the position of any mineral processing equipment and stockpiles, for further consideration.
- e) Given the variation in estimates of potential mineral reserves we suggest that the applicant submits the borehole results and supporting information, including a plan highlighting the borehole locations, as referred to in Section 3.9.2 of the ES, or our further consideration.
- f) You may wish to seek clarification on these matters from the developer as a mineral washing and grading plant can involve a range of significant impacts.
- g) re: ES Section 3.9.3 - I am however very concerned that this statement is aveated by the phrase "*without the prior permission of the Local Planning Authority*". This appears to indicate that a more sustainable utilisation of the mineral resource off-site could be an option.
- h) The site is not a preferred sand and gravel quarry as identified in policy CALP3 and links with policy CALP4 which states "Planning permission will not normally be forthcoming for sand and gravel proposals outside the preferred areas as identified in CALP3 and the proposals map".
- i) The impacts to the highway network and local amenity associated with additional heavy commercial vehicles exporting minerals have not been assessed within the context of this proposal. In accordance with CALP5, CALP6 & CALP14.
- j) We recommend that the applicant be required to demonstrate that, in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (1999), the applicant is required to demonstrate that they have considered the export/alternative uses of virgin aggregates as an alternative scheme to their use as restoration fill.

68. **Sport England** – comments regarding strategic need:

- a) There are several documents that refer to the strategic need for additional rowing facilities in the Cambridge area:
 1. Rowing Facilities Strategy (1999-2005) (Amateur Rowing Association). This document confirms the importance of rowing in the East of England, with the region supplying 13% of all members and 33 "open" clubs, figures bettered only by the Thames Region. In terms of facility provision, sites at Bedford and Cambridge were specifically identified to meet regional training and competition requirements. The Strategy defines the facility requirements as "up to 2000m long, but 15000m would be practical if this is all that can be

achieved for physical or economic reasons, width should be not less than 60m".

2. East of England Plan (Draft December 2004). The draft regional spatial strategy sets out policies for the provision of regional cultural facilities. The supporting text to Policy C4 "Sporting Facilities" makes reference to the need for additional rowing facilities in Bedford and Cambridge.
3. Sports Facility Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Draft February 2006). This study, commissioned by Cambridgeshire Horizons, is currently in draft form only, but makes reference to the ARA Regional Plan, which identifies the Bedford Rowing Lake and Cambridge Sports Lakes as priorities for facility development and support. However, it also acknowledges that other projects exist within the sub-region, notably the "CamToo" proposed on the River Cam in Cambridge. The study also makes the link between the need for new sports facilities within the sub-region and the projected population growth, which will further increase demand for strategic facilities.

The above documents indicate that there is a long-standing desire and need to provide additional rowing facilities within the East of England generally, with Cambridge being one of the preferred locations for such a facility, along with Bedford. This need reflects the popularity and profile of the sport within the region and the relative inadequacies of existing facilities.

- b) With regard to the other sports that will benefit from these facilities, these are secondary to the principal aim of providing new rowing facilities, though have the potential to deliver strategic facilities for these respective sports. For example, the national facilities strategy for Canoeing (1999-2004) identifies a need for a regional performance centre and development centres for sprint racing.
- c) Further discussions may be necessary between the applicants and the relevant governing bodies for triathlon and cycling to ascertain the status of the proposed facilities within the national/regional hierarchy of facilities for those sports, though I note the general letters of support from the British Triathlon Association (dated 22 September 2003), British Canoe Union (dated 5 December 2005) and British Cycling (dated 17 October 2005). I also note the letter of support from the East of England Development Agency (EEDA) dated 9 November 2005, and would reiterate the points made in that letter regarding the potential for this project to support the London Olympics in 2012.
- d) In terms of maximising benefit to sport it comments that Sport England seeks to ensure that planning applications maximise benefits to sport, and a major scheme such as the Cambridge Sports Lakes can help to deliver government objectives to raise participation in sport and physical activity through the following:
 1. The creation of a genuine multi-sport environment that encourages an inclusive approach to participation.
 2. Adoption of a community use agreement that maximises the benefit to sport in terms of making provision for community access to the facilities.
 3. Design and technical standards - ensuring that primary and ancillary facilities meet adopted national and sport-specific technical standards.

With regard to the above, Sport England supports the general principle of developing a multi-sport facility that will serve not only "elite" users, but people new to sport and those seeking to improve and develop their skills within a structured environment. Obviously, many of the facilities proposed in this project have a close relationship to each other, with a primary focus around water sports.

- e) With regard to community access, Sport England supports the provisions of the draft Section 106 planning obligation, which seeks to ensure that the public has full access to the lakes and adjoining country park for purposes of informal recreation.
- f) Sport England would recommend that the s106 agreement could be widened to include provision for a community use programme aimed at introducing groups

under-represented in sport¹ to use the formal sports facilities in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing by the applicants and planning authority, and managed/monitored by the forum identified in Para 2(b) of the second schedule of the draft s106 obligation.

- g) We have already met with the applicants to discuss this element of the scheme and, if planning permission is forthcoming, look forward to developing a strategy to maximise access for such target groups who are under-represented in sport.
- h) With regard to the design and technical aspects of the proposals, these have been developed over a period of many years with the close involvement of sports governing bodies.
- i) In general terms, Sport England is supportive of this proposal, which would appear to meet an identified strategic/sub-regional need for additional rowing facilities in the Cambridge area.
- j) We also support the aim of encouraging informal recreation and public access to the site, through the draft s106 obligation, as it is important that the site and facilities are seen as genuinely accessible to all members of the community.
- k) We would hope that any planning permission granted would secure a wide-ranging community use/access programme, which secures the use of the facilities for under-represented groups, as this could help the government objective of increasing participation in sport and physical activity amongst the general population.
- l) Please note that these comments relate to the planning merits of this application and do not imply support for any subsequent application for funding from Sport England funding streams.

69. **County Rural Services** – no comments received.

70. **Health and Safety Executive (HM Railway Inspectorate)** – comments:

- a) This development should not cause any blocks or traffic queues etc. to form over any vehicular level crossings.
- b) Private level crossings should be closed permanently, as the change of use negates any current legal agreement between landowners and railway'
- c) All public footpath level crossings should be closed or alternative routes provided.

71. **Conservators of the River Cam** – comment:

- a) The Conservators have no objection to the proposed Sports Lakes, per se; but will require the developers to enter into the necessary formal agreement in accordance with their statutes prior to doing any work on/to the banks of the river. In addition, a full specification of the bridge will need to be approved by engineers appointed by the Conservators. The agreement will have to provide for periodic inspection and maintenance of the bridge to standards appropriate from time to time, with an appropriate form of bank guarantee or indemnity, to ensure the ongoing safety and convenience of those using the Halingway (towpath) so that no expense falls on the Conservators.
- b) It would be helpful if a condition should be applied to the application requiring the applicant to obtain the formal approval of the Conservators before commencing work on the river bank. Indeed, almost certainly, the Environment Agency will require similar safeguards being entered into so far as they are concerned to ensure the integrity of the river.

72. **Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum** – Overall it welcomes the proposals, which will provide a significant increase in the area of land accessible for quiet enjoyment and physical activities close to Cambridge. The overall benefits outweigh concerns it

has about the details of access provision, however the following points require clarification prior to determination:

- a) Access is proposed on a permissive basis only. At least one dedicated statutory public right of way available to walkers, cyclists and horseriders through the site from Waterbeach to Milton should be provided. It is disappointed that SCDC has not pursued this, as it was in the Environmental Statement's Scoping Opinion. It should also be secured through a Section 106 agreement.
- b) Clarification of what the access link to Milton Country Park is actually to be including along which routes, whether cycle or pedestrian and the legal status of designated routes i.e. not just 'potential' links.
- c) Clarification of precise areas to be made available for cycling and walking. The draft section 106 refers to access being limited to 'the country park and around the lakes' and also 'the multi-sport park and lake surrounds'. A plan is required of zones of access and this must form part of a section 106 in order to provide clarity.
- d) Conditions being placed on the availability of access for cycling and walking require clarification. The draft section 106 stated this will be for at least 300 days a year. Will this exclusion apply to all or only specific parts of the site? It also refers to additional exclusions for up to 50 days a year – are these geographically different and will they be on the same days as the 65 days of exclusion?
- e) It reminds SCDC of its statutory obligation to have regard to its advice when carrying out its functions.

73. **Police Architectural Liaison Officer** – comments awaited and will be reported verbally.

74. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** – Comments:

- a) Additional water supplies for fire fighting are not required.
- b) Access and facilities for the Fire Service should be provided in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document B5, Section 17.

75. **Local Highways Authority** – Initially commented:

- a) Traffic Impact Assessment - A10 / Car Dyke Road T Junction Impact on highway capacity and journey times needs to be assessed for an average day, an event utilising 750 car parking spaces, and a special event.
- b) A safety scheme must be submitted to the County Council as Highway Authority to support this application. A Travel Plan framework for special events needs to be agreed with the County Council. Access issues should be brought together in an access management plan.
- c) A Permissive Path Agreement needs to be submitted by the Trust and agreed by the County Council, forming part of a trilateral S106 Agreement.
- d) An emergency access strategy (being worked up) should be conditioned as part of the planning application.
- e) Construction traffic needs to be understood, and any significant impacts mitigated where possible. S106 to include a routing agreement for construction traffic
- f) Site Access: Detailed design of the junction needs to go through Stage 2 safety audit. Enforcement should be through a planning condition.

76. Following subsequent negotiations with the applicants it has concluded that the transport assessment is insufficiently detailed submitted and therefore it has not been possible for the County Council to come to a formal view on the impacts of the development. An interim response has been provided and is intended to highlight the

additional information that the County Council requires. This has been forwarded to the applicants and covers:

- a) An assessment of the impacts of an event that utilises the 750 space car park on highway safety, junction capacity and journey times.
- b) An accident remediation scheme for the A10/Car Dyke Road is submitted by the Cambridge Sport Lakes Trust and approved by the District Council in consultation with the County Council. Enforced through a planning condition.
- c) A detailed junction design for the site access is submitted by Cambridge Sports Lakes Trust and approved by the District Council in consultation with the County Council. This design needs to go through Stage 2 safety audit. Enforcement should be through a planning condition.

77. In addition to the above it has listed a number of points that also need to be addressed but could be, if necessary conditioned or covered in a Section 106:

- a) A travel plan framework for all events of greater than 50 vehicles is submitted by Cambridge Sport Lakes Trust and approved by Cambridgeshire County Council. This travel plan framework must be written into a trilateral S106 agreement.
- b) The type of measures required will be related in scale to the travel demand of the event. A main strand of the framework will be the use of off-site car parking for national and international events working in conjunction with shuttle buses.
- c) A detailed scheme for public rights of way is submitted by Cambridge Sports Lakes Trust and approved by Cambridgeshire County Council. This access management plan needs to be written into a trilateral S106 agreement.
- d) Discussions have already taken place between the Trust and the County Council with regard to public access to the site. This position needs clarification through the access management plan.
- e) An emergency access strategy must be submitted by the Trust and approved by the District Council in consultation with the County Council before any development commences on site. This should be secured through a planning condition.
- f) An assessment of the likely construction traffic volumes, their impacts and any mitigating measures, routeing agreements need to be submitted by the Trust and approved by the County Council before any works can commence on site. This must be secured through a tripartite Section 106 agreement.

78. **Chief Environmental Health Officer** – requires a full Environmental Noise Assessment in line with Mineral Planning Guidance 11. Details would need to include existing and predicted levels, hours and duration of work, effect on adjoining residences and mitigation work. In response to the matrix the following comments are added:

- a) Agrees that a condition is required to control noise but believes it is more pertinent to apply this to the construction period when the most noise would be produced from earthworks and construction vehicles operating on site.
- b) PPS23 Annex 2 relates to land contamination issues and this should be conditioned by our standard condition.
- c) However CSL's commitment to audit emissions of fugitive dust during the construction period is welcomed and it is suggested that this is conditioned to control dust during the construction period by the use of considerate construction practices - e.g. covered haul trucks, water dowsers for dampening down etc.

Representations

79. Councillor Richard Summerfield comments:

- a) He supports the Parish Council and there are many points which still are issues.
 - b) The major concern that we have locally is the inability of the applicants to provide a workable drainage scheme for the project. There is a huge amount of local knowledge about the local drains and the applicant and their advisers seem unwilling to use such knowledge. It is essential that construction is not allowed to start until an approved workable drainage scheme has been submitted and agreed by all. The Environment Agency's unwillingness to be part of this process is very disappointing.
 - c) We need to ensure that there is a Section 106 agreement in place that has been agreed by local members and the Parish Council. Although our recent meeting was helpful there is a long way to go!
 - d) In the Matrix there are answers relating to operating noise once the Lakes are open but the question of construction noise has not been addressed.
 - e) The final point I want to draw your attention to is the use of Fen Road Milton for construction traffic. We have always been assured that this would not happen and now it has been sprung on us as being needed.
80. Councillor Hazel Smith has queried the integrity or structural capacity of the clay that is to be used for the banks, and suggests that more technical data on this is required.
81. County Councillor Michael Williams has commented primarily on traffic matters. His full comments are attached at Appendix 1.
82. Six letters of objections have been received raising the following points:
- a) Queries planting mixes;
 - b) How will the pipe under the lake be cleared when silted?
 - c) Impact on Baits Bite Lock has not been addressed.
 - d) Inadequate cross sections to show the Cam, railway, height of banks at storage lakes, rowing lake and west side.
 - e) Poor pedestrian and cycle links to the Station.
 - f) Concern that debris will keep flaps open and allow water into the land west of the railway when the Cam is high.
 - g) The railway drain has only partially been cleared in forty years and does not work as a drain.
 - h) The existing drainage map only shows Awarded Drains.
 - i) Active badger setts will be impacted.
 - j) The piezometers on Penfold Farm have not been recorded for the last three years and some have never been used at all.
 - k) Query regarding where the Heritage Centre is to be located. Previously it was planned for the Golf Club.
 - l) Finds should be presented in the new buildings.
 - m) Impact upon Fen Road as a rural country lane.
 - n) Destruction of Fen edge landscape.
 - o) Safety of railway crossings.
 - p) Inadequate analysis of traffic on the Car Dyke Road and Horningsea-Clayhithe-Waterbeach Road.
 - q) Impact upon the Park and Ride if it is to be used by other users.
 - r) Impact of construction traffic on Fen Road, including its road surface.
 - s) Alternative locations should be considered.
 - t) Impact on the water table and knock-on impacts on neighbouring properties.
 - u) Access to Baits Bite Local via Fen Road must be retained.
 - v) Additional congestion on Fen Road.
 - w) Inadequate car parking, increasing parking nearby.

- x) No benefit to local people.
- y) Noise disturbance from spectators and users of the park.
- z) Measures to segregate spectators and competitors must be included.
- aa) Measures to segregate or relocate wildlife.
- bb) Impact on local businesses if competing business uses are allowed.
- cc) Proximity of the access road running from Car Dyke alongside the canal in relation to residences in Waterbeach.
- dd) Impact on Car Dyke Road of car parking.
- ee) Increased traffic on the A10, A14 and at Milton roundabout.
- ff) Paths being created should be public rights of way.
- gg) Paths within the park should link to paths outside to form local and sub-regional networks of routes.
- hh) Entrance to the park should be free to walkers, cyclists and horse riders.
- ii) Adequate separation of paths/tracks for walkers, riders and cyclists.
- jj) The importance given to walking to, within and through the site appears to be low.
- kk) Considerable spoil from the development is to be retained within the site area, most of which will have to be deposited on dry areas on either side of the lake, raising the land level by this amount is unfeasible and storing materials nearby but off site will imply abstraction, for which a licence is unlikely to be granted.
- ll) The plans are badly prepared and presented on the cheap.
- mm) The developer should provide a financial contribution towards linking pedestrian and cycle routes to the River camcycle/tow path and the A14 cycle bridge via Milton Park.
- nn) The 1800 car parking spaces is excessive and involves loss of existing wildlife habitat.
- oo) A shuttle bus to Cambridge railway station should be provided by the developer for large events.

83. Approximately two hundred letters of support have been received. These are almost exclusively from individuals with interests in the various sports accommodated in the scheme and individuals campaigning against proposals at Bedford which potentially impact upon the former Bedford-Sandy-Cambridge Railway link. The points raised include:

- a) The proposals will create a valuable sporting and recreational facility for Cambridge and the sub-region.
- b) It will provide a world-class venue for the development of sports people.
- c) It will massively ease congestion on the River cam.
- d) It will conserve a large area of land close to Cambridge.
- e) It will provide for six major sports.
- f) It will enable increase partnership with schools and community groups which is currently limited due to lack of space and facilities.
- g) It will benefit the entire community.
- h) It is in line with the Government's aim of getting people to live more active lifestyles.
- i) It will provide much needed facilities for cycling. The nearest facilities of comparable nature are at Welwyn Garden City and Manchester.
- j) Existing rowing facilities are overcrowded and inadequate.
- k) The proposals will increase tourism.
- l) They will encourage children to take up sports.
- m) Cycle training facilities off road are required and will increase safety for cyclists.
- n) The Eton lakes has brought many benefits to the Eton area.
- o) It benefits the CamToo project.
- p) It is a well thought out scheme, including measures to reduce the impact of prevailing winds which is a problem at other sites.

- q) It will secure 235 acres of open space which will act as lung to the City.
- r) Improved safety for rowers.
- s) Provision of facilities for the 2012 Olympics.
- t) This initiative is rail served from day one and therefore accessible by public transport to the widest possible audience.
- u) If the application is successful, it will serve as 'the' regional rowing lake and cancel applications for similar such facilities at Willington in Bedfordshire, which would not be rail served from day one and which could detract from the focus on Cambridge Rowing Lake as the premier venue.
- v) It is hoped that the council can give support to hasten the identification, protection and advancement of reopening the former Bedford-Sandy-Cambridge Railway to enable people from Bedford and Milton Keynes access to the venue by rail eventually as well, cutting the volume of traffic congesting our trunk and urban road systems.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

Need

- 84. The application proposes a sports development which is supported by the Eastern Region Rowing Council Regional Plan (2005) and the Cambridgeshire Horizons, Sport England and Cambridgeshire Local Authorities jointly sponsored report: “A major sports facilities strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (2005/6). That report recommends that, “given the tradition and demand for rowing opportunities in the sub-region, a new rowing facility be provided with a sub-regional perspective.”
- 85. Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia to 2016 (RPG6 - 2000) notes that a regional off-river rowing centre is an identified priority by Sport England. The Draft revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the East of England comments that Bedford and Cambridge have been identified as preferred general locations for a new regional competition rowing course with associated access, parking, boat storage and changing facilities.
- 86. In the context of need, identified above, the key issues in the determination of this application are the impact of the proposal upon the Green Belt, landscape, transport, drainage, archaeology, the historic environment and biodiversity.

Green Belt

- 87. Outdoor sport is an appropriate use within the Green Belt, along with buildings providing essential facilities for outdoor sport. Given the need to serve rowing in Cambridge and the functional link with the River Cam, it is difficult to imagine a rowing course being anywhere other than in the Green Belt.
- 88. Although there will be buildings, structures and car parking on site, the proposed sporting uses would generally contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and are all of an outdoor nature.
- 89. Policy GB5 of the Local Plan aims to resist outdoor sports which frequently attract large numbers of participants or spectators or which would result in the loss of the best and most versatile grades of agricultural land. It is arguable whether planned special events will be frequent to justify an objection. Statutory consultees have not objected to the loss of high quality agricultural land.
- 90. I therefore conclude that the development constitutes an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt.

Landscape

91. The application proposals recognise that the landscape of the site will be completely changed. Of the total area, just under half will become open water. The remainder will be landscaped to create windbreaks and to accommodate all the spoil from the excavations. Inevitably this will create a new man-made feature in the landscape, but this is not unusual in the Fens.
92. The greatest change will be either side of the competition rowing course, where bunds will range in height from 7-10m. AoD. Although the existing railway line along the south-east boundary of the site is such a linear feature, the bunds will be very noticeable in this flat and open landscape in the short to medium term, particularly as little existing vegetation will be retained. In the longer term substantial and a variety of planting proposals should soften the earth modelling.
93. The applicant's Landscape Design Report envisages that, prior to any construction work commencing on site, planting plans for each phase and a proposed landscape management plan will be prepared and submitted for approval by the Planning Authority. In considering such plans it will be important to ensure that the objectives of the landscape policies of the Local Plan, in terms of respecting the nature of the landscape character areas and the River Cam valley environment are met.

Transport

94. Understandable concerns have been raised about the impact of the proposal upon the safety and junction capacity of the A10/Car Dyke Road junction, particularly from events that utilise the proposed 750 space car park. This junction has a record of accidents. Despite such concerns being raised, the applicant has not been able to quantify traffic movements from an event of this nature to date. However, an appraisal of accident history and the need for an accident remedial scheme at this junction has been commissioned by the applicant. This report will not be available before 18th September.
95. I consider that the County Council's request for a highway scheme to deal with safety and capacity issues for this junction to be submitted is perfectly reasonable. This should be worked up to sufficient detail for Stage 1 safety audit before the application is determined. This may involve signalisation of the junction. Traffic management measures proposed by the applicant may not be adequate.
96. To achieve sustainable means of travel in accordance with Government and Development Plan Policies, a travel plan should be put in place for all events greater than 50 vehicles. This should accommodate the needs of walkers, cyclists and those travelling by public transport. The applicant intends to use off-site car parks working in conjunction with shuttle buses for national and international events. This complete package can be written into a S.106 Agreement and controlled by condition.
97. The draft S.106 Agreement incorporates arrangements for public access within the site and for the management of the scheme by the Trust. This will enhance its role as improving access to the countryside and providing links from this site to Milton Country Park and the public right of way alongside the River Cam.
98. An emergency access strategy and a construction traffic routing agreement should be required. The latter should be secured through the S.106 Agreement.

Drainage

99. The existing site and surrounding area is currently drained via a series of Awarded Drains (3 no.) and field drains outfalling to the River Cam. The eastern edge of the

site alongside the railway line and extending the full length of the site falls within flood zones 2 and 3 (low to medium and medium to high risk).

100. Mitigation proposals will include the construction of a perimeter drain along the western boundary which will convey flows from existing drains to a settling basin and discharge via a lifting station to the competition lake. Flows will ultimately discharge from the competition lake to the River Cam.
101. The E.S. identifies that flood risk from the River Cam will be significantly reduced because there will be increased flood storage on the River Cam above Baits Bite Lock by 34%. This has been accepted within the approved Stage 1 FRA.
102. Further discussions have taken place with the Environment Agency in respect of the proposal to introduce Penstock Control gates to the competition lake. These would be operated by a telemetry system linked to Baits Bite Lock. Details of design and operation could be covered by a planning condition, whilst maintenance and ownership would be part of the S.106 Agreement. Proposals for conditions and S106 obligations have been sent by the applicant to the Environment Agency for its consideration.
103. Award Drain No. 291 (thirteenth public drain) would be intercepted by the proposed canal link to the River Cam. A proposal to siphon the drain beneath the canal has been accepted in principle by the Council's Land Drainage Manager, subject to agreement of details at the Stage 2 FRA, agreement of a commuted sum and to inspecting the final design details. Because of the implications for up-stream flooding along the Award, the applicant will be expected to pay the Council's costs in employing consultants to advise on the proposals.
104. Proposals for the perimeter drain have been accepted in principle by the Lands Drainage Manager subject to agreement regarding the extinguishment of sections of existing Award Drains, a protocol covering the potential failure of the proposed pumping station and buffer strips.
105. Technical matters therefore seen capable of resolution in order to maintain the integrity of the existing drainage system, subject to consideration of the design and impact of the siphon on Award Drain 291. Conditions and S.106 obligations need to be finalised having regard also to the provisions of The Reservoirs Act 1995, which controls aspects of reservoirs over a capacity of 250,000 cu.m. (the FRA stage 1 indicates the proposal would have a capacity of 420,000 cu.m.)

Archaeology

106. Car Dyke, on the east boundary of the site, is a Schedule Ancient Monument (SAM). No objections have been raised to the impact of the proposal upon the setting of the SAM but protection is required during the construction process. This can be achieved by a planning condition.
107. Extensive field evaluations have been carried out on site. Discussions between the applicant and the County Archaeology Office have resulted in a revised mitigation strategy being submitted to and approved by the latter. This strategy will be implemented in full by the applicant.

Historic Environment

108. Baits Bite Lock is a Conservation Area. The proposed canal link to the River Cam and the towpath bridge over the canal would be within the Conservation Area. One

of the features of the Area is the strong tree belt, mostly of willows, which line the river edge.

109. A Conservation Area Appraisal has been prepared for this Council. It notes that the open and rural character of the river bank is an important characteristic of the Conservation Area and should be preserved. The riverside path has recently been re-surfaced with a low-key bound gravel surface which is in keeping with its rural setting. It is important that any further works to the path and track surfaces maintain this simple treatment.
110. The proposed canal link on the southern boundary of the Conservation Area should not detract from its appearance or character subject to agreement on appropriate design and materials for the canal towpath bridge and re-instatement of towpath surfacing as per existing.

Biodiversity

111. Although there are no statutory designated sites within the area affected by the proposals, the main negative impact of the scheme arises from the loss of habitat, disturbance and displacement of protected species during initial construction and from the loss of mature scattered individual trees, hedgerows and drainage ditches.
112. The ES indicates that “the landscape design of new aquatic marginal and wetland habitats (marshland habitat surrounding the storage lake) would mitigate against the loss of aquatic habitat and create a range of habitats of preference to protected and BAP listed species. An extensive tract of woodland planning has been incorporated into the proposed design, strengthening the existing fragmented habitat connection between Milton Country Park and Car Dyke woodland to the north, therefore enhancing the continuity of wildlife corridors.”
113. PPS9, “Biodiversity and Geological Conservation” (2005) indicates that planning decisions should aim to maintain and enhance, restore or add to biodiversity and geological conservation interests. In this particular case, there is an opportunity to significantly enhance the ecological importance of the region. However, the submitted information fails to clarify how this will really be achieved as no figures for habitat creation are provided. A balance sheet of losses and gains for the overall scheme should be provided.
114. Notwithstanding the submission by the applicant of an Update on Ecological Assessment and Response to Planning (June 2006), the Ecology Officer still considers that further work is required in terms of a habitat balance sheet, further mitigation for badgers, water voles (details of new ditch shapes and bankside seeding/planting) and nightingales and a commitment to achieve monitoring not just through the construction phase but for 10 years following completion.
115. The suggestion that habitat creation and public access links between Milton, Waterbeach and the River Cam would be enhanced by creating a link between the site and fields to the northeast on the east side of the railway line, an area known as Waterbeach Meadows, is laudable but is not one which the Trust in itself can deliver. Co-operation with the landowner, believed to be the County Council, would be necessary to achieve this objective.
116. The Ecology Officer will be contacting the applicant’s ecologist to discuss the submitted update ecological report.

Draft S106 Agreement

117. The application is accompanied by a Draft Agreement which incorporates the following obligations:
1. The setting up of a consultation forum, involving representatives of the County Council, District Council and the Parish Councils (Milton, Landbeach and Waterbeach).
 2. A guarantee to complete or reinstate any phase of development.
 3. Provisions for the protection of the Council's responsibilities for awarded watercourses.
 4. Provision of managed public access to walk or cycle free of charge, subject to exclusion for the holding of private club functions, tournaments and matches on no more than 65 days in any calendar year.
 5. Re-imbusement to the County Council of all costs associated with any necessary Road Traffic Regulation Orders, signage, way-marking and access junction modifications.
 6. Requirement that traffic management measures for national or international events should be agreed with the Local Highway Authority.
118. These obligations were refined over a period of time during the consideration of the 1993 application. However, the proposed draft now incorporates three principal changes:
- (a) The representatives of the Councils would no longer have voting rights upon a Management Trust. The proposed consultative forum would operate in a similar way to other groups established for minerals and waste development schemes. There is no planning land use justification for requiring voting rights. The Council's former Legal Director advised that voting rights would be inappropriate.
 - (b) Although completion and restoration would be guaranteed, there is now no reference to the need for the applicants to certify that funding has been secured, that land assembly has been completed and that regular secure funding certificates are produced to the Council. The Committee may consider that such additional protection remains necessary to ensure work does not commence, or continue on any particular phase, until the necessary funding has been secured.
 - (c) The possibility of the public (excluding residents of Landbeach, Milton and Waterbeach) being charged for admission to walk or cycle has been deleted. Reasonable charges may still be made for car parking. This change is welcomed.
119. In addition to the above the S.106 Agreement will need to incorporate further drainage obligations, travel arrangements for special events and a construction vehicle routing agreement.

Conclusion

120. There is an acknowledged case of need for a regional off-river rowing centre. Cambridge has been identified as a suitable location for many years.
121. The uses are considered to be appropriate in the Green Belt and have the potential to contribute to the following objectives of the Green Belt as outlined in PPG2 "Green Belts":
- (a) To provide opportunities for access to the open countryside;
 - (b) To provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; and
 - (c) To secure nature conservation interests.
- On the other hand it could be argued that the proposals will not enhance the landscape, particularly in the short to medium terms.
122. Further work is required of the applicants to address transportation and ecology issues.
123. Drainage negotiations appear to have reached the stage of consideration of terms of conditions and S.106 provisions, although the siphon proposal on Award Drain 291 may require further consideration in advance of any permission being issued.
124. On balance I consider that the Authority should continue to take a positive view of the proposal and continue to work towards achieving an acceptable scheme.
125. I have not, at this stage, initiated a review of draft conditions (dated 22nd December 1995) prepared in relation to the 1993 application. Many changes will be necessary to take account particularly of transportation, drainage and ecology matters. The 6th draft 1995 conditions are attached as an appendix 2 for Members information.

Recommendation

- A. That, subject to satisfactory resolution of outstanding transportation, drainage and ecological matters, and to the prior completion of a S.106 Agreement, the application be approved.
- B. That the final terms of the S.106 Agreement and planning conditions be agreed in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Local Members for Landbeach, Milton and Waterbeach.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Ref. S/0810/92/F, S/0917/93/F and S/0032/06/F

Contact Officers: Melissa Reynolds – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713237
David Rush – Development Control Manager
Telephone: (01954) 713153

Comments on CSL matrix of responses

Michael Williamson – County Councillor for Waterbeach, Landbeach and Milton

In this response I wish to focus upon matters that are in my remit as County Councillor for Waterbeach, Landbeach and Milton, that is principally traffic matters.

Traffic issues

The main issue for my division is the effect of the development upon Waterbeach and, in particular, upon the A10, Car Dyke Road and village traffic in general.

Traffic issues are addressed by the County Council on pages 5-7 of the response matrix. They raise a number of points relating to traffic and the development, and have received responses from CSL that are to say the least unsatisfactory. In particular, I am extremely concerned about their proposal for dealing with major events.

Although CSL are looking towards an off-site parking solution for major events, their proposals seem to be lacking in detail. Clear proposals need to be seen before the development is finally approved. In particular, I am very concerned that they are suggesting just a 'traffic management plan' rather than accepting that major re-engineering of the Slap-Up junction might be needed. If their proposals are accepted, by the time we discover that there are major problems at events it will be too late to get from them a developer contribution.

Those of us who have lived in Waterbeach for over 30 years remember the traffic chaos caused by the Burma Star days at the airfield. In those days the A10 was considerably less busy than it is now, and so it is clear that, unless really effective traffic management measures are in place, together with any necessary junction engineering works, this chaos may well be repeated on major event days.

The A10

I am concerned about the assumptions made for traffic flows on the A10. I note that CSL are using a fairly standard factor for inflation over the period to 2009. However, there is considerable development taking place to the north of Waterbeach, particularly in Ely and towns further north. I believe therefore that close attention should be given to these forecasts.

It is also important to note that traffic flows at weekends outside the normal weekday peak hours are high and seem to be increasing.

The Slap-Up junction

While the use of this junction is not so heavy now that traffic lights have been installed at Denny End, it is still a major access to Waterbeach and there continue to be minor accidents at this junction.

The junction will be the principal access to the site both during the construction phase and when it is up and running. It is thus essential that a detailed assessment be provided by CSL as to the effect upon this junction of the two event types requested by the County Council on page 5 of the matrix. In particular, the potential problems of a number of boat trailers turning right at this point must be considered.

It may be that significant improvements will be required for this junction and these should be paid for by a developer contribution. I would remind the Development, Conservation and Control Committee that the development of 100 houses to the north of Bannold Road in Waterbeach provided a significant financial contribution to the installation of traffic lights at the Denny End junction.

Access to the site

It is essential that all access to the site during the construction phase should be via Car Dyke Road and not through Waterbeach. We would expect clear signage on the A14 and other

local roads to ensure that construction traffic does not use Station Road, Waterbeach which, in any event, has an existing weight limit.

There are also concerns that boat trailers may be tempted to try to use Station Road, Waterbeach. I have been told by a resident of the village who is a keen rower that this will be dangerous and probably impossible. Indeed, I would have major concerns both on Saturdays (when weddings are regularly held at the church) and on Sunday mornings at the times of regular services that there could be major issues if boat trailers tried to negotiate the sharp corner by Waterbeach church. Signage must indicate that Station Road is not suitable for trailers and any literature issued by organisers of events must also state this.

On event days, there are major concerns that traffic will be tempted to use village streets for parking and for access to the site. It must be a condition of granting permission for this development that access to the site on event days should only be from Car Dyke Road off the A10 and that traffic should not be able to turn left into the site from Cambridge Road, Waterbeach. Indeed, it might even be that use of Cambridge Road from Greenside to Car Dyke Road on event days is reserved for residents' access only.

Finally, parking restrictions on village streets for those attending events must be enforceable and strictly enforced.

Rail access

While we would like to encourage travel to special events by train via Waterbeach Station, Waterbeach are concerned that access through the Recreation Ground should be discouraged. A large number of pedestrians crossing this area could well cause disruption to games being played there and, unless they keep to the paths, could cause damage to the grass. Access to the Recreation Ground from the Station Road end is also through an old people's sheltered housing development, and large numbers of pedestrians could cause disturbance to the residents. We would ask that appropriate signage be provided on special event days to control use of the Recreation Ground as a short cut.

Other matters

I note the comments of Milton Parish Council and would support them. Landbeach are less affected by the development.

I have concerns that planning permission should only be granted if the committee are convinced that adequate funds are available for the project's completion. This is a major development with very significant implications for the landscape and drainage of the area. It is vital that the planning authority should ensure that the scheme is bonded so that we can be assured that, once it starts, it will be completed.