

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

04 June 2014

AUTHOR/S: Planning and New Communities Director

Application Number:	S/1066/13/OL
Parish(es):	Fulbourn
Proposal:	Outline Planning Permission for the redevelopment of the Ida Darwin Hospital site with up to 180 dwellings (C3) including affordable housing, a 70 unit Extra Care facility (C2) with access and associated works, open space and landscaping, following the demolition of existing buildings on site.
Site address:	Ida Darwin and Fulbourn Hospital, Fulbourn Old Drift, Fulbourn, Cambridge, CB21 5EE
Applicant(s):	Cambridge and Peterborough NHS Foundation
Recommendation:	Delegated Approval
Key material considerations:	Allocated Green Belt site, Green Belt Policy, Highway impacts, ,
Committee Site Visit:	07 January 2014
Departure Application:	Yes Advertised
Presenting Officer:	Katie Parry
Application brought to Committee because:	Major application and Officers recommendation conflicts with Parish Council view
Date by which decision due:	15 August 2013

Update to the Report for Agenda Item 5

1. Since the publication of the Report further comments have been received on the outline application, these are summarised below:
2. **Fulbourn Forum** – Considers that the minor changes put forward do not alter their original comments on the scheme. It is still too big, too high, and too dense for this 'isolated' (words of the applicant's agent at his presentation to

Committee on 8 January 2014) site and for the general infrastructure of Fulbourn. The applicants Design and Access Statement (page 64) states that "... it is anticipated that the development will be largely 2 storeys, with some occasional one storey houses." If translated into the plans and the built form this would achieve, together with more space between houses, a more open development consistent with the NPPF and SCDC Policy GB/4, and greatly reduce the impact of the proposed Extra Care scheme, although we still consider this facility to be a very poor location for such a development.

3. We urge the committee to reject the Design Brief. Page 48 outlines a number of design principles, some of which should not be accepted:

1- *Establish a clear and visually open green wedge at the western end of the site* – this should be amended to say the 'western part of the site' thus requiring the Masterplan to be suitably altered to reflect the intentions of the 'Proof of Evidence' accepted by the Planning Inspector by increasing the extent of the Green Wedge.

2 – *Locate any larger scale elements appropriately* –no larger scale built elements should be allowed in this Green Belt, edge of village, rural site. This will help reduce the visual impact of the whole scheme, especially when viewed from the Cambridge Road and Teversham Road has virtually no impact on the 'green' separation between Capital Park and the present edge of Fulbourn village – a view that will be significantly changed by a three storey construction close to the railway line. Large scale buildings will also conflict with one of the applicant's other design principles that housing should "relate to the areas around it, and form part of the village." Existing edge-of-village development is small scale and lower density than the Ida Darwin proposals.

3 – *'Extra Care provision to be at the heart of the development, as an integral part of the new community'* – this is a very poor location for a large Extra Care facility, particularly when it is not within reasonable walking distance, especially for older people, of all the main village facilities. The aim should be for the Ida Darwin redevelopment to become, as much as is possible for this 'isolated' site, an integrated part of the existing village, not a separate 'new community' built around Extra Care provision. We also have concerns that much of the affordable housing on the site will be tied up in the Extra Care unit (with a District City catchment), limiting the number of homes available for local young people and families. If the District Council is still minded to proceed with an Extra Care Facility then the Design Brief should be altered as indicated in item 2 above, to limit its height to two storeys with some lower height elements to break up the massing of a large, institutional building.

4. Notwithstanding the minor changes to the original application, the illustrative Masterplan and the Design and Access Statement should also be rejected for the reasons set out in our earlier response of 20 July 2014.
5. The comments by the Fulbourn Forum have been supported by 23 no. residents.
6. **Network Rail** – Comments have been received from Network Rail. As the application site is adjacent to Network Rail's operational railway infrastructure, Network Rail strongly recommends that the developer contacts its Asset Protection Anglia team prior to any works commencing on site. The

masterplan for the site indicates that to the centre north of the site two SUDS will be located. These SUDS will be located in close proximity to Network Rail's boundary and the operational railway. Network Rail Asset Protection team generally require the SUDS/ Soakaways are not constructed within 20 metres of Network Rail's boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail's property. This is to ensure the safety of the operational railway. If the applicants intend to locate them within 20m of Network Rail's boundary they should contact Network Rail Asset Protection team for approval.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:

- Encroach onto Network rail land;
- Affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company's railway and its infrastructure;
- Undermine its support zone;
- Damage the company's infrastructure;
- Place additional load on cuttings
- Adversely affect any railway land or structure
- Over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land;
- Cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future.

7. Future Maintenance – The development must ensure that any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant's land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail's adjacent land and air-space. Therefore all buildings should be situated at least 2 metres (or 3 metres for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail's boundary.
8. Construction -Any scaffold, cranes or other mechanical plant must be constructed and operated in a "fail safe" manner that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no materials or plant are capable of falling within 3.0m of the nearest rail of the adjacent railway line, or where the railway is electrified, within 3.0m of overhead electrical equipment or supports.
9. Demolition - Any demolition or refurbishment works must not be carried out on the development site that may endanger the safe operation of the railway, or the stability of the adjoining Network Rail structures.
10. Drainage - Storm/surface water and effluent must not be discharged onto Network Rail's property or into Network Rail's culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail's property. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail's existing drainage.
11. Fencing - In the interests of promoting public safety and reducing the risk of trespass and vandalism on the railway, the applicant should ensure that a suitable trespass resistant fence is located along the northern boundary of the site. Any new fencing provided should be independent of existing Network Rail fencing and a sufficient distance should be allowed for between fences to allow for future maintenance and renewal.

12. Landscaping - Any hedge planted adjacent to Network Rail's boundary fencing for screening purposes should be so placed that when fully grown it does not damage the fencing or provide a means of scaling it. No hedge should prevent Network Rail from maintaining its boundary fencing.
13. **Highways** – Highways have made comments relating to the possibility of securing a footpath link along the railway line. The main issue in providing a link along the railway line is that the land in question is not under the control of the applicant, nor is it adopted public highway. There is an existing footway along the length of Fulbourn Old Drift and this connects to the section of this road within the City of Cambridge.
14. **Update on Education contribution** - Additional Information has been provided for members appendix 1 Letter dated 22nd May from County Council and Appendix 2 Primary School Extension and Alteration Fulbourn Primary School Milestone 2 Report.
15. **Additional Information provided by applicant**
The applicant has provided additional information with regard to the impact of imposing a condition to limit the height of the Extra Care facility to 2 storeys. The applicant's Master Planners have assessed the impact of this and they consider that with a height limit to 2 storeys the facility would only be able to accommodate 50 units rather than 70 units. This would mean an overall reduction in the number of units on the site from 250 to 230 and in turn will reduce the number of affordable units. However, please note there is no intention for the 40% affordable housing on the scheme to be reduced.

Planning Comments

16. **Extent of Development**
This was addressed in paragraph 68 of the original reports and explains the reasons why it is considered that the extent of development put forward through the Outline application is considered appropriate.
17. **Larger scale development**
The height of the extra care facility is proposed through the outline application to be controlled by condition. The condition would limit the height to 2 storeys. This is likely to cause a reduction in numbers for the Extra Care facility from 70 units to 50 units.
18. **Extra Care Provision**
There is a need within the district for this type of housing to be provided. The scheme will be 100% affordable. The site is not located within the centre of the site however the facilities are considered to be a reasonable walking distance from the site. The facility will cater for older people with varying degrees of care needs. In addition, it is normal for some service to go into a facility such as this so there will not always be the need for residents to access facilities in Fulbourn. The footpath links from the site to the village are proposed to be improved if planning permission is granted.
19. **Paragraph 63** – Amend 2nd and 3rd sentences to “Core principles (the 5th, 8th, and 9th bullet points of paragraph 17) of the NPPF are relevant for this application. Paragraph 89 of the NPPF provides details of exceptions to

inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Bullet point 6 of paragraph 89 allows for limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. Therefore, it is considered that the principle of redeveloped this land is established through both local policies and the provisions made in the NPPF for the redevelopment of Brownfield land.”

20. The officer recommendation remains as per paragraph 79 of the original report, namely members grant delegated powers to officers to approve the application subject to the prior completion of planning obligations(s) under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Contact Officer: Katie Parry – Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 01954 713379