

GLEBE FARM FULL APPLICATION – COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE

To: Cabinet

Date: 23rd February 2010

From: Executive Director: Environment Services

Electoral division(s): Trumpington

Forward Plan ref: Not applicable *Key decision:* No

Purpose: To outline the proposed consultation response to the Glebe Farm full planning application.

Recommendation: Cabinet is invited to:

i) Comment on and endorse the draft consultation response.

ii) Agree with the recommendations for objecting to the application.

iii) Delegate to the Lead Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Executive Director, Environment Services, the authority to make any minor textual changes to the consultation response prior to submission.

<i>Officer contact:</i>		<i>Member contact</i>	
Name:	Joseph Whelan	Name:	Cllr Roy Pegram
Post:	Head of New Communities	Portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning
Email:	Joseph.Whelan@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	Roy.Pegram@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	(01223) 699867	Tel:	(01223) 699173

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Glebe Farm is one of the developments which make up the Cambridge Southern Fringe urban extension as defined in the former Structure Plan and the adopted Cambridge City Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (see Figure 1). Therefore the principle of the development is established.

Figure 1: Cambridge Southern Fringe



Clay Farm and Glebe Farm Appeal

- 1.2 Outline applications have previously been submitted for the Clay Farm and Glebe Farm sites. Countryside Properties are the developer of both sites.
- 1.3 The outline applications went to appeal and a Public Inquiry was held in October 2009. The main issues for appeal were in relation to the level of affordable housing, economic viability, and the need for a library on the Clay Farm site. The Secretary of State will make a decision on the appeal by March 10th 2010.

Glebe Farm Full Application

- 1.4 Following the Glebe Farm outline application, a full application has now been submitted to the City Council for 286 dwellings. The submission includes drawings that provide details on matters such as the design and layout of each dwelling, the layout of the development, access arrangements, pedestrian and cycle paths, open spaces, allotments and landscaping as well as technical details on matters such as drainage and ecology.

- 1.5 The submission acknowledges that a new Section 106 (S106) is required for the Glebe Farm full application, but it does not make a firm commitment to what will be provided. It is officers' views that the content of the S106 agreement will be submitted following the decision of the Secretary of State in relation to the appeal, however until this has been confirmed, it is recommended that the County Council maintain a holding objection against this application. Further details on S106 funding and risk can be found in Section 3 of this report.

Kick Start Funding and the Full Application

- 1.6 The submission, prior to knowing the outcome of the appeal, was made by the developer to secure Government 'Kick Start¹' funding. Full planning permission is one of the requirements necessary to secure funding.
- 1.7 The developer was unsuccessful in winning their bid, but the scheme is on a reserve list.
- 1.8 Approval of the Glebe Farm full application would allow the developer to commence development straight away, subject to meeting any planning conditions which need to be discharged prior to commencement.

2. MAIN ISSUES

- 2.1 The Glebe Farm full application has relied upon much of the supporting information submitted as part of the outline applications. Therefore, all County related Section 106 requirements (with the possible exception of the Library capital and revenue contribution) and planning conditions that were contained within the decision notices for the outline applications should be retained and transferred to this full application.
- 2.2 Appendix 1 sets out the draft County Council consultation response to the Glebe Farm full application. In summary, the following issues are raised within the response:
- **Sustainability** – The application presents an excellent opportunity to build a high quality exemplar sustainable development. The developer should be doing more in order to achieve this.
 - **Highways** – Various detailed design issues which the developer needs to address.
 - **Sustainable Drainage** – The developer's proposals for sustainable drainage at the site need to be discussed further with the County Council.
 - **Biodiversity** – Various concerns which the developer needs to address and further work the developer should be doing in order to enhance the site in terms of biodiversity.

¹ A Programme run by the Homes and Communities Agency which awards funding to sites to support the construction of high quality mixed tenure housing developments.

3. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

Resources and Performance

- 3.1 The County Council has already negotiated a S106 package with the developer which has been endorsed by Cabinet. The package will provide sufficient funding for the County Council to provide the necessary public services and infrastructure arising from the Glebe Farm development (with the possible exception of the Library capital and revenue contribution). The S106 package is dependent on the outcome of the appeal. However, the S106 package was submitted to the Planning Inspector in a Statement of Common Ground. Therefore, officers believe it likely that the Statement of Common Ground will be accepted by the Secretary of State.
- 3.2 The County Council require a Library capital and revenue contribution from the Clay Farm and Glebe Farm developments in order to provide a new library on the Clay Farm site to serve the Cambridge Southern Fringe. This requirement is contested by the developer and therefore the inclusion of a Library capital and revenue contribution within the S106 for the Clay Farm and Glebe Farm developments will be dependent on the Secretary of State's decision in relation to the appeal.
- 3.3 In terms of the specific contributions themselves, all capital contributions are index linked to nationally recognised indices to protect the value of the contributions. The baseline for the indexation will limit the potential problem for the cost to have increased between the determination of the planning applications and the sealing of the S106 agreements.
- 3.4 Parent Company Guarantees and / or a combination of Bonds will be secured against the capital contributions for the Glebe Farm development.

Statutory Requirements and Partnership Working

- 3.5 The S106 agreement will enable the County Council to provide facilities and services that discharge its statutory duties in relation to education, transport, waste, community learning and development. Failure to secure the funding will have a direct impact on the ability of the Council to undertake these duties and will impact on the new residents of the proposed development.
- 3.6 The development proposals have been subjected to significant public consultation and debate, including through the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan and Cambridge City Local Plan processes. County Council Members also sit on the Cambridge Fringes Joint Development Control Committee who determined the Clay Farm and Glebe Farm outline applications and will determine this full application.

Climate Change

- 3.7 The proposed response (Appendix 1) encourages the developer to achieve more in terms of sustainability and climate change.

- 3.8 In terms of the County Council’s role, we will be encouraging sustainable transport within the development by ensuring that public transport and cycling infrastructure is in place. Developer contributions have been sought in order to achieve this.
- 3.9 The creation of a residential travel plan is also a requirement of the County Council. Part of the plan will ensure that the developer offers new residents moving into Clay Farm and Glebe Farm a ‘welcome pack’ which will identify sustainable transport options in the development and surrounding area. Such a pack should help to encourage early residents to choose more sustainable forms of transport over their car.

Access and Inclusion

- 3.10 The proposed response contains some specific comments under the ‘Highways Section’ which would help to promote accessibility and inclusion. In addition to this, the County Council has helped to unlock development at Glebe Farm and the Southern Fringe in general by building the Guided Busway and Addenbrooke’s Access Road. These are major pieces of infrastructure which will promote access and inclusion. The County Council has sought significant S106 contributions from Countryside Properties in relation to these pieces of infrastructure, along with contributions to conventional bus services, cycling and walking. All of which will help to promote accessibility.
- 3.11 The County Council will also be building a Children’s Centre at Fawcett School which will serve the Southern Fringe. Contributions for this facility have also been sought from the developer. The building of the Centre will help to promote inclusion for children and their families.

Engagement and Consultation

- 3.12 Lead and local Members have been made aware of the planning application and a copy of the Design and Access Statement has been left in the Members’ Lounge. The proposed response has been circulated to Growth and Environment PDG Members. No concerns have been raised.

Source Documents	Location
Glebe Farm Full Planning Application	New Communities, 2 nd Floor A Wing, Castle Court

APPENDIX 1

Glebe Farm FULL Application Consultation – Draft Response

Proposal: *Detailed application for 286 new mixed-tenure dwellings, associated landscaping, open spaces, vehicular access to the south from the Addenbrooke's Access Road, augmented landscape treatment to the north of the Addenbrooke's Access Road and all related infrastructure including connection to the Clay Farm infrastructure on highway land to the east adjoining Addenbrooke's Access Road.*

Location: **Glebe Farm (Land East of Hauxton Road, North of the AAR and South of Bishops Road), Trumpington, Cambridge**

Application No: **09/1140/FUL**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The County Council has provided extensive comments on the Glebe Farm outline applications and the City Council will be aware of the County's Section 106 requirements and proposed planning conditions.
- 1.2 This full application has relied upon much of the supporting information submitted as part of the outline applications. Therefore, all County related Section 106 requirements (with the possible exception of the Library capital and revenue contribution) and planning conditions that were contained within the decision notices for the outline applications should be retained and transferred to this full application. As the County's requirements have not been transferred to this full application at this stage, we maintain a holding objection until they are.
- 1.3 In addition to this, the County Council has the following detailed comments to make in relation to this full application for Glebe Farm.

2. Sustainability and Climate Change

- 2.1 The Glebe Farm site presents an excellent opportunity to build a high quality exemplar sustainable development. The County Council believes that the developer should be setting out to achieve higher standards with respect to sustainability and climate change.
- 2.2 A stronger commitment to reducing emissions is required. It is noted that the application demonstrates how 10% of carbon emissions from energy use will be saved through the use of renewable technology. Seven renewable technologies have been considered in detail (Table 5-1, Energy Strategy), with the cumulative potential to deliver significant carbon savings. However, it is proposed to use only one or two of these methods (photovoltaics is preferred) in order to deliver the minimum 10% carbon saving. There is no consideration given to going beyond this minimum level.

- 2.3 As summarised in the supporting Energy Strategy, three technologies could be used individually to deliver the 10% renewable energy policy, or a mix of technologies could be used to reach this target. Photovoltaics may be used with other renewable technologies such as solar hot water and heat pumps (4.2.2). Biomass heating is also compatible with these technologies. A combination of technologies could be used to provide a much more substantial fraction of renewable energy, which would help to make Glebe Farm an exemplar of sustainability.
- 2.4 We note that the development will meet Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) Level 4 in accordance with the credit rating established in the Code for Sustainable Homes, Technical Guide (May 2009): Table 1.6: Please see: http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/uploads/code_for_sustainable_homes_techguide.pdf
- 2.5 At present, the proposed development will achieve a 69 credit rating, 1 point over the required 68 credits. However, we feel the development should be achieving a higher credit level by working towards a CSH Level 5 (84 credits) and striving towards an exemplar of sustainability. As this is a proposed phase development, we feel that further effort could be made to account for potential future regulation changes.
- 2.6 Furthermore, it should be noted that policies stated within the supporting documents have not been updated since the initial outline planning application consultations; the Draft Climate Change Bill is still quoted despite being superseded by the 2008 Climate Change Act. It is specified in the Sustainability Statement, Annex A: Glebe Farm KPIs, Ref 3.1A: "*Draft Climate Change and Sustainable Energy Bill: A 60% reduction of CO2 by 2050*". The 2008 Climate Change Act, (1.1.1) actually stipulates that this now needs to be at least an 80% reduction by 2050.
- 2.7 In light of these changes to national policy, it is suggested that there should be a stronger commitment to reducing emissions in line with the Climate Change Act 2008. Overall, the measures proposed for this development are minimal and the County Council would request that further consideration be given to procedures, methods, means and execution of adapting to climate change, reducing carbon emissions and increasing usage of renewable energy.

3. Highways

- 3.1 The County Council, as Highway Authority, objects to this proposal on highway grounds. Where additional information or clarification is required, these are holding objections until a view can be given on the outstanding information.

Drawings/Plans

- 3.2 The drawings lack dimensions. Highway widths (including those of footways and cycleways) should be shown on the plans, together with visibility splays (both at junctions and for forward visibility), dimensions between kerbs at constrictions, sizes of parking bays and other crucial dimensions must be

provided for comment. General arrangements drawings showing the Highway layout must be provided at a true scale of 1:500 or better.

- 3.3 The vehicle tracking diagrams provided are at a very small scale yet appear to indicate vehicle strike on some structures and overrun of footways. The developer must provide larger scale drawings showing the vehicle tracking to clarify this issue, at a true scale of not less than 1:200.
- 3.4 No dimensioned drawing has been provided for the layout of the access junction. This must be provided at a scale of 1:500 or better.
- 3.5 The “Street Plans” provided are unclear and ambiguous. There are notes on them, such as those that refer to 25mm kerbs avoiding dropped kerbs. This is confusing and needs further explanation. Some drivers may interpret the change in level and material as parking provision and park on the footway.

Road Adoption

- 3.6 There appears to be a mix of adoptable and private roads within the site, yet it is not always clear which is which. Some roads have a layout that would be acceptable if they remained private, but would not fulfil the role and functions required of adoptable highway and so would not be accepted for adoption. A plan showing what the developer is intending to offer for adoption should be supplied and a technical response from the County Council will be provided.

Waste Collection/Emergency Services Access

- 3.7 A waste collection strategy should be provided by the developer. This is required as access for the refuse collection vehicles does not appear possible to all dwellings. Similarly, issues of access by emergency services exist and the opinion of the fire officer should be sought on the acceptability of this strategy.

Homes Zones/Speed Limits

- 3.8 The application makes several references to “home zones”. The developer needs to be aware that the County Council, as Highway Authority, can make no commitment to the successful implementation of a home zone order. In any case, the requirement should be unnecessary if the site is designed in accordance with the Manual for Streets. The use of play street orders and similar Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO’s) can achieve the desired effect of a ‘homezone’.
- 3.9 The application makes several references to “Speed limits” and “control speeds”. The Highway Authority has made no undertaking to advertise or implement a traffic regulation order imposing a speed limit within the site. Vehicle speeds should be constrained to acceptable speeds by design.

Parking

- 3.10 The section in the Transport Statement on parking provision for private cars is confusing and makes reference to “An overall cap on street spaces of 1.5 per dwelling”. This appears to be a misunderstanding by the developer of the

planning Authority's intention to limit car parking provision over all within the site (including provision on-street, within the curtilage of properties and car parking courts) to 1.5 spaces per dwelling overall.

- 3.11 No indication has been given of car parking provision on street (which would serve the needs of visitors), but the maximum allowance for 286 dwellings would be 429. The developer is already proposing a total of 439, but has not taken on-street provision into account. Further clarification on this matter is sought.
- 3.12 To support the parking strategy, and maintain an environment uncluttered and unobstructed by on-street parking, the Highway Authority is minded to support an enforcement strategy based upon an area-wide traffic regulation order restricting on-street parking within the site to designated spaces. Whilst this order would be subject to consultation procedures and the final result dependent upon those procedures, a clear understanding by all parties of such a proposal is recommended, and to this end the developer must be required to bring the parking strategy for the site to the attention of residents during the purchase process. The developer must fund all and any TRO's via a Section 106 Agreement.
- 3.13 There is no on-street provision for visitor cycle or motor-cycle parking. This omission should be rectified.

Highway Design

- 3.14 The document proposes the use of 4.8 metre carriageway widths on the lower roads in the route hierarchy. The County requires 5.0 metre carriageway widths generally, with reductions being permissible at speed management features and restricted to a limited length. Narrow carriageways make circulation difficult for servicing vehicles and lead to dissatisfaction amongst residents. Similarly, shared private driveways should provide passing places 4.5 metres wide for ease of passing by residents' cars. Widths of 3.5 metres do not provide this. This needs to be corrected.
- 3.15 All footways should be a minimum width of 2.0 metres. This needs to be rectified.
- 3.16 A farm access is shown to the south of access junction on Figure 5.1 of the Transportation Statement. Further details of the use of this access must be provided. In its current position with the layout shown this access would only allow a left turn in, and is poorly positioned for a right turn out.
- 3.17 The bus stop located on the south side of the Addenbrooke's Access Road at the exit of the Glebe Farm junction would require some widening of the carriageway. Appropriate widening would allow vehicles to easily pass stationary buses. There is also no pedestrian facility on this arm. The design should provide such a facility and the plans should be amended.
- 3.18 The left turn lane into the site from the Addenbrooke's Access Road should be extended to provide early separation of flows to reduce lost capacity on the straight-on lane. The phasing modelled for the Glebe Farm junction should therefore be revised to improve junction performance.

- 3.19 The drawing for Road 12 shows various doors opening across the highway, which would be contrary to the provisions of the Highways Act 1980. This road, particularly, appears over constrained and may lead to vehicle conflict and difficulties in maintaining the highway. This is an example of a more widespread problem that needs attention throughout the site. Further work is necessary.

Pedestrian/Cycle Routes

- 3.20 All pedestrian and cycle entrances to the site (as shown as blue dashed lined on Figure 4.2 of the Transport Statement) need to have a bound surface.
- 3.21 All stop and give way markings on the Hauxton Road pedestrian/cycle path should be removed.
- 3.22 The Bishop's Road pedestrian/cycling crossing should be raised with give way markings added for cars.
- 3.23 The raised pedestrian/cycle crossing at the Access Road Junction runs square to the junction rather than parallel to the Access Road with the effect that the alignment for cyclists is poor on the east side. This would be improved by making the raised crossing parallel to the Access Road. This should be rectified.

Public Transport

- 3.24 All proposed bus stops should be designed to accommodate Guided Busway buses.

4. Landscape

- 4.1 We are pleased with the consideration of landscape planning and are satisfied that the species for planted areas conform to Cambridgeshire's Landscape Guidelines. No changes are needed to this application.

5. Sustainable Drainage

- 5.1 The Highway Authority has previously indicated that it would consider a trial usage of the porous surfacing on this site; however, what is being proposed is well beyond the scope of a trial area.
- 5.2 Permeable paving is proposed throughout the scheme. This type of paving would not comply with the Highway Authority's current specification and would be likely to impose a significant additional maintenance burden upon the Highway Authority if such a material were to be used on adoptable highway. Reliance on this material to satisfy sustainability requirements and runoff attenuation may result in the Highway Authority being unable to accept the works for adoption.
- 5.3 It is recommended that further detailed discussions are held between the developer and County Council in order to reach a resolution in relation to sustainable drainage.

5.4 The sustainable drainage proposals also do not take into account the latest UK Climate Projection (UKCP) 09 projections. These could have implications for surface water drainage and the City Council will need to be satisfied that the proposed design is sufficient to cope with future extreme rainfall events.

6. Green Infrastructure

6.1 We welcome the improved distribution of open space around the site and a clear distinction between the allotment site and the four areas of open space.

6.2 We understand the need to locate the allotments in one location, and would wish to see a section within the Residential Travel Plan (RTP) which would encourage allotment users, wherever possible, to use sustainable means of travel to get to the allotment site. We would also encourage the developer to engage with new residents and promote access to larger areas of open space, such as Trumpington Meadows Country Park, Hobson's Brook, Wandlebury Country Park and the Magog Downs. This could also be incorporated with the RTP.

7. Biodiversity

7.1 We are still concerned that there is no assessment of the potential impact of the proposed development on the water quality and ecology of Hobson's Brook or the Bird Mitigation Area at the Clay Farm site. This assessment needs to be done and it should have been addressed within the Environmental Statement. It is important that the pollution control planning condition for the outline applications is retained for this full application.

7.2 We welcome the inclusion of areas of chalk grasslands, however, we feel more could be achieved to enhance biodiversity and make this an exemplar of sustainable living well into the 21st century.

7.3 Only a small proportion of the available area of flat roofs have been allocated for green roofs and as such, it is considered that the design of the scheme has the potential to contribute further. Whilst we understand that developers may be reluctant to include green roofs on private dwellings, full green roofs could be provided on apartment buildings and not just the entrance canopies.

7.4 A greater use of low maintenance and evergreen green walls across the site could be made to reduce the impact of urban heat islands². This would improve the visual amenity of this high density site and provide further benefits for biodiversity.

7.5 We note that no badger survey or bat foraging/commuting survey work has been undertaken at the site for over two years and as such, the survey information is considered out of date. Without this information, the impact of the proposed development on badgers and bats cannot be fully addressed. In addition, The Ecology Chapter (ES Vol 2) does not fully acknowledge the results of the 2002 – 2007 survey work which includes evidence of badger recorded activity within the site and the suitability of the terrestrial habitat

² Urban Heat Island – An urban area which is significantly warmer than its surrounding areas

present at the site for Great Crested Newts. Therefore, further details (including survey work, if appropriate) are required to ensure that a thorough assessment of the impact of the proposed scheme for protected species has been undertaken, with appropriate mitigation provisions.

- 7.6 We welcome the undertaking of a Site Wide Biodiversity Management Plan (paragraph 13.90 ES Vol 2). As well as outlining management and monitoring measures, we suggest the document should also indicate who will be responsible and funding issues.
- 7.7 Further concerns are raised noting that a number of documents (including the aforementioned Ecology Chapter; the Ecology Strategy and Management Plan (ESMP) and the Sustainability Statement) refer to an Ecological Clerks of Works, however, the ESMP (section 2.5.1) states that a “*full time Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) is not considered to be necessary.*” We wish to receive further clarification of this matter.
- 7.8 There are inconsistencies between the mitigation measures and biodiversity enhancements outlined within the Environmental Statement (Vol 2 Chap 13) and the ESMP. Further details and clarification are required before the suitability of the mitigation measures/biodiversity enhancements can be fully assessed.
- 7.9 We welcome the undertaking of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (paragraph 13.76 ES Vol 2). The CEMP will ensure ecological mitigation measures are clearly laid out and approved prior to construction commencing. Should this development receive planning permission, the undertaking of the CEMP should be stipulated as a condition.

8. Sustainable Travel

- 8.1 A Residential Travel Plan Framework has been agreed with the developer as part of the Section 106 agreement for the outline applications. This Framework should now be included as part of a Section 106 for this full application.
- 8.2 We welcome the measures taken to promote walking and cycling within and around the site, such as new routes, crossings, speed control and adequate lighting for example. There are inconsistencies between cycle parking standards outlined in the Design and Access Statement and the Transport Statement accompanying this application.
- 8.3 The Design and Access Statement (section 2.7) states:
- “The provision of cycle storage spaces is compliant with Cambridge Cycle Parking Guide as a minimum. In many cases, particularly the 3 – bedroom units, the requirement is exceeded.”*
- 8.4 However in Table 4.2 (Chapter 4, Transport Statement) it shows parking standards and the level of parking provided; it is noted that in several cases the development will not meet cycle parking standards. Additionally, Table 4.2 shows that no provision has been made for visitor parking provision. This is contrary to Cambridge City Council cycle parking guidance. Please see:

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/transport-and-streets/cycling-and-walking/>

- 8.5 Furthermore, there is no indication of where visitor cycle parking will be located in the site. Clarification is sought on this matter.
- 8.6 At present, the development does not appear to accord with cycle parking policy. Therefore, the County Council object to this application. In order to remove this objection, the developer must clarify the cycle parking issues and clearly demonstrate that the development is policy compliant.
- 8.7 We note that the previously identified issues with the non-motorised unit (NMU) link to Exeter Close along the original Vicarage Farm access road have not yet been resolved. This would be an important link and we would encourage the developer to engage with the land owner in order for such a link to be provided.
- 8.8 We would like to see clear highway status for the NMU link identified linking to Bishops Road. We note with some concern that this is not included in the coloured area on the new masterplan in the Design and Access Statement, and trust that the August 2008 outline application access and movement diagram will still be reflected in what is built. Further clarification is needed on this matter.

9. Phasing

- 9.1 There are inconsistencies between the submitted documents in relation to the phasing of the development. The Supporting Planning Statement (paragraph 4.17) suggests a 2-3 year building programme, whilst the Design and Access Statement, (section 2.4) and the Environmental Statement (Vol 1 page 15), both suggest a construction programme of 3 – 4years. Clarification on this matter is needed.