

WATERBEACH BARRACKS AND AIRFIELD PLANNING APPLICATION

To: Economy and Environment Committee

Meeting Date: 12TH July 2018

From: Graham Hughes – Executive Director, Place and Economy

Electoral division(s): Waterbeach

Forward Plan ref: 2018/041 **Key decision:** Yes

Purpose: To consider and approve the draft heads of terms for Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield section 106 agreement and to consider the Council's response to the amendments to the application prior to determination of the planning application by South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Recommendation: The Committee is requested to:

- a) Receive an update on the outline planning application;
- b) Consider and endorse the draft section 106 agreement heads of terms.
- c) Delegate to the Executive Director (Place and Economy) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the draft Heads of Terms and the Council's response to the amended planning application.

<i>Officer contact:</i>		<i>Member contacts:</i>	
Name:	Juliet Richardson	Names:	Councillors Bates and Wotherspoon
Post:	Business Manager Growth & Development	Post:	Chair/Vice-Chair
Email:	Juliet.richardson@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	lan.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk timothy.wotherspoon@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 699868	Tel:	01223 706398

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The planning application for the redevelopment of the former Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield was submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) in March 2017. This is an outline application made by Urban and Civic/Defence Infrastructure Organisation for the comprehensive development of the entire Ministry of Defence land holding at Waterbeach.
- 1.2 The Economy and Environment Committee (E and E Committee) previously considered a paper on this application on 13th July 2017 to approve the Council's response to the planning application consultation. These papers can be found by following this [link](#).
- 1.3 Since the last E&E meeting dialogue between the County Council, the applicant and SCDC has been ongoing to resolve outstanding issues relating to the application and in respect to the planning obligations (section 106 agreement) that are necessary to make the development acceptable. The purpose of this report is to 1) update the Committee on the progress of the application, 2) to appraise the Committee of the Council's response to the amended application and, particular, in relation to any holding objections, and 3) to set out and seek the Committee's agreement to the draft heads of terms.
- 1.4 For the avoidance of doubt this report only considers the application on the Airfield and Barracks site. A further planning application for the land to the east of the airfield is due by RLW and will be considered by the Committee separately.

2. MAIN ISSUES

Comments on Amended Planning Application

- 2.1 The amended planning application was submitted to SCDC on 14th May. Officers have reviewed this latest submission and supporting documents in the light of comments previously made and any further issues that need to be addressed. A summary of the key issues are set out below. In some cases the proposed amendments adequately address the issues previously raised and consequently there are some areas where holding objections can be withdrawn. Where matters have not been adequately resolved it is recommended that holding objections remain in place.

Transport

- 2.2 The evidence suggests that the site could be brought forward on a '**monitor and manage**' basis, described below:
 - **Initial Phase:** The proposals include an initial phase of 1,600 units. This phase would be accompanied with an initial, defined mitigation package that would satisfactorily address the impacts of this phase. The development will require a strong emphasis on sustainable travel and the proposed mitigation package has been designed to drive this. Trips from the development would be monitored with a view to capping the development to accord with a phase one 'trip budget'. Beyond this phase, no further development would be allowed on the site without (a) further transport assessment, and (b) agreement of additional (strategic) mitigation.

- **Future Phases:** No future phases could be developed beyond 1,600 units without agreement of further mitigation measures. The details of the future mitigation will be drawn from the emerging findings of the Combined Authority's Ely to Cambridge Strategic Study and associated workstreams, and agreed as part of a phase by phase TA process. As part of this outline application, we would secure the principle of a significant financial cap – i.e. a financial contribution towards strategic solutions to unlock future phases. This financial contribution will have flexibility in terms of how it is spent, with the fundamental purpose of supporting whichever strategic solutions are deemed most appropriate for the site/A10 area.

2.3 To clarify: A detailed mitigation package is proposed that would satisfactorily release 1,600 units. Beyond that there is a lot of flexibility regarding the future mitigation, but the developer is proposing (a) a significant financial cap to support its delivery, and (b) no development beyond 1,600 until the mitigation for future phases is agreed.

2.4 Notwithstanding the above, there are technical matters that need to be resolved before CCC is in a position to approve the evidence and to agree the initial mitigation package. These issues are highlighted in the draft comments appended to this report and are:

- Parking - Further information required - (1) Justify the proposed car parking provision, and (2) provide detail on the design of the spaces.
- Trip Rates - Confirm trip rates as there are inconsistencies in the information submitted. Further discussion is required about the assumptions on car occupancy as this will ultimately inform the total number of vehicles. The assumptions will need to be consistent with NTS data.
- Distribution and Modal Split – Information is missing from the TA and is required.
- Milton Interchange - The applicant is required to demonstrate the capacity threshold of the A14 interchange with the Highways England scheme.
- Denny End Road / A10 - The applicant is required to investigate the potential for a temporary bridge structure at this location, and to examine what further measures could be made to increase highway capacity should a bridge be built.
- Shuttle Bus - The applicant is asked to detail the charging structure for the shuttle bus service.
- Rail Package (1) - The applicant is required to demonstrate deliverability of the rail package and demonstrate support from Network Rail. Rail access improvements are key to avoiding an early dependency on a relocated station.
- Rail Package (2) - The applicant is required to detail how many of the additional rail passengers could use the community bus service, could use the additional cycle parking, and could park within walking distance of the station.

- 2.5 Further discussion and technical work is required on the mitigation package and associated designs / tests. However, in principle a mitigation package is possible. The early phase (1,600 units) mitigation package is listed in the conclusion to the attached comments. Works on the highway would be designed with a focus on 'quick wins' and minimising abortive work. The package and includes the following:

Ref	Highway Mitigation	Details
1	To undertake traffic flow monitoring of the study area and site access junction and travel surveys of the site. Details of the location and type of monitoring to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority (LHA).	S106
2	To undertake additional works at the A14 / A10 interchange should the vehicle trips from the site reach the capacity limits of the Highways England works, or if no longer term capacity solution has been identified. The details of the capacity threshold and works to be agreed with the LHA,.	S106
3	To implement prior to occupation revision to signal timings at the junctions of the Park and Ride and Butt Lane with the A10.	condition
4	To undertake capacity enhancements of the A10 between Butt Lane and the Milton P&R access should the vehicle trips from the site reach the capacity limits of the Highways England works. The details of the threshold and works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106
5	To implement prior to occupation improvements to capacity and road safety at the junctions of Landbeach Road / Humphries Way / A10. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	condition
6	To implement prior to occupation improvements to capacity and road safety at the junctions of Waterbeach Road / Car Dyke Road / A10. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	condition
7	To implement prior to occupation improvements to capacity and pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities at the junction of Denny End Road / A10. These works should include some or all of the following measures. A temporary bridge structure, highway improvements, and or a financial contribution towards an overall scheme. Details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106 / condition (To be agreed)
8	To implement prior to occupation improvements to capacity and road safety at the junctions of Cambridge Research Park / Site Access / A10. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	condition
9	To implement prior to occupation improvements to capacity at the junction of Stretham Roundabout / A10, and or make a financial contribution towards an overall scheme. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106 / condition (To be agreed)
10	To implement within one year of the first occupation improvements	condition

	to traffic calming within the villages of Landbeach, Cottenham, Waterbeach and Horningsea to deter and or limit the use of roads within these villages. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	
	Cycling Mitigation	
11	To implement within one year of the first occupation a 3m surfaced cycle route between Denny End Road and Green End, and along the Mere way byway between Landbeach and the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway. The details of the works to be agreed with the County Council.	condition
12	To implement prior to occupation widening of the existing footway alongside the A10 to 3m where possible between Denny End Road and Ely Road Milton. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	condition
13	To implement prior to occupation improvements to cycle safety and traffic calming within Milton between Ely Road and the A14. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	condition
14	To implement within one year of the first occupation improvements to cycle safety and traffic calming within Waterbeach village between Denny End Road, the railway station and along Car Dyke Road. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	Condition
15	To implement prior to completion of the Cambridge to Waterbeach Greenway a link to the Greenway within the site should this be required. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	condition
16	To implement prior to occupation improvements to the cycle route between Denny End Road and Cambridge Research Park. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	condition
17	To implement within one year of the first occupation improved cycle links to Cottenham. This will involve the creation of new public rights of way and surfaced routes. The details of the works to be agreed with the County Council.	S106 / condition (To be agreed)
18	To implement prior to occupation of the 1,000 dwelling improved cycle links to Chittering and Lode. This will involve the creation of new public rights of way and surfaced routes. The details of the works to be agreed with the County Council.	S106 / condition (To be agreed)
	Public Transport Mitigation	
19	To provide a frequent service (up to 10 minutes frequency) between the site and Cambridge City Centre, as per the May 2018 Transport Assessment. Details of service operation to be provided though it would be based on an extension of existing Milton-Cambridge services.	Condition

20	To facilitate the extension of the bus route 196 into the site as per the May 2018 Transport Assessment. Details of service operation to be provided.	Condition
21	To facilitate the provision of a small bus transport hub within phase 1 where the above services and proposed shuttle service will be accessed, including a small number of parking spaces on existing hardstanding (c.100), as per the May 2018 Transport Assessment. Details to be agreed with the LHA. It is envisaged that this provision would be temporary, to align with the longer term transport plan to create a multi modal transport hub.	Condition
22	To implement prior to occupation RTPI and bus stop shelters to key bus stops within Landbeach and Waterbeach villages. To include contributions towards the future maintenance of bus stop shelters of £7,000 per shelter and £10,500 per RTPI unit. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106 / condition
23	To facilitate the provision of an on demand/mobility bus service as per the May 2018 Transport Assessment. This is to enable links between Cambridge Research Park, the site and Waterbeach Railway Station, and for other links to the surrounding community.	Condition
24	To facilitate with Network Rail and the County Council and to implement prior to occupation improvements to the provisions for passengers at the existing Waterbeach Railway Station as per the May 2018 Transport Assessment.	Condition
25	To monitor car parking within the vicinity of the railway station and to fund the provision of additional parking controls where required.	Condition
26	To monitor bus journey times for the bus route through Landbeach and investigate options for bus priority to reduce bus journey times. To agree thresholds and measures with the LHA prior to occupation of the first dwelling.	Condition
27	To facilitate the construction of a link road to the relocated railway station prior to its opening.	S106
	Other Mitigation	
28	That a Travel Plan is submitted and approved by the LPA prior to occupation of the first dwelling. The travel plan should include personalised travel planning, subsidised bus travel and cycle purchase.	Condition

- 2.6 The Highway Authority requests a hold on any further development beyond Phase 1. Any future phase will require a Transport Assessment to be approved by the Local Planning Authority. The additional Transport Assessment will need to refer to strategic A10 solutions and other public transport and cycling based infrastructure that is identified within the Waterbeach Special Planning Document and Ely to Cambridge Study work.
- 2.7 Further development of the new town will be dependent on this infrastructure being implemented. The Combined Authority is leading work to advance the recommendations of the Ely – Cambridge Study regarding coordinated multi modal strategic solutions – Including consideration of the A10 upgrade, Mass Transit solutions, extensive walking and cycling routes within the immediate vicinity of public transport nodes and an on demand mobility and bus service. The aim must be to create a sustainable transport system that is so good and appealing that public transport, walking and cycle become the preferential travel choice over the car. The developer will ultimately be required to contribute, (with an overall cap to be agreed), towards the strategic solutions identified by the CA and partners (Greater Cambridge Partnership, CCC) to unlock future phases. The transport cap will be flexible in terms of how it is spent, but it *could* include contributions towards the following strategic infrastructure.

Ref	Mitigation	Details
29	A contribution towards the upgrade of the A10 between the A14 and Waterbeach. The amount to be determined and subject to agreement with the County Council.	S106
30	A contribution towards the upgrade of the A14 / 10 interchange The amount to be determined and subject to agreement with the County Council.	S106
31	A contribution towards a public transport / mass transit corridor between Waterbeach and Cambridge. The amount to be determined and subject to agreement with the County Council.	S106
32	A contribution towards the provision of improved cycle connections to Histon, Impington, Stretham, Fen Ditton and Lode (via a new bridge over the River Cam). The amount and works to be determined and subject to agreement with the County Council.	S106
33	A contribution towards a Waterbeach multi modal transport hub. At this stage there are no details agreed about this, though the relocation of the railway station provides an opportunity for interchange of public transport/mass transit, rail services, on demand/bus services and potentially cars (with an option for c.1000 parking spaces)	S106
34	Ongoing monitoring of travel behaviour and vehicle flows in the study area and any additional mitigation measures required resulting from increased traffic flows.	S106

- 2.8 There are clear limitations on the existing railway station at Waterbeach, and an opportunity exists for the two developers of the new town to work together to facilitate the prompt delivery of the new relocated railway station at the earliest opportunity. This will help deliver further development and maximise the potential of the new railway station.

Education

- 2.9 The original application made provision for 3 primary school sites each of 3 hectares in size to accommodate up to 3 forms of entry (FE) (630 children), including early years provision on each. The amended application has reduced the amount of land reserved for expansion to 2 hectares which will provide a maximum of 11 FE. This is in line with the maximum demand of 11 FE projected using the general multipliers (25 to 35 primary aged children per 100 dwellings) in place at the time the application was submitted.
- 2.10 There has been a change to the broad location of the first primary school indicated on the parameter plan. Education officers have challenged this new location due to its proximity to the A10. Discussion with the applicant following additional noise modelling has indicated that the location is satisfactory providing appropriate noise mitigation is provided in the form of bunding and acoustic fencing. It is recommended that the County Council agrees with the new location provided that suitable conditions and planning obligations are in place to deliver and maintain the mitigation measures.
- 2.11 The County Council is supportive of the general location of the proposed schools, although the precise locations and boundaries, compliant with the Council's site specifications will need to be agreed at the detailed planning stage.
- 2.12 The application now includes land of at least 1.7 hectares safeguarded for the special school. This amendment is to be welcomed and overcomes an earlier objection by the County Council regarding the lack of provision for special needs and Post 16 provision within the development. The Council is looking to secure a site for a Post 16 facility within the adjoining RLW site.

New Communities

- 2.13 The Council sought a commitment for more formal support and community development, especially for those more vulnerable, to ensure all people are fully integrated and welcome in the new community. This is considered necessary to help mitigate the high needs (much higher mental health needs, higher cases of domestic abuse, higher levels of crime etc.) that have been evidenced at the earlier development of other sites of this scale. The New Communities service has analysed the forecast needs arising from this development and has proposed a scheme to mitigate the impact. This will be negotiated and secured through the Section 106 agreement (see below).

Floods and Water

- 2.14 The Floods and Water team lodged an objection to the original application relating to the site wide surface water drainage strategy. The flood risk assessment has been updated using new hydraulic modelling and since the initial objection in April 2017 the Floods and Water team has received clarification on our concerns from the applicant's drainage consultant and are able to remove the objection.
- 2.15 The revised fluvial flood extents encroach very slightly into the attenuation feature referenced as Pond 1.1 in the approved outline drainage strategy. Measures may be required at the detailed design stage to ensure that the functionality and capacity of the surface water attenuation is not compromised in this location.
- 2.16 The LPA has been asked to include conditions necessary to address the following matters:
- A strategic surface water drainage strategy for the entire site;
 - A detailed surface water scheme pursuant to each reserved matters site;
 - The implementation of the associated surface water infrastructure works in accordance with the agreed site-wide drainage strategy;
 - Approval and implementation of a scheme for the temporary storage and management of surface water on that parcel/plot prior to commencement of development.

Public Health

- 2.17 The Public Health team has worked with the applicant in the preparation of a revised health impact statement and consequently the holding objection can be withdrawn.

Minerals and Waste

- 2.18 The application includes the provision of 2 energy centres to contribute towards CO2 and climate change targets through local energy generation. The application provides scant details on these facilities stating that this will be provided at the detailed design stage following feasibility and viability testing.
- 2.19 The development specification (SP25) incorrectly states that the energy centres "are proposed in general locations shown on the Parameter Plan".
- 2.20 Since the outline application lacks any substantive detail of the energy centres, particularly details of the fuel and feedstock, the Waste Planning Authority is unable to make any meaningful comment on this part of the application. As such the comments made following the first consultation stand.
- 2.21 Further to the earlier response the requirement for a Detailed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan is still required and this will be secured through a condition.
- 2.22 The County Council's previous comment regarding the need to ensure the sustainable use of mineral extracted during the development complies with the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (Policy CS42). It is suggested that this can be secured through a suitable condition requiring the Construction Environmental Management Plan to include proposals for the sustainable use of mineral extracted from the site.

Libraries and Lifelong Learning

- 2.23 The Library service has sought interim provision to cover the early stages of the development with a permanent hub library to be provided in a community building. The site, timing and arrangements for delivering this facility will be secured through the section 106 agreement (see below).

Archaeology

- 2.24 Officers do not object to the application, but recommend that conditions are put in place to ensure the effective management of undesignated heritage assets which may be impacted by the development, including the construction phase.

Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms

- 2.25 Planning obligations or Section 106 agreements are legal agreements between local planning authorities and developers in the context of the granting of planning permission. They can be both financial and non-financial (land, works in kind), and they are used when there is a requirement to address the impact of a development and the impact itself cannot be dealt with through a planning condition on the permission. The use of planning obligations is an effective tool to ensure that development meets the objectives of sustainable development as required in local and national policies.
- 2.26 Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) provides that from 6th April 2010 it is unlawful for a planning obligation to be taken into account when determining a planning application if the obligation does not meet the following tests:
- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - Directly related to the development; and
 - Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 2.27 Officers are working with the applicant and SCDC to progress the Heads of Terms for a S106 Agreement to secure the necessary infrastructure to make this development acceptable in planning terms.
- 2.28 Appendix 2 provides a schedule of the planning obligations that are being proposed and which are considered necessary to mitigate the impact of the development. This relates only to County Council infrastructure and services. There will also be obligations in favour of the District Council for affordable housing, open space, sport and recreation, health and community development.
- 2.29 The final heads of terms will be approved by the local planning authority prior to resolving to grant of planning permission. It is expected that the Planning Committee will be in September. It is recognised that there is further work to do on the heads of terms prior to this and whilst Appendix 2 captures the key issues Members should be mindful these will be scrutinised against the legal tests in 2.20 above and possible viability assessment of the development. The Committee is asked, therefore, to endorse the current heads of terms as set out in Appendix 2 and provide delegated authority as set out in the recommendation to conclude the negotiation.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

The development will provide employment and retail opportunities to benefit the local economy for all.

3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

The application provides a range of measures to promote healthy lives, including sport, play and leisure uses. The application includes a proposal for a 600 residential care bed spaces or similar.

3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

Contributions towards community health and development workers are being sought to help support vulnerable people whilst the new community is being established.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Resource Implications

There are no further significant resource implications at this stage.

5.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

5.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

There are no significant implications within this category other than the need to settle the terms of an agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with the developers and the SCDC.

5.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

5.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

5.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

There are no significant implications within this category.

5.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes or No Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by Finance?	N/A Name of Financial Officer: Paul White
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes or No Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes or No Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes or No Name of Officer: Joanna Shilton
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes or No Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes or No Name of Officer: Iain Green

Source Documents	Location
South Cambridgeshire District Council planning application "Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield Outline Planning Application", reference S/0559/17/OL	South Cambridgeshire District Council planning portal: S/0559/17OL

Appendix 1: Transport Assessment Comments

Waterbeach Barracks New Town 6,500 Dwellings and Associated Land Uses S/0559/17/FL

TRANSPORTATION COMMENTS

PREPARED BY: Transport Assessment Team

AUTHOR: Tam Parry

CHECKED BY: David Allatt

DATE: 23rd May 2018

HEADLINE

Headlines - Holding Objection

- The evidence suggests that the site could be brought forward on a ‘monitor and manage’ basis, with an initial mitigation package that would satisfactorily address the development impacts of an early phase of up to 1,600 units. Trips from the development would be monitored with a view to capping the development to accord with a phase one ‘trip budget’.
- Beyond 1,600 units, no future phases could take place without agreement of further mitigation measures. The details of the future mitigation will be drawn from the emerging findings of the Combined Authority’s Ely to Cambridge Strategic Study and agreed as part of a phase by phase TA process.
- Notwithstanding the above, there are technical matters that need to be resolved before CCC is in a position to approve the evidence and to agree the initial mitigation package. These issues are summarised below:
 - Further information required regarding parking. (1) Justify the proposed car parking provision, and (2) provide detail on the design of the spaces.
 - Confirm trip rates as there are inconsistencies in the information submitted. Further discussion is required about the assumptions on car occupancy as this will ultimately inform the total number of vehicles. The assumptions will need to be consistent with NTS data.
 - Distribution and Modal Split – Information is missing from the TA and is required.
 - Milton Interchange - The applicant is required to demonstrate the capacity threshold of the A14 interchange with the Highways England scheme.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Denny End Road / A10 - The applicant is required to investigate the potential for a temporary bridge structure at this location, and to examine what further measures could be made to increase highway capacity should a bridge be built. ○ The applicant is asked to detail the charging structure for the shuttle bus service. ○ The applicant is required to demonstrate deliverability of the rail package and demonstrate support from Network Rail. Rail access improvements are key to avoiding an early dependency on a relocated station. ○ The applicant is required to detail how many of the additional rail passengers could use the community bus service, could use the additional cycle parking, and could park within walking distance of the station. ○ Further discussion is required on the mitigation package and associated designs / tests. 	
Proposal Description: <u>Accepted</u>	
Study Area: <u>Accepted</u>	
Traffic Data: <u>Accepted</u>	
Trip Generation: <u>Accepted</u> in principle however further information is required from the applicant required to address inconsistencies in the TA information presented. Vehicle occupancy assumptions are <u>Not Agreed</u>	
Distribution and Assignment: <u>Not Agreed</u> – Outstanding detail required	
Assessment Scenarios and Traffic Growth: <u>Accepted</u>	
Modelling: Paramics model structure agreed – Detail of inputs to be discussed. Other junction models are still to be agreed	
Mitigation: Further detail and discussion required before package can be agreed.	

Introduction

These comments are based on the updated Transport Assessment dated May 2018 provided by Peter Brett Associates (PBA) as part of an outline application for mixed use development of 6,500 dwellings and other associated land uses for the Waterbeach new town.

The below comments are further to comments dated 18th September 2017. The applicant has undertaken additional work to address these comments, which is presented in the TA. These comments, refer to the updated TA, and also to ongoing dialogue with the applicant that might not be fully represented in the TA submitted.

This application relates only to the former airfield and barracks land and does not relate to the remainder of the site which is expected to follow as a separate application.

A Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is being prepared to articulate the key principles for development of the new town. These comments focus exclusively to the TA. However, linkages to the SPD are evident in the mitigation strategy and wider application.

Background

- Comment 1 The information relating to the application has been updated. This application remains a detailed application in terms of transport for the first phase, and an outline application for the total of 6,500 dwellings. The first phase remains at 1,600 dwellings, and the overall application at 6,500 dwellings. Details relating to the transport provisions after the first phase will be considered in detail at each subsequent phase.
- Comment 2 The applicant has revised the early phase proposals and reduced the expected employment of the initial phase of the development. The applicant now proposes a total of 411 jobs including those related to a primary and secondary school, hotel, office and leisure uses.
- Comment 3 The details of the design of the application site will be considered as part of future applications should approval be given for this application. However, as with Northstowe, the County and applicant have aspirations for the site which are explored in more detail with the Spatial Planning Document which is being prepared by the planning authority.
- Comment 4 Waterbeach New Town has been allocated in emerging policy SS/5 of the South Cambridgeshire Emerging Local Plan 2011 to 2031. The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) 2013 includes the transport measures that are considered necessary to enable the new town. These are explored in more detail in the reporting of the Ely to Cambridge Study published in January 2018. These reports conclude that the interventions outlined in the TSCSC are necessary to enable the new town. In terms of the early phase of development, the early provision of bus, rail and cycle infrastructure is required, along with improvements to key junctions on the A10 between the A14 and Waterbeach. In terms of the wider development, the reports outline that the A10 between the A14 and Waterbeach will need to be duelled. Further work will be required on these proposals as part of ongoing work to develop and implement these schemes.

Existing Local Transport Network

Walking Routes

Headline: There is a requirement to improve walking connections between the site, Waterbeach village, and other surrounding villages.

- Comment 5 The applicant notes that there are footways alongside many of the roads within the village, and some existing and potential footway connections between the site and Waterbeach village. Between Waterbeach and surrounding villages, the applicant notes that there are opportunities to improve the Public Right of Way Network.

Cycling Facilities

Headline: There is a requirement to improve cycling connections between the site and Cambridge, Waterbeach Village, Lode, Chittering, Stretham, Cottenham and Horningsea.

Comment 6 Waterbeach currently suffers from poor accessibility to Cambridge by bicycle. Current provision is made up of (1) a narrow footway alongside the A10 and (2) a narrow, muddy path alongside the river Cam. These facilities would not be likely to encourage the use of cycling from the development site.

Comment 7 In terms of existing connections to surrounding villages, there are no connections for cycling between Waterbeach and Lode, Chittering, Stretham, Cottenham and Horningsea that are separate from traffic routes. The Greater Cambridge Partnership have proposals for a Greenway route between Cambridge and Waterbeach with connections to Horningsea. However, the funding and delivery of this route is not currently committed.

Local Public Transport Services

Headline: There is a requirement to improve (1) buses serving the area in terms of frequency and operating hours, (2) Waterbeach rail facilities and associated access provision.

Comment 8 Waterbeach is served by the Citi 2, No.9 and No.196 bus services. The Citi 2 serves Waterbeach during peak times only, between 6 and 8 AM and PM. The No.9 service has only one service each hour. The No.196 has four inbound and three outbound services Monday to Friday. Whilst the applicant has demonstrated that there is spare capacity on these buses, the frequency and times of these services would not be likely to encourage the use of buses from the development site.

Comment 9 Waterbeach station currently suffers from poor accessibility in terms of platform width, ramp gradients, lack of provision of cycle parking, limited car parking, on street parking in the surrounding area, limited platform passenger shelters and general amenities. These facilities would not be likely to encourage the use of rail from the development site.

Local Roads - Existing Traffic Conditions

Headline: Study area, traffic surveys and accident analysis are agreed. Current rat running and unreliable journey times on the A10 are noted.

Comment 10 The study area of the applicant includes Stretham, Wilburton, Cottenham, Histon and Impington, Milton and Horningsea. **The study area is agreed.**

Comment 11 The applicant has collected traffic flow data from the A10 and surrounding area (November 2015 and June 2016). This has been aggregated across the sites and is agreed for use in the transport models. **Existing traffic flow data is agreed.**

Comment 12 The Ely to Cambridge Study and the applicant acknowledge that the A10 currently suffers from severe peak time congestion. This leads to vehicles seeking alternative routes through these villages ('rat running') particularly during peak times.

Comment 13 The applicant has undertaken journey time surveys of the A10 between Stretham and the A14. This outlines that during the AM peak the journey time is most variable

southbound between Denny End Road and the A14, with a variation of between 3 to 11 minutes between Landbeach Road and the A14. During the PM peak the journey time is most variable northbound between the Cambridge Research Park roundabout and Stretham roundabout, with a variation of between 6 to 20 minutes. **These findings are replicated in the Ely to Cambridge study and are agreed.**

Comment 14 The applicant has updated the accident analysis for the study area with data for the last five years up to October 2017. This highlights that there are several key clusters of collisions in the area. On the A10 these include the junctions with Denny End Road (with 7 accidents), Car Dyke Road (with 8 accidents), Landbeach Road and Humphries Way (with 15 accidents), and the A14 (with 11 accidents). In the surrounding area clusters of particular note are Beach Road between Cottenham and Landbeach (with 4 accidents), the A10 between Chittering and Stretham (with 8 accidents). **The accident analysis is agreed.**

Car and Cycle Parking

Headline: CCC recommends that the cycle parking is agreed as it is compliant with LPA standards. CCC require additional information to (1) justify the proposed car parking provision, and (2) provide detail on the design of the spaces. It is noted that parking requirements will be assessed on a phase by phase basis.

Comment 15 The cycle parking conforms to emerging policy of 1 space per bedroom for dwellings and for other uses. **Proposed cycle parking is within LPA standard.**

Comment 16 The applicant proposes to provide a lower than emerging policy parking ratio for the first phase with an average 1.5 spaces per dwelling including for visitor parking. This allows for one space for 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings, and 2 spaces for 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings. This is on the basis that the provisions for alternative modes of travel from the site, will limit the need for car ownership by future residents. Therefore Cambridge fringe rather than Northstowe equivalent parking standards are proposed. This is proposed to be monitored throughout the lifetime of the first phase. The parking provision for subsequent phases will need to be agreed at the time of these applications.

Comment 17 The County have reservations regarding the provision of parking, however, this is noted to be a matter to be determined by the Local Planning Authority. The 2011 Census notes that the average level of car ownership across the South Cambridgeshire District area is 1.56, and for Waterbeach in particular is lower than the average at 1.37 cars per household. The reasons for this lower car ownership are unclear. **The applicant is asked to undertake further analysis as to what reasons there are for the lower car ownership in Waterbeach, and whether these factors are likely to be replicated within the new town.**

Comment 18 A further factor to consider will be the likely layout and location of parking, as this can determine the use of the parking to be provided. This is evident in Orchard Park to the north of Cambridge where rear courtyard parking is not fully used by residents, leading to on street and pavement parking. The future layout and design of parking will be considered in more detail in the design code and detailed applications to

follow for the first phase. **The applicant is asked to undertake further analysis as to the details of the location and layout of parking within the first phase.**

Spreadsheet Model

Headline: The spreadsheet model, its inputs, growth assumptions and scenario tests are agreed.

Comment 19 The applicant has undertaken a spreadsheet model approach to determine the existing and future transport network relating to the wider area around Waterbeach. This uses National Travel Statistics and Census data at its core and is more appropriate in this location than using the CSRM based approach. The methodology of the construction of the spreadsheet model is set out in section 8.2 of the revised TA. The spreadsheet model has been provided by the applicant and evaluated by the County in order to gain a full understanding of its construction and operation. **The principal of using the spreadsheet model, its structure and inputs are agreed.**

Comment 20 The spreadsheet model prepared by the applicant considers all of the existing transport movements by mode to and from Waterbeach and in the surrounding area. It adds future committed developments to these movements. The committed developments for both employment and housing are agreed. A comparison of the growth predicted in the spreadsheet model and Temprow, (used in the CSRM modelling) has been undertaken. This shows that the growth in the spreadsheet model is in excess of that in Temprow. **The growth predicted in the spreadsheet model is agreed.**

Comment 21 The scenarios tested are agreed and include a 2021 baseline and with the first phase, and a 2031 baseline and with the full development, and full allocated development for the site. **The scenario test years are agreed.**

Forecast Trip Generation

Headline: The trip generation information in the TA is inconsistent with the spreadsheet model – The applicant is required to use the spreadsheet model figures, which have been discussed in detail. Note that the developer would be required to monitor trips from the site on an ongoing basis – The developer will be required to agree to a capped ‘trip budget’ based on the total number of vehicle trips that can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Total Person Trip Rates

Comment 22 This section reviews the trip generation and distribution resulting from the first phase of development of 1,600 dwellings. The applicant outlines in Chapter 13 the trip generation from the first phase of development and full application of 6,500 dwellings.

The figures in tables 13.1 to 13.8 in the TA and Figures 13.1-13.2 from the TA are not the latest agreed figures (i.e. the spreadsheet model figures) – so cannot be agreed.

The spreadsheet model figures forecast 496 internal trips and 1329 external trips (772 out and 557 in) giving a total of 1825 total person trips in the AM peak. For the PM peak there are 260 internal trips and 1,628 external trips (755 out, 873 in) giving 1,888 total person trips. The total person trip rates from the spreadsheet are comparable with other large developments and are accepted in principle. **Before these can be agreed the applicant is asked to confirm the above trips and trip rates.**

Comment 23 For the full application development the spreadsheet model determines that there will be 3216 internal trips and 4,304 external trips (2,252 out, 2,052 in) giving a 7,520 total person trips in the AM peak. For the PM peak there are 1401 internal trips and 4,005 (1,534 in, 2,471 out) external trips giving a total of 5,406 trips. **Before these can be agreed the applicant is asked to confirm the above trips and trip rates.**

Comment 24 Overall the spreadsheet model has predicted a higher amount of trips in the AM and PM peaks to those predicted by the CSRM model in the Ely to Cambridge Study.

Internalisation Rates

Headline: Trip internalisation rates are based on the NTS data and are accepted, noting that these will be monitored to inform future assumptions for future phases.

Comment 25 For the first phase the internal trips are principally related to education based trips. These account for 27% of all trips in the AM peak and 14% in the PM peak. For the whole application site the internalisation rate is predicted to increase to 43% of all trips in the AM peak and 28% in the PM peak, due to a greater amount of land uses within the new town. **Internalisation rates are based on the NTS data and are accepted, noting that these will be monitored to inform future assumptions for future phases.**

Forecast Trip Distribution

Headline: Distribution information is not clearly provided in the TA and is required by CCC.

Comment 26 This is not detailed in TA report in detail. From additional information provided by the applicant, the distribution has a bias of 77% of car driver and passenger trips going south towards in the AM peak, and 80% approaching from the south in the PM peak. **The applicant is asked to detail the distribution to and from the site in the peak periods for the first phase in particular, including any analysis of non A10 routes.**

Forecast Mode Split

Headline: Mode share information is not clearly provided in the TA and is required by CCC.

Comment 27 **The applicant is asked to detail a mode split table of proportion of trips made by each mode from the spreadsheet model. This needs to separate out the different PT modes and also needs to break down 'car/passenger' include 'number of cars'.**

Comment 28 The mode split has initially been taken from the spreadsheet model which first makes a distinction between which trips could be made by walk and cycle, followed by which trips are made between car and public transport. The applicant has also provided additional information further to the revised TA.

Comment 29 Of the 772 trips leaving the site in the AM peak the model outlines a mode share of 7% for cycle (53), 8% for public transport (58) and car 86% (661) of which 371 (48%) is car driver and 290 (38%) is car passenger (i.e. 371 cars and 1.8 people per car). **CCC requires assumptions on car occupancy to be consistent with NTS data (i.e. 1.2 people per car).**

Comment 30 Of the 873 trips entering the site in the PM peak 87% (673) are cars of which 454 (52%) is car driver and 129 (15%) is car passenger with 1.2 passengers per car, 6% are cycle (52) and 7% are public transport (58). For internal trips, the mode share for walking and cycling is much higher at 73% in the AM peak and 60% in the PM peak.

Comment 31 The cycle proportions have been informed by Cambridge based census data and a sensitivity test has been undertaken that takes into account the potential for the proportion of cycling trips to Cambridge and nearby locations to increase. The rationale and inputs to this sensitivity test are agreed. The sensitivity test includes an increase in the mode share of cycling from residents of the first phase, a mode switch from car to other modes for existing residents in the locality, and the reassignment of vehicles away from the A10 due to the improvements to the A14.

Comment 32 The changes to mode share for residents of the site results in an increase in the sustainable trip proportion from 12% to 16%, and a corresponding reduction in the proportion of car driver and passenger trips from 88% to 84%. **The applicant is asked to detail a mode split table of proportion of trips made by each mode from the spreadsheet model. This needs to separate out the different PT modes and also needs to break down 'car/passenger' include 'number of cars'.** This results in the potential of a reduced vehicle generation from the first phase of 43 vehicles in the AM peak leaving the site, and 71 vehicles entering the site in the PM peak.

Comment 33 In terms of the potential for mode switch from residents and employees in the locality, additional information from the applicant notes that 220 trips could switch from car driver and passenger to sustainable modes in the AM peak, and 190 trips in the PM peak.

Comment 34 In terms of the potential for the reassignment of vehicles from the A10 additional information from the applicant notes that 213 trips could reassign from car driver and passenger on the A10 to sustainable modes in the AM peak, and 286 trips in the PM peak.

Forecast Trip Impacts

Headline: Vehicular trips will predominantly use the A10 and A14. The primary destination for public transport and cycling demand is Cambridge. A micro-simulation model has been

produced as well as individual junction models based on the robust core test. These tools have informed, and allowed the testing of proposed highways mitigation.

Comment 35 The bias of trips towards Cambridge to and from the site results in the main route for vehicles trips being the A10 and A14, with the predominant destination for public transport and cycling trips being Cambridge. This results in impacts at several junctions including Cambridge Research roundabout, Denny End Road, Car Dyke Road, Landbeach Road / Humphries Way and the A14. North of Waterbeach the main impacts of the proposals are at the Stretham roundabout.

Comment 36 The applicant has completed a micro-simulation model of the A10 corridor to understand how traffic moves between Waterbeach and the A14. This is due to the linked nature of queues from one junction to another that lead to slow moving traffic along this stretch of the A10. Several junctions have also been modelled in more detail to assess the mitigation proposed. These junctions include:

- A14 / A10
- Park and Ride and Butt Lane / A10
- Landbeach Road / Humphries Way / A10
- Denny End Road / A10
- Cambridge Research Park / A10
- Stretham Roundabout

The proposed mitigation at these junctions has been modelled with the higher traffic flows using the aggregated traffic data collected, with the committed development and application flows added for 2021 ('core test'). This is a more robust analysis than using the lower flows resulting from the sensitivity test detailed above.

Mitigation Strategy and Proposed Measures

Headline: A clear mitigation package is proposed for phase one. The details of this need to be discussed further with the applicant. A 'Monitor-and-Manage' approach is proposed for future phases based on the principle of the developer supporting the delivery of strategic measures identified as part of the A10 work.

Comment 37 The applicant proposes a comprehensive package of mitigation to address the impacts of the development on the A10 corridor. This mitigation package will be of benefit to the site as well as those working at Cambridge Research Park, and existing communities of Landbeach, Waterbeach and Milton.

The mitigation package is an initial package of measures for the first phase of development, but will also be of benefit to future phases of the development. As part of the Monitor-and-Manage approach, the developer will be required to commit to a transport cap for future mitigation/strategic measures. The future mitigation is to be considered on a phase by phase basis, with no further development beyond phase one until the mitigation for the subsequent phase(s) is agreed.

It is likely that the cap will be spent on those measures identified by the Ely to Cambridge Study, including strategic A10 measures, a rapid public transport connection to Cambridge, provision of a relocated railway station with park and rail

facilities, a greenway cycle link to Cambridge and wider cycle connections to the surrounding villages.

The package of measures for the first phase are discussed in more detail below.

Highway Mitigation

A14 / A10 Junction – ***Highways England's committed scheme provides some additional capacity. However, additional capacity enhancements to the junction could be required within the first phase, and this will need to be explored further.***

Comment 38 Highways England proposals as part of the Huntingdon to Cambridge Scheme improves the capacity of this junction, and has been designed to accommodate the traffic resulting from 1400 dwellings at Waterbeach. This is most of the first phase of development. The scheme includes a new off-slip for northbound traffic leaving the A14 to join the A10, and a wider southbound overbridge to increase capacity for southbound traffic.

These changes have been modelled by the applicant in Linsig and this model shows that there is limited impact of the development flows at the junction in the AM and PM peaks. However, with this scheme in place there are several links at capacity, indicating that the scheme is at its limits of capacity with the first phase of development. Those links with congestion include the A14 southbound entry and Cambridge Road in the AM peak and PM peaks, the A14 westbound slip road in the AM peak, and Milton Road in the PM peak.

As a result of this congestion, it is possible that further mitigation measures may be required to increase capacity at this junction towards the end of the first phase of development. These measures have been modelled by the applicant, to gain a better understanding of the benefits of additional mitigation. This modelling shows that the measures that are most related to Waterbeach related traffic include widening of the A10 southbound entry, signalisation of the Cambridge Road entry, and increases to the capacity on the southern side of the junction.

The additional mitigation proposed by the applicant is most likely to be required following the first phase of development, but elements of the package could be bought forward earlier. This includes the measures to the north side of the junction in particular. **The applicant is asked to define the capacity of the interchange, in terms of traffic flows to and from the A10. The applicant is asked to define what additional capacity within phase 1 could be implemented if required.**

Park and Ride / Butt Lane with A10 – **Mitigation Agreed subject to detailed design**

Comment 39 A review of the signal timings is proposed at this junction to improve its capacity. This is agreed.

Landbeach Road / Humphries Way / A10 – **Mitigation Agreed subject to detailed design**

Comment 40 This junction is an accident cluster location, and is also where the bus route is proposed to enter the A10 from Landbeach Road. An increase in traffic at this

location resulting from the application is likely to result in increased risk of collisions, and difficulty for southbound buses to exit Landbeach Road and turn right onto the A10.

To address these issues the applicant proposes to signalise this junction. This will make the junction safer for vehicles making a turning movement at the junction, and enable priority to be given to buses exiting from Landbeach Road. This signal layout of the junction is broadly agreed, and the modelling of this layout demonstrates that the revised junction layout will have sufficient capacity. This mitigation is agreed.

Car Dyke Road / Waterbeach Road / A10 – **Mitigation Agreed subject to detailed design**

Comment 41 The proposals for the improved cycle route to Cambridge along the Mere Way is likely to result in an increase in pedestrians and cyclist crossing the A10 at this junction. There is no pedestrian crossing facility at present. The applicant proposes the installation of a Toucan crossing. This is agreed.

Denny End Road / A10 - **Mitigation Agreed: Subject to further discussion regarding the preferred solution – most likely to be a bridge solution. Further detail required from the applicant.**

Comment 42 The applicant proposes a pedestrian / cycle crossing at this junction. This gives access to the cycle route to the Mere Way from the development.

The design of this junction is compromised by narrow islands for the pedestrian and cycle crossing. This will result in limited storage room for cycles, as well as the need to cross the A10 in several movements. This will result in a delay to users crossing the A10, over and above that which would normally be acceptable. To have a pedestrian crossing that allowed for crossing the A10 in one movement would not be possible as this would result in a significant loss of capacity at this junction.

As a result the preferred option at this junction is for a bridge structure to be built to enable pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians to cross the junction. This could then be moved or made permanent when the final alignment of the A10 is known. This will also allow for changes to the junction to be made that would increase its capacity, to address the additional traffic resulting from the application.

Comment 43 Further design work is being undertaken as part of the Ely to Cambridge Study at this junction to examine the potential for a solution that would increase the highway capacity. It is considered that a solution is possible, however, further design work is required at this location. **The applicant is asked to investigate the potential for a temporary bridge structure at this location, and to examine what further measures could be made to increase highway capacity should a bridge be built.**

Cambridge Research Park / A10 – **Mitigation Agreed subject to detailed design**

Comment 44 The design of this junction has been approved by Highways Development Management and includes a Toucan crossing to the south of the roundabout for

pedestrians and cyclists to be able to access the Cambridge Research Park. The design of this roundabout is to accommodate the first phase of the development. Further to this phase additional changes to the roundabout will be required to accommodate the higher vehicles flows in future phases. These changes can be secured once the final alignment of the A10 is known.

Stretham Roundabout / A10– **Mitigation Agreed in principle: Subject to further discussion regarding the preferred solution**

Comment 45 The applicant has highlighted that there are existing queues northbound from the site to this roundabout during the PM peak. To mitigate the impact of the development traffic flows the applicant has proposed part-time PM peak only traffic signals on Wilburton Road. The County have reservations with regards to the design of this measure. However, the need for mitigation during the PM peak is agreed at this junction.

Comment 46 Further design work is being undertaken as part of the Ely to Cambridge Study at this junction to examine the potential for a solution that would increase the highway capacity. It is considered that a design solution is possible, and it is expected that this can be agreed with the applicant.

Cycling Mitigation

Connections to Cambridge – **Mitigation Agreed subject to detailed design**

Comment 47 The applicant has proposed to provide a new cycle route between the site and Cambridge with an upgrade to the surface of the Mere Way byway with a 3m wide surfaced path. This will connect to a new cycle path across County Farm land between Denny End Road and Landbeach. The provision of this facility is welcomed, as it will allow for a much improved cycling connection to Cambridge from the site. The detailed design of this scheme will need to be agreed with the County prior to its construction. **The Mere Way Cycle Mitigation is agreed subject to detailed design**

Comment 48 The existing footway alongside the A10 between Car Dyke Road and Ely Road Milton is narrow and not easy for cycling along. The applicant proposes to widen this path to 3m width to improve its use for cycling, and to provide enhancements to the route through Milton. The principal of these improvements is agreed, and this will allow for a much improved cycling connection to Cambridge from the site. The detailed design of this scheme will need to be agreed with the County prior to its construction. **The A10 Cycle Mitigation is agreed subject to detailed design**

Comment 49 Waterbeach will benefit from the future implementation of a Greenway by the Greater Cambridge Partnership linking Waterbeach to the Cambridge north area. This will complement the mitigation measures described above. **CCC requires that the site connects to the Greenway route.**

Connections to surrounding villages– **Mitigation Agreed subject to detailed design**

- Comment 50 The applicant proposes two Toucan crossings over the A10. One to the south of the Cambridge Research Park roundabout, and a second at Car Dyke Road to gain access to Landbeach. These will provide much needed improved connections to Cambridge Research Park and to Landbeach from Waterbeach village. (An access route is to be provided through the site to connect from Waterbeach to the Cambridge Research Park). **The need for this mitigation is agreed.**
- Comment 51 An improved cycle connection to Cottenham is an essential part of the mitigation for the site. This may be achieved through work being undertaken by the Cambridge Research Park, but additional support from the applicant will be required should this not be occur. **The need for this mitigation is agreed.**
- Comment 52 An improved cycle connection to Chittering and Lode is an essential part of the mitigation for the site. This will need to be achieved in future phases beyond the first phase. This may be achieved through work being undertaken by the County, but additional support from the applicant will be required should this not be possible. **The future need for this mitigation is agreed.**
- Comment 53 An improved connection to Horningsea and Fen Ditton will be made possible by the strategic solution to the A10 and the route through Milton. **This is agreed.**
- Comment 54 Improvements to the cycle route through the village of Waterbeach is to be made by the applicant. These will be determined with the Parish Council, but will aim to reduce vehicle speeds and improve safety for cycling through the village to the railway station. The principal of these improvements is agreed, and this will allow for an improved cycling connection to the railway station and potentially beyond to Lode. The detailed design of this scheme will need to be agreed with the County prior to its construction. **Mitigation Agreed subject to detailed design**

Public Transport Mitigation

Bus Mitigation

- Comment 55 The applicant proposes to extend the existing Park and Ride buses from Milton Park and Ride to the site. These will route via Landbeach, Cambridge Research Park and the site and not through Waterbeach village itself. The frequency of the buses will initially be two an hour up to the occupation of 499 units, 3 an hour up to 874 units, and six an hour after the occupation of 875 units. The provision of a bus service with this frequency early on in a development is welcomed. It is considered that serving Waterbeach village would also be beneficial. **Mitigation Agreed – The applicant is required to explore the potential of serving Waterbeach Village as well.**
- Comment 56 The applicant proposes to extend the existing 196 bus service to the site. Whilst this service has few peak time journeys, its extension does allow for connections to north east Cambridge. **Mitigation Agreed**
- Comment 57 The applicant proposes a temporary park and ride to help intercept cars from the A10 heading for Cambridge. This is as per the policy and will be complementary to the above bus service. **Mitigation Agreed**

Comment 58 The applicant proposes to improve key bus stop facilities in Landbeach and Waterbeach. This is help encourage existing residents to use the bus. **Mitigation Agreed**

Comment 59 The applicant proposes a community bus service that will facilitate improved links to the existing railway station, a school service between Waterbeach and Cottenham when required, and a community bus link to other nearby villages and Cambridge. This will help future and existing residents to use the bus. **Mitigation Agreed -The applicant is asked to detail the charging structure for this service.**

Rail Mitigation

Comment 60 The TA does not suggest a dependency on a relocated station, though it is supportive of such a scheme. Whether there is a dependency or not would be determined by what access improvements are possible at the existing station. The applicant proposes a series of improvements to Waterbeach railway station. These are required for implementation prior to the opening of the relocated railway station. The County fully supports the relocation of the railway station, and also any improvements to the existing railway station that can be achieved before then.

Comment 61 The improvements to the railway station include the following measures:

- Bus bay with footway and bus stop flag;
- Measures to deter inappropriate parking;
- Additional 25 parking spaces;
- Additional shelters and ticket machines for passengers;
- Upgraded pedestrian access to both platforms;
- Additional cycle parking adjacent to both platforms;
- New footbridge over the railway;
- Upgrade of half width barriers to full width barriers;

Comment 62 Whilst these measures to improve the railway station are comprehensive, they have not been tested with Network Rail. As a result, and without their endorsement, it is not possible to fully support these proposals. The County will support any of the above proposals that can be supported by Network Rail. **The applicant is required to demonstrate deliverability of the rail package and demonstrate support from Network Rail.**

Comment 63 If completed prior to the opening of the relocated railway station, the first phase of development could result in an additional 160 passengers using the railway, if based on current usage in Waterbeach. It is not currently clear whether this number of additional passengers can be accommodated at the railway station. The applicant is asked to discuss these proposals with Network Rail, and to determine which if any of the listed proposals could be implemented in the short term. **The applicant is also asked to detail how many of the additional rail passengers could use the community bus service, could use the additional cycle parking, and could park within walking distance of the station.**

Comment 64 CCC and partners have emphasised the opportunities regarding the relocated station. Should it come forward during phase one, the developer should work closely

with Network Rail and the ultimate station developer to provide an access route to the A10 and a complementary park and ride.

Travel Planning

Comment 65 The applicant proposes to undertake travel planning for new residents and employees of the site. This is agreed and should include personalised travel planning.

Comment 66 As part of the travel plan, the applicant should offer incentives that promote bus travel, including the provision of free or subsidised tickets.

Post-Phase One Mitigation

Monitor and Manage Approach

Comment 67 The applicant's proposed junction improvements and the committed Highways England works at the A14 junction will provide a limited capacity increase on the A10, potentially unlocking an early phase of development, prior to the delivery of a strategic solution on the A10.

The applicant is required to demonstrate the capacity threshold of the A14 interchange with the Highways England scheme. This will inform the cap on vehicle trips to be generated by the development within the first phase.

Comment 68 The Highway Authority requests a hold on any further development beyond Phase 1. Any future phase will require a Transport Assessment to be approved by the Local Planning Authority. The additional Transport Assessment will need to refer to strategic A10 solutions and other public transport and cycling based infrastructure that is identified within the SPD and Ely to Cambridge Study. Further development of the new town will be dependent on this infrastructure being implemented.

Comment 69 The Combined Authority is leading work to advance the recommendations of the Ely – Cambridge Study regarding multi modal strategic solutions. The developer will ultimately be required to contribute towards the strategic solutions identified by the CA and partners (Greater Cambridge Partnership, Greenways) to unlock future phases.

Indicative Heads of Terms First Phase of Development

Comment 70 Having reviewed the relative impacts of the development on the A10 corridor the following mitigation package is considered to be essential to mitigate the first phase of the development up to a potential 1,600 dwellings and therefore would seek to be agreed with the applicant as follows. Note the details of this package will be subject to further discussion:

Ref	Highway Mitigation	Details
1	To undertake traffic flow monitoring of the study area and site access junction and travel surveys of the site. Details of the location and type of monitoring to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority (LHA).	S106

2	To undertake additional works at the A14 / A10 interchange should the vehicle trips from the site reach the capacity limits of the Highways England works, or if no longer term capacity solution has been identified. The details of the capacity threshold and works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106 Direct Delivery
3	To implement prior to occupation revision to signal timings at the junctions of the Park and Ride and Butt Lane with the A10.	condition
4	To undertake capacity enhancements of the A10 between Butt Lane and the Park and Ride access should the vehicle trips from the site reach the capacity limits of the Highways England works. The details of the threshold and works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106 Direct Delivery
5	To implement prior to occupation improvements to capacity and road safety at the junctions of Landbeach Road / Humphries Way / A10. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106 Direct Delivery
6	To implement prior to occupation improvements to capacity and road safety at the junctions of Waterbeach Road / Car Dyke Road / A10. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106 Direct Delivery
7	To implement prior to occupation improvements to capacity and pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities at the junction of Denny End Road / A10. These works should include some or all of the following measures. A temporary bridge structure, highway improvements, and or a financial contribution towards an overall scheme. Details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106 Direct Delivery
8	To implement prior to occupation improvements to capacity and road safety at the junctions of Cambridge Research Park / Site Access / A10. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106 Direct Delivery
9	To implement prior to occupation improvements to capacity at the junction of Stretham Roundabout / A10, and or make a financial contribution towards an overall scheme. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106 Direct Delivery
10	To implement within one year of the first occupation improvements to traffic calming within the villages of Landbeach, Cottenham, Waterbeach and Horningsea to deter and or limit the use of roads within these villages. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106 Direct Delivery
Cycling Mitigation		
11	To implement within one year of the first occupation a 3m surfaced cycle route between Denny End Road and Green End, and along the Mere way byway between Landbeach and the Cambridge Guided Busway. The details of the works to be agreed with the County Council.	condition
12	To implement prior to occupation widening of the existing footway alongside the A10 to 3m where possible between Denny End Road and Ely Road Milton. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	condition
13	To implement prior to occupation improvements to cycle safety and traffic calming within Milton between Ely Road and the A14. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	condition
14	To implement within one year of the first occupation improvements to cycle safety and traffic calming within Waterbeach village between	Condition

	Denny End Road, the railway station and along Car Dyke Road. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	
15	To implement prior to completion of the Cambridge to Waterbeach Greenway a link to the Greenway within the site should this be required. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	condition
16	To implement prior to occupation improvements to the cycle route between Denny End Road and Cambridge Research Park. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	condition
17	To implement within one year of the first occupation improved cycle links to Cottenham. This will involve the creation of new public rights of way and surfaced routes. The details of the works to be agreed with the County Council.	S106 / condition (To be agreed)
18	To implement prior to occupation of the 1,000 dwelling improved cycle links to Chittering and Lode. This will involve the creation of new public rights of way and surfaced routes. The details of the works to be agreed with the County Council.	S106 / condition (To be agreed)
Bus Mitigation		
19	To facilitate the extension of the Milton Park and Ride bus service to the site as per the May 2018 Transport Assessment. Details of service operation to be provided.	Condition
20	To facilitate the extension of the bus route 196 into the site as per the May 2018 Transport Assessment. Details of service operation to be provided.	Condition
21	To facilitate the provision of a Park and Ride within the first phase of development as per the May 2018 Transport Assessment. Details to be agreed with the LHA.	Condition
22	To implement prior to occupation RTPI and bus stop shelters to key bus stops within Landbeach and Waterbeach villages. To include contributions towards the future maintenance of bus stop shelters of £7,000 per shelter and £10,500 per RTPI unit. The details of the works to be agreed with the LHA.	S106 / condition
23	To facilitate the provision of a community bus service as per the May 2018 Transport Assessment. This is to enable links between Cambridge Research Park, the site and Waterbeach Railway Station, and for other community uses.	Condition
24	To facilitate with Network Rail and the County Council and to implement prior to occupation improvements to the provisions for passengers at the existing Waterbeach Railway Station as per the May 2018 Transport Assessment.	Condition
25	To monitor car parking within the vicinity of the railway station and to fund the provision of additional parking controls where required.	Condition
26	To monitor bus journey times for the bus route through Landbeach and investigate options for bus priority to reduce bus journey times. To agree thresholds and measures with the LHA prior to occupation of the first dwelling.	Condition
27	To facilitate the construction of a link road to the relocated railway station prior to its opening.	S106
Other Mitigation		
28	That a Travel Plan is submitted and approved by the LPA prior to	Condition

	occupation of the first dwelling. The travel plan should include personalised travel planning, subsidised bus travel and cycle purchase.	
--	--	--

Indicative Heads of Terms of Full Development

Comment 71 For the outline approval of the application for 6,500 dwellings and associated other land uses the following mitigation package is considered to be essential to mitigate the full application development of 6,500 dwellings. Note that the mitigation post 1,600 dwellings is to be considered on a phase by phase basis, with an overall cap on the mitigation based on contributions towards the following:

Ref	Mitigation	Details
29	A contribution towards the upgrade of the A10 between the A14 and Waterbeach. The amount to be determined and subject to agreement with the County Council.	S106
30	A contribution towards the upgrade of the A14 / 10 interchange The amount to be determined and subject to agreement with the County Council.	S106
31	A contribution towards a public transport corridor between Waterbeach and Cambridge. The amount to be determined and subject to agreement with the County Council.	S106
32	A contribution towards the provision of improved cycle connections to Histon, Impington, Stretham, Fen Ditton and Lode (via a new bridge over the River Cam). The amount and works to be determined and subject to agreement with the County Council.	S106
33	A contribution towards a Waterbeach transport hub / Park and Ride facility.	S106
34	Ongoing monitoring of travel behaviour and vehicle flows in the study area and any additional mitigation measures required resulting from increased traffic flows.	S106

Appendix 2: Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms

Infrastructure	Project Details and Delivery	Contribution
Early Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of space in each primary school Provision of EY facility in a multi-purpose community hall or standalone unit Obligation to market a site and progress to lease on reasonable commercial terms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Included in capital cost of primary school
Primary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land and capital funding for 3no. primary schools (with early years) to provide a minimum 9 forms of entry – 9 hectares Additional land to be safeguarded for expansion subject to education review mechanism for a further 2 forms of entry – 2 x 1 hectare 	Indicative costs (4Q2017): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3FE + 3EY classes - £12,460,000 4FE + 4EY classes - £15,360,000 3FE (4FE core) + 3EY - £13,280,000 1FE expansion – £2,080,000
Secondary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land and capital funding for 1no. 8 form of entry secondary school – 8.5 hectares A further 2 hectares safeguarded for potential expansion if required. 	Indicative costs (4Q2017) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8FE - £30,000,000 3FE expansion - £13,500,00
Post 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital contribution towards 400 place Post 16 facility on adjoining development site Need to be determined by Education Review Mechanism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 400 place - £13,300,000 Pro rata capital contribution to be agreed with both developers
Special Education Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land and capital contribution towards 110 place SEN Safeguarded land – 1.7 hectares Need to be determined by Education Review Mechanism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 110 place - £15,650,000 Pro rata capital contribution to be agreed with both developers
Library	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial contribution towards interim library provision Provision of 1,000sqm for hub library to be located in multipurpose community centre. Developer to construct community centre, and 1) fit out to LLL specification, or 2) financial contribution towards fit out. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interim library - £28,920 Hub library –developer to build with fit out costs to be agreed
Collaborative Early Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A combination of measures and support projects to develop a healthy and resilient community. Focus on tackling mental health and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £1,870,757

Infrastructure	Project Details and Delivery	Contribution
	social problems especially associated with the early stages of new communities	
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Phase of Development • Full Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Appendix 1 (Comment 70) • See Appendix 1 (Comment 71)