

**BOURN AIRFIELD – OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

**To:** Economy and Environment Committee

**Meeting Date:** 7 February 2019

**From:** Graham Hughes, Executive Director (Place and Economy)

**Electoral division(s):** Cambourne, Bourn

**Forward Plan ref:** 2019/005      **Key decision:** Yes

**Purpose:** To consider and endorse the officers' response to an outline planning application for up to 3,500 new dwellings at Bourn Airfield.

**Recommendation:** Committee is asked to:

- a) Consider and approve the Council's comments on the planning application and draft section 106 heads of terms;
- b) 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 Council's response in Appendix 1; and
- c) Delegate to the Executive Director (Place and Economy) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to conclude negotiations on the section 106 agreement.

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

## 1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd and the Taylor family (landowners) have jointly submitted an outline planning application (OPA) to South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC), as the local planning authority, for 3,500 new homes. This report seeks Member endorsement of the officer response to the planning application consultation, which was submitted to SCDC on the 9 November 2018, in order to meet the consultation deadline. It is not expected that SCDC will determine the OPA until autumn 2019 at the earliest.

### The Site – Bourn Airfield

- 1.2 Bourn Airfield is situated to the north of Bourn village, to the east of Cambourne and approximately 9 km (5.5 miles) west of Cambridge. It is served by the A428 trunk road which connects St Neots and Cambridge. Diagram 1 below shows the location of the site in relation to adjacent settlements in Cambridgeshire.



**Diagram 1: Location plan for proposed development**

*Source: Bourn Airfield Planning Application*

- 1.3 The development site is 210 hectares (519 acres) in size and was previously laid out as a World War II bomber airfield. Today it is primarily used for agriculture with a private airfield and container storage utilising the remaining runways. The north eastern quarter of the airfield, outside of the OPA site, has been developed for employment uses.

#### 1.4 The OPA proposes :-

- a new mixed use village comprising approximately 3,500 dwellings;
- mixed uses comprising employment, retail, hotel, leisure, residential institutions, education, community facilities, open space including parks, ecological areas and woodlands, landscaping; engineering for foul and sustainable urban drainage systems;
- footpaths, cycleways, public transport infrastructure;
- highways, including a principal eastern access from the roundabout on St Neots Road and western access with Broadway, including the first section of a strategic public transport route; and
- associated infrastructure, groundworks and demolition.

- 1.5 As an outline planning application, the applicant is seeking to establish whether the general scale and nature of a proposed development would be acceptable to the local planning authority, before a fully detailed proposal is put forward. All matters (such as appearance, landscaping and layout) are reserved, except for matters of access including the principal highway junctions from St Neots Road roundabout and the Broadway. Detailed matters will be agreed by way of subsequent Reserved Matters planning applications.
- 1.6 Any planning application will be considered in line with planning policy (see paragraphs 2.3 to 2.5) and any consent granted will be subject to securing a S106 Agreement<sup>1</sup> to mitigate any adverse impacts of the development on existing infrastructure, such as highways or schools.
- 1.7 Pre-application discussions have been held with County Council officers, as well as public consultation events and workshops. These events have helped to establish the requirements for the proposed development.
- 1.8 The masterplan has also been reviewed by the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel in June 2016 and December 2017. The Panel were generally supportive of the development proposals in principal, subject to a number of recommendations in relation to the north-eastern corner of the site, local centre, schools, connectivity and treatment of the development edges. These matters will be addressed either through the extant outline or subsequent reserved matters planning applications.

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning obligations under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), commonly known as s106 agreements, are a mechanism which make a development proposal acceptable in planning terms, that would not otherwise be acceptable. They are focused on site specific mitigation of the impact of development. S106 agreements are often referred to as 'developer contributions' along with highway contributions and the Community Infrastructure Levy.

1.9 Diagram 2 below shows the illustrative masterplan for the development proposals.



**Diagram 2: Masterplan drawing of proposed development**

*Source: Bourn Airfield Planning Application*

1.10 The planning application reference number is S/3440/18/OL.

## **2.0 MAIN ISSUES**

2.1 Appendix A of this report contains the full officer response submitted to SCDC. Where necessary, valid objections (either 'objection' or 'holding objection') have been made which will constitute a material consideration when the local planning authority determine the planning application at planning committee. The degree of weight attached to these material considerations will be set out in the SCDC planning officer report.

2.2 The main County Council officer comments are summarised in paragraphs 2.3 – 2.14 below.

### Development in principle

2.3 The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) under Policy SS/6 allocates Bourn Airfield for a new village of approximately 3,500 dwellings. This policy is to be supplemented by preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) with the aim of contributing towards meeting housing need in South Cambridgeshire in the period to 2031 and beyond. The SPD is expected to be adopted by late summer 2019.

2.4 The site is designated Previously Developed Land in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

- 2.5 The development will contribute towards the corporate priorities of the Council, as set out in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.3 of this report.

Developer contributions / s106 agreement

- 2.6 Officers have and will continue to work with the applicant and SCDC to secure an acceptable s106 agreement to mitigate any negative impacts arising from the development. Such provisions must be in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and in particular, contributions must meet the following tests:-

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the development; and
- Fairly and reasonable related in scale in kind to the development.

- 2.7 Table 1 below sets out the key infrastructure items required and proposed for the development. It is recognised that much of the applicant's offer reflects discussion from some time ago and that changes are now required as a result of new requirements, amended specifications or new policy (and Indexation).

- 2.8 The final heads of terms will be approved by the local planning authority prior to resolving to grant a planning permission. It is recognised that there is further work to do on the heads of terms prior to this and this table captures the key issues. Members should be mindful that these will be scrutinised against the legal tests in 2.6 above and possible viability assessment of the development. The Committee is asked, therefore, to endorse the current heads of terms as set out below and provide delegated authority as set out in the recommendation to conclude the negotiation.

Table 1: Draft S106 Heads of Terms (County Council Only)

Contribution Infrastructure	Initial Developer Position	Updated Development Contribution Amount Required (with Indexation Date)).	Comments
Primary schools (with early years provision)	<b>£26,570,190 (4Q17)</b> for 6FE (2 x 3FE)	<b>£29,700,000 (3Q18)</b> for 7FE provision (1 x 3FE and 1 x 4FE)	Applicant has used previous general multipliers and therefore underestimated extant requirement.
Secondary school	<b>£24,500,000 (3Q17)</b>	<b>£24,657,000 (3Q18)</b>	Minor adjustment and indexation
Special Education Needs (SEN) + start-up cost	<b>£3,768,990 + £39,840 (4Q17)</b>	<b>£3,768,990 + £39,840 (4Q17)</b>	Agreed
Children's Centre	TBC	Provision in kind	Office + room. Could be provided at a community building or school.

Contribution Infrastructure	Initial Developer Position	Updated Development Contribution Amount Required (with Indexation Date)).	Comments
Nursery	£0	£0	D1 Use Class Order designation
On-site school start up fees	<b>£120,000</b> (£40,000 per school)	<b>£250,000</b> (comprising £50,000 per primary school and £150,000 for the secondary school)	Start-up costs have changed in the October 2018 Schools Forum
Library	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	
Public Health	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	
Household Waste Recycling Centre	To be confirmed	£633,500 towards St Neots recycling centre in accordance with Recap policy of £181 per dwelling	
Transport	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	To be agreed

### Education

- 2.9 The planning application proposes to provide two new on-site primary schools (with early year's settings), a new on-site secondary school and an off-site contribution towards Special Educational Needs (SEN). In addition, plots will be available for private nursery use (D1 use classification), subject to market demand. This approach is supported in principle, subject to agreeing the detailed site and financial matters in the s106 agreement.
- 2.10 The Council's Education Service has identified that the applicant needs to update their child yield requirements to take account of revised general multipliers, as approved by the Council's Children and Young Person's Committee in December 2017. This will require some additional land and school building, as detailed further in paragraphs 1.8 to 1.12 of the officer response in Appendix 1.
- 2.11 The planning application purports that the schools should be built to BREAM "Excellent". This is in conflict with the County Council policy of construction to BREAM "Very Good" and is a more onerous requirement that is proposed for non-education buildings on the development. A holding objection is raised until the BREAM requirements of this development are aligned with County Council policy.
- 2.12 The schools will be funded through s106 contributions, secured in accordance with the planning tests detailed in paragraph 2.6 of this report, and as set out in Table 1 above.

### Archaeology

- 2.13 A holding objection is raised until officers are satisfied that the impacts of the development on the heritage assets of archaeological importance are adequately addressed with regard to mitigation measures.

## Transport Assessment

- 2.14 A holding objection is raised until, (i) further information is provided and assessed and the Transport Assessment is approved, (ii) the mitigation measures and contribution amounts, including those for the Greater Cambridge Partnership schemes are fully agreed, and (iii) Public Rights of Way requirements are satisfied.

## Other services

- 2.15 Public Health, Lead Local Flood Authority, County Planning and Strategic Waste and Library Service have raised issues of concern which can either be addressed by way of planning condition or by working with the application to agree appropriate mitigation measures.

## **3.0 ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

### **3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all**

The development will provide a range of employment opportunities both during the construction and subsequent delivery phases of the schools, community facilities and local centre. There will also be 10,000m<sup>2</sup> of employment space.

### **3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives**

The applicant has assessed the health impacts of the development through undertaking a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) which suggests measures to encourage healthy lifestyles such as a Travel Plan to support walking, cycling and sustainable transport modes. The development is proposing a retirement/care living facility.

### **3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people**

This has been assessed through the HIA.

## **4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS**

### **4.1 Resource Implications**

There are no further significant resource implications at this stage.

### **4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category

### **4.3 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 applicant, landowners and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

#### 4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category

#### 4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

There are no significant implications within this category

#### 4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

There are no significant implications within this category

#### 4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?	Yes Name of Officer: Paul White
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Elsa Evans
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Sarah Silk
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Andrew Preston
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Stuart Keeble

Source Documents	Location
<a href="#">OPA S/3440/18/OL</a>	Click on link in source documents. Room 304, Shire Hall, Cambridge



## APPENDIX 1: OFFICER RESPONSE TO OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR BOURN AIRFIELD



### County Council Officer Comments

*Outline planning application a new mixed use village comprising residential development of approximately **3,500 dwellings**; mixed uses comprising employment, retail, hotel, leisure, residential institutions; education, community facilities, open space including parks, ecological areas and woodlands, landscaping; engineering for foul and sustainable urban drainage systems; footpaths, cycle ways, public transport infrastructure; highways including a principal eastern access from the roundabout on St Neots Road and western access with Broadway including first section of strategic public transport route; associated infrastructure, groundworks and demolition; with all matters reserved except for the principal highway junctions from the St Neots Road roundabout and onto Broadway with some matters reserved except for access.*

**S/3440/18/OL**

#### Summary Response

- i This note sets out the County Council officer comments on the above outline planning application in response to a consultation by South Cambridgeshire District Council. Whilst County Members have been made aware of the consultation, this response does not include their comments or considerations. The County Council Environment and Economy Committee will consider the S106 agreement draft Heads of Terms, before any agreement is signed and note the officer response – providing any key further comments as appropriate. Currently, a February 2019 committee is scheduled for consideration of this planning application.
- ii Officers broadly support the principle of residential-led development on this site, as part of the proposals and broader growth agenda for South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge, and as established in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) at Policy SS/7: New Village at Bourn Airfield.
- iii Support for this planning application is subject to resolving the issues and objections raised, application of appropriate and necessary planning conditions and the satisfactory signing of a S106 agreement.
- iv Set out below are the detailed officer comments from County Council Service Teams, identifying any issues to be addressed by the applicant and mitigation measures necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Such measures will be compliant with the planning tests of:-
  - Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
  - Directly related to the development
  - Fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development

- v The following County Council Services have been consulted ( ✓ denotes response received):-
- Archaeology – ✓
  - County Planning/M&W/Strategic Waste ✓
  - Digital Infrastructure & Connecting Cambridgeshire – no comments Received
  - Ecology – no comments received
  - Education ✓
  - Energy Investment – no comments received
  - Floods and Water ✓
  - Library ✓
  - New Communities ✓
  - Public Health ✓
  - Transport Assessment & Highways ✓
- vi This response is not necessarily limited to the full extent of comments which might have been made by other officers/services of the Council and it is acknowledged that comments might be superseded by further updates as discussions progress.

### **Service Comments**

#### **1 EDUCATION**

- 1.1 The County Council is the Local Children's Services Authority for Cambridgeshire and its recommendations should be a material consideration in the determination of this planning application.
- 1.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (2018) sets out that development should come forward through a plan-led system and that strategic policies should set out an over-all strategy for pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for (amongst other provision) community facilities such as education – para 21. It adds at para 34 that development contributions expected should be set out in plans, such as those for education. Further, para 94. States "It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should:
- a) give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and
  - b) work with schools promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted."
- 1.3 The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) at Policy SS/7, point 10 requires that the village will ensure the provision, management and maintenance of infrastructure, services and facilities to meet the needs of the village – and this would include education. In response to the applicant's proposal, the Council's requirement is that the development must to provide sufficient on-site land for early years, primary and secondary schooling with associated, proportional financial contributions towards the build costs.

- 1.4 It is acknowledged that much of the provision set out in the OPA reflects discussions from time ago and that due to the passage of time some changes are now required to reflect new requirements, specifications and policy.

#### Locations of the proposed school sites

- 1.5 The applicant has identified proposed sites for the on-site primary (2 No.) and secondary (1 No.) schools and shared them with Council officers. The location of the proposed primary school in the southern part of the site is considered to be acceptable and represents good urban design. It is recommended that the location of the primary school in the northern part of the site could be re-positioned slightly further south-west and swapped with the pavilion building. This would provide for a location more central within the overall site, with ease of access to the valley park. As part of this the proposed open space to the east of the schools' current location could also be moved west, adjacent to the eastern boundary of the school building. The location of the Secondary School on the site is well related to the busway /expressway and appears to have been informed by good urban design principles. The key concern in its location relates to noise from the A428. Additional information should be provided at this stage to provide further comfort on both internal and external noise levels at the school, having regard to Building Bulletin and the Acoustic for Schools Design Guide (2015).
- 1.6 For any queries in relation to school sites and specifications, please contact the Council's Education Capital Strategy Manager (Graham Tweed) on 01223 699804, who has commissioned a technical assessment of the school sites.

#### Size of proposed schools

- 1.7 The Council uses general multipliers to determine the likely number of children expected from the development at early years, primary and secondary levels. This is appropriate, since the planning application is at an outline stage and the exact mix of dwellings is not yet known or agreed. Detailed multipliers are only used when a development mix is agreed.
- 1.8 The information in the planning application (paragraph 9 of the Environmental Statement) is based on previous Council general multipliers, which were updated and approved by the Council's Children and Young Person's Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2017. This increased the primary school general multiplier from 35 children per 100 dwellings to 40 children per 100 dwellings.
- 1.9 If the extant primary general multiplier of 40 children per 100 dwellings is applied then the yield would be 1,400 children ((3,500 dwellings x 0.4 = 1,400 children). This is equivalent to 6.7FE. On this basis, there may be a need for 7 FE of primary provision, likely comprising of 1 x 4FE and 1 x 3FE school rather than 2 x 3FE schools, as currently proposed in the OPA.
- 1.10 A 3 FE primary school requires a site of 3 hectares and a 4 FE primary school a site area of 4 hectares. The proposed master plan will need to be reviewed in this respect.
- 1.11 A 6FE secondary school requires a site of 7 hectares.

- 1.12 The principle of shared community uses is generally supported, however, it is highlighted that ultimately it will be for the school operator to agree to this and any such requirements over and above that necessary for the operation of the school must be identified and, where appropriate, costed separately to ensure compliance with the planning tests.

### School Costs

- 1.13 During pre-application discussions, initial costs were provided for the schools, based on available information at that time. Updated costs have now been produced for comparable primary schools, as given below.
- 3 FE primary school with Early Years provision = £13,500,000 (3Q18)
  - 4 FE primary school with Early Years provision = £16,200,000 (3Q18)
- 1.14 The Cambourne West secondary school, also 6FE, is costed at £22,215,000 (4Q16) and subject to minor adjustment including indexation would cost £24,657,000 (3Q18) at Bourn Airfield.
- 1.15 These updated costs, at this stage of the process, remain indicative, and are based on the Council's standard cost estimate approach. This reflects the contract costs of recent projects across the County and the accommodation requirements set out in the Department for Education's Building Bulletin 103. Due to the timescales for likely delivery no allowance has been made for:
- Tender-price inflation to construction mid-point;
  - Local market conditions; or
  - Brexit currency fluctuations.

### Triggers

- 1.16 Council officers will work with the applicant to agree primary school triggers for the s106 agreement, however, the expectation is that payments will be the Council's standard approach, as follows:-
- 10% on commencement
  - 65% 12 months after commencement
  - 25% 24 months after commencement
- 1.17 Triggers for the second primary school will need to be agreed to reflect the pace and delivery of housing and therefore may differ from the proposed triggers of 10% prior to occupation of 900<sup>th</sup> dwellings; 65% payable no later than 12 months after 900<sup>th</sup> occupation; and 25% payable no later than 24 months after 900<sup>th</sup> occupation.
- 1.18 Council officers will work with the applicant to agree secondary school triggers for the s106 agreement, however, the expectation is that payments will be as follows:
- 10% payable by no later than 900<sup>th</sup> dwelling;
  - 65% payable no later than 12 months after 900<sup>th</sup> occupation;
  - 25% payable no later than 24 months after 900<sup>th</sup> occupation.

### Phasing

- 1.19 Both the secondary and primary schools located within the northern area of the site will be provided within Phase 1 of the development, which is supported. Officers have some concerns that the second primary school is located in Phase 4 of the development. The timing of the 2nd school will depend on the trajectory of the development but may be needed before phase 4 begins. The Council will need access to the site at least a year before the opening date to construct it, hence officers have concerns that the Council will incur additional costs if basic services, such as access roads are not in place.

### School Design

- 1.20 Whilst it is premature to commence the design process for the schools at present, Council officers will continue to engage with the applicant's team, and the local planning authority, to ensure that appropriate design aspirations for the school are achieved together with common design themes for the development and emerging Design Codes. The applicant will also be invited to form part of the design team over-seeing the school designs.
- 1.21 In accordance with Council policy, schools are built to BREAAAM "Very Good". Objection would be raised to any requirement to achieve BREEAM 'Excellent'. A BREEAM 'Very Good' Standard could be secured by way of suitably worded planning condition and would be consistent with the SCDC Local Plan (2018) for non-education buildings greater than 1000 square metres to achieve BREAAAM "Very Good" also.

### Indexation

- 1.22 Any financial contributions will require the application of Indexation, using the BCIS Index, from the date of the project cost given as stated in this response (or as amended by agreement).

### Special Education Needs (SEN)

- 1.23 The Council has a statutory duty (under the Children and families Act 2014) to secure appropriate provision for children and young people with SEND requirements from 2 – 25 years of age. The County Council had already agreed at Cabinet in July 2013, the need for three new Area Special Schools and subsequently the need for a fourth school has arisen.
- 1.24 This development is expected to be served by the proposed Northstowe Area Special School and require 30 places at a cost of £111,818 per place (4Q14) or £3,354,540 (4Q14).
- 1.25 The number of places is calculated as 3,500 x 0.85 (no of residents aged 0 -25) of which 1% (30) would require SEN provision.

### Start Up Costs

- 1.26 Start-up costs are sought, where appropriate, to allow for new schools to appoint staff ahead of opening, to fill the funding gap. These costs were updated at the Schools Forum and are currently £50,000 per primary school and £150,000 per secondary school.

### Children's Centres

- 1.27 In line with the current Council approach to Children's Centres, an office and access to a room is required, which could be at a school or other suitable community building. There is no requirement for a financial contribution to build additional dedicated space.

### Private Nursery

- 1.28 Council officers support the provision of D1 uses in the application, since this will allow for private nursery provision – subject to market demand – to be provided within the development.

## **2 ARCHAEOLOGY**

- 2.1 The County Council is the local authority archaeology service and maintains the Historic Environment Record (HER) which is the comprehensive, accessible and authoritative record of the local historic environment. The HER is used to formulate advice to local planning authorities and is a material consideration in the determination of any planning application.
- 2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (2018) sets out in section 16 the approach to conserving and enhancing the historic environment and specifically at para. 192 "In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
  - b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
  - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness."
- 2.3 The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) at Policy NH/14: Heritage Assest sets out the policy context for this application.
- 2.4 The application area has been subject to geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation, undertaken by the applicant's archaeological contractor (Oxford Archaeology East) in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation agreed with the County Council's Historic Environment Team. Unfortunately the evaluation results have not yet been provided to the Council to date.
- 2.5 Officers therefore place a holding object to the planning application on the grounds that the applicant has not adequately described the impacts of development on heritage assets of archaeological importance and has not put forward appropriate strategies to mitigate the development impact.
- 2.6 Officers will advise further when we are in receipt of the evaluation results.

### 3 PUBLIC HEALTH

- 3.1 The comments below should be taken in the context that this response is from Public Health within the County Council and that South Cambridgeshire District Council as the Planning Authority have the responsibility to score the submitted Health Impact Assessment (HIA) as per their local plan policy and Supplementary Planning Document on HIA.
- 3.2 The application, in particular the Health Impact Assessment, has been compared to the New Housing Developments and the Built Environment Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) for Cambridgeshire<sup>2</sup>.
- 3.3 The JSNA contains an evidence review of the built environment's impact on health and has distilled the evidence into the following themes:
- Generic evidence supporting the built environment's impact on health.
  - Green space.
  - Developing sustainable communities.
  - Community design (to prevent injuries, crime, and to accommodate people with disabilities).
  - Connectivity and land use mix.
  - Communities that support healthy ageing.
  - House design and space.
  - Access to unhealthy/"Fast Food".
  - Health inequality and the built environment.
- 3.4 The application has therefore been reviewed against these themes to ensure the application and assessments has identified relevant impacts on health and contains specific mitigation measures to address the impact the development can have on human health. The HIA references other documents which should have been submitted with the application, where possible these have also been reviewed, however one of documents referenced could not be found on the South Cambridgeshire District Council website, namely the "Social Infrastructure Statement incorporating Sports Strategy and Community Development Strategy" produced by Quod, reference 4g.
- 3.5 Specific comments on the Health Impact Assessment are as follows.
- 3.6 For ease of reference the comments on the HIA reflect the chapter headings and structure of the HIA.
- 3 HIA Methodology
  - 4 Health Profile
  - 5 Wider Determinants of Health
    - Public Services and Community Infrastructure
    - Physical Activity and Access to Open Space
    - Air Quality and Noise
    - Transport
    - Crime and Community Safety

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/joint-strategic-needs-assessment/current-jsna-reports/new-housing-developments-and-built-environment>

- Healthy Food
  - Access to Employment
- 6 Stakeholder Engagement
- 7 Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring

### HIA Methodology

- 3.7 The methodology is sound and follows the guidance set out in the South Cambridgeshire District Council SPD on Health Impact Assessment. The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment which has been quoted as being used in the HIA is only one of a suite of JSNA's reference should also have been made to the "Transport and Health JSNA" and the "New Housing Developments and the Built Environment JSNA". The use of the HUDU checklist is appropriate and together with the "People Proofing Principles" (from the SCDC HIA SPD) establishes a sound framework for the HIA.
- 3.8 The qualification of the limitations and uncertainties of the baseline data is welcomed. The chapter concludes that as the "application is submitted in outline, ... many detailed aspects of the Development, which could have implication for health, will be determined at the reserved matters stage" a mechanism for this has not been suggested", **therefore should the application be granted consent a condition should be imposed requiring that:**

**"A Statement of Compliance shall be submitted for approval with each reserved matters application, pursuant to this outline permission, to show that the Mitigation, Recommendations and Monitoring put forward within the Health Impact Assessment have been implemented and addressed."**

**Reason: To ensure that the development and associated mitigation and recommendation measures takes place in accordance with the principles, parameters and assessment contained within the Health Impact Assessment, Application Documentation, and Environmental Statement.**

### Health Profile

- 3.9 The Health Impact Assessment has provided a sound "health profile" of the local area and the district as a whole. Whilst the Health Profile has used data from the Cambridgeshire JSNA Summary report it would have benefitted from a more in depth analysis using the themed JSNAs, in particular the New Housing Developments and Built Environment JSNA and the Transport and Health JSNA.

### Wider Determinants of Health

- 3.10 The HIA has identified the main links between poor housing and poor health outcomes, including homelessness, and has linked this to the baseline health profile. Whilst produced a number of years ago the "Housing JSNA" could have be used to supplement the data. This section could have made reference to the changing needs of housing over a lifetime and the need to provide housing near employment.

### Public Services and Community Infrastructure



- 3.11 The HIA has identified the main links between public services and community infrastructure and building strong, sustainable and cohesive communities.
- 3.12 The assessment on Health Care provision will need to be checked with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group as the data used (1 GP per 1800 patients) may not reflect the current model of health care commissioning. The allocation of space for a new health centre within the D1 allocation is welcomed.
- 3.13 Section 5.18 makes reference to the market providing Dentists, opticians and pharmacy services should demand exceed existing supply, it should be noted that the decision to provide these services may not be up to “the market” but is likely to require “permission” from NHS England.

#### Early Years Provision

- 3.14 No comments

#### Primary School Provision

- 3.15 No comments

#### Secondary School Provision

- 3.16 No comments

#### Social Cohesion and Social Capital

- 3.17 The HIA has identified the main links between community infrastructure and poor health outcomes, including the need to deliver community infrastructure early within the development as identified within the New Housing and the built environment JSNA.

#### Physical Activity and Access to Open Space

- 3.18 The HIA has identified the main links between Physical Activity and Access to Open Space and poor health outcomes. The HIA has not used a health based model to determine distance to open space, it is recommended that the provision of open space is compared to the ANGSt standard. The Health impact assessment needs to consider each area of open space in relation to proximity and access to/from residential areas to ascertain the potential health impacts. Reference is made to the “Landscape Strategy”, this could not be found on the South Cambridgeshire DC website as a submitted document as part of the planning application.
- 3.19 The HIA has not identified the health impacts “phasing” will/may have on health outcomes and the need to provide open space at an early stage.
- 3.20 The HIA could have used tools such as the Sport England Active Design Principles to ensure physical activity becomes part of everyday living in the development.

#### Air Quality and Noise

- 3.21 At this stage it is too early to claim that the “Development will have an imperceptible effect on air quality” as the road layouts and the energy options are not fixed or been decided. Also it is difficult to have confidence that an increase on 3,500 homes will have a negligible impact on air quality, both within the site and beyond into Cambridge City. I would suggest that expert advice is sought from the South Cambridgeshire Air Quality Lead and Cambridge City Air Quality Lead as Cambridge City already has an Air Quality Management Area and any additional vehicles is likely to exacerbate the air quality problem in the City.
- 3.22 The HIA, in section 5.47, has not mentioned initiatives such as EV charging points or car free areas/zones as measures to ensure a neutral or positive effect on air quality.

### Transport

- 3.23 The HIA has identified the main links between transport and poor health outcomes, and has used local data from the Transport and Health JSNA. The prioritisation of walking and cycling is supported. The provision of a link to Cambourne within the first phase is welcomed.
- 3.24 Officers would therefore recommend that the following points are carried forward and are included within the design code and the Bourn Airfield SPD.
- Prioritising walking as the primary transport choice within the site, including through creating safe, attractive, and accessible walking routes through the Application Site.
  - The design of the overall road and street network provides a logical hierarchy of connections, which will be designed to provide sufficient space and a public realm to ensure a comfortable walking experience away from conflict from motor traffic or parked vehicles. The safe routes will be well-maintained and legible with lighting, signage and the use of quality materials.
  - Designing improved cycle routes through the development that are interconnected to existing external cycle links, with off and on-road routes.
  - Cycle routes that are suitable for both commuters and for leisure or other slower speed cycling, for instance through prioritising direct routes for the former and routes with more scenic interest and stopping places for the latter.
  - Cycle parking at least at the levels required by SCDC, to include space for larger cargo bikes in some locations (also useful for mobility cycles and trikes).
  - Walkable access between the application site and Cambourne.
  - “Soft” measures be promoted to encourage cycling and walking such as promotion of Travel for Cambridgeshire, promotional material and maps in Welcome Packs and as visitor information, provision of a Travel Plan Coordinator or similar to promote and where possible offer incentives to cycle.

### Crime and Community Safety

- 3.25 The HIA has identified the main links between Crime and Community Safety and poor health outcomes. The HIA states that the detailed measures to reduce and prevent crime will be set out at the Reserved Matters Stage, therefore as mentioned above any consent should require **“A Statement of Compliance shall be submitted for approval with each reserved matters application, pursuant to this outline permission, to show that the Mitigation, Recommendations and Monitoring put forward within the Health Impact Assessment have been implemented and addressed.”**

### Healthy Food

- 3.26 The HIA has considered options for growing fruit and Vegetables and the provision of healthy food through local food outlets but has not considered the availability of fast food outlets in the vicinity of the site or options to limits A5 uses within the development site. The consideration of healthy options for on-site catering for construction workers has not been considered. I would therefore recommend that the recommendations and findings of the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) guidance on “Planning Healthy Weight Environments” are carried forward and are included within the design code and the Bourn Airfield SPD.

### Access to Employment

- 3.27 The HIA has identified the main links between Access to Employment and poor health outcomes, the HIA could have included the links between access to transport and accessing employment.

### Stakeholder Engagement

- 3.28 No comments

### Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring Housing

- 3.29 The mitigation measures proposed are supported.

### Access to Public Services

- 3.30 The mitigation measures proposed are supported, however the mitigation measure for community development workers should be stronger i.e. Community Development Workers or equivalent will be provided as part of the development and will be available prior to first occupation.

### Access to Open Space and Nature

- 3.31 The mitigation measures proposed are supported. In addition at the Reserved Matters stage the design of open space should take into account the findings of the “New Housing Developments and Built Environment JSNA” and therefore should be fed into the Design Codes and the Bourn Airfield SPD.

### Air Quality, Noise and Neighbourhood Amenity

- 3.32 The mitigation measures proposed are supported. In addition the Reserved Matters application for Boilers should also include low emissions for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> as well as NO<sub>x</sub>. The Development’s Travel Plan should also include Electric Vehicle Charging points and these should be carried forward within the design code and the Bourn Airfield SPD.

### Accessibility and Transport

- 3.33 The mitigation measures proposed are supported. In addition the travel plan should make use of the latest evidence on active travel and modal shift, such evidence should be used in the preparation of the design code and the Bourn Airfield SPD.

#### Crime Reduction and Community Safety

- 3.34 The mitigation measures proposed are supported and should be used in the preparation of the design code and the Bourn Airfield SPD.

#### Access to Healthy Food

- 3.35 The mitigation measures proposed are supported, however the applicant should consider healthy options for on-site catering for construction workers and the potential for restrict unhealthy fast food outlets in the local/town centres and therefore the recommendations and findings of the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) guidance on “Planning Healthy Weight Environments” should be included within the design code and the Bourn Airfield SPD.

#### Access to Work and Training

- 3.36 The mitigation measures proposed are supported, however the commitment to deliver these is vague. The applicant through negotiation should specify which of the mitigation measures WILL be adopted.

#### Social Cohesion and Lifetime Neighbourhoods

- 3.37 The mitigation measures proposed are supported, however the commitment to deliver some of these is vague. It is recommended that the applicant confirms that the mitigation measures WILL be adopted rather than “could”.

#### Minimising the use of resources

- 3.38 The mitigation measures proposed are supported, however the commitment to deliver some of these is vague. It is recommended that the applicant confirms that the mitigation measures WILL be adopted rather than “could”.

#### Climate Change

- 3.39 The mitigation measures proposed are supported, however the commitment to deliver some of these is vague. It is recommended that the applicant confirms that the mitigation measures WILL be adopted rather than “could”. In addition to the Reserved Matters applications which will contain detail on climate change, climate change should also be carried forward within the design code and the Bourn Airfield SPD.

#### Areas not addressed within the Application

- 3.40 The HIA has not assessed the role of and opportunities for the local community in decision making/governance and management of the place where they live, or the integration of existing and new communities (Cambourne, Bourn, Caxton)

## Summary of Public Health Comments

- 3.41 The HIA is a thorough assessment of the potential health impacts associated with the development. It is evidence based and has used local data appropriately. The mitigation measures proposed are in the main part acceptable however the level of commitment to some the measures is vague.
- 3.42 Most of the mitigation measures will need to be agreed at the Reserved Matters stage and design coding and through the SPD. In order to have confidence that the mitigation measures contained in the Health Impact Assessment are implemented a "Statement of Compliance" as requested above should be submitted with each Reserved Matters Application.
- 3.43 The HIA references other documents which should have been submitted with the application, however one of documents referenced could not be found on the South Cambridgeshire District Council website, namely the "Social Infrastructure Statement incorporating Sports Strategy and Community Development Strategy" Therefore my comments only reflect the HIA until the other documents are available.

## **4 LEAD LOCAL FLOOD AUTHORITY (LLFA)**

- 4.1 The County Council is the Lead Local Flood Authority for Cambridgeshire and its recommendations should be a material consideration in the determination of the planning application.
- 4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) sets out in section 14 the approach to meeting the challenge of flooding and approach to risk.
- 4.3 The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018), Policy CC/7:Water Quality; CC/8: Sustainable Drainage Systems and CC/9:Managing Flood Risk set the policy context for consideration of the planning application.
- 4.4 Officers have reviewed the following documents:
1. Illustrative Master Plan, Drawing no RG-M-59, Revision C, dated 6/3/18, Prepared by Barton Willmore
  2. Land Use Plan, Drawing no RG-M-37-1, Revision N, Dated 17/11/17, Prepared by Barton Willmore
  3. Indicative Phasing Plan, Drawing no RG-M-48, revision E, Dated 4/12/17, Prepared by Barton Willmore
  4. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (appendix 17.1 of Environmental Statement Volume 3), Report no 10011224002, Date 3/8/18, Prepared by Arcadis
- 4.5 Based on these documents, as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), there is **no objection in principle** to the proposed development.
- 4.6 The above documents demonstrate that surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the use of strategic swales, basins and wetlands, and site specific SuDs, restricting surface water discharge to 3.5l/s/ha

4.7 Officers request the following conditions are imposed:

**Condition 1**

*Prior to submission of the first reserved matters application involving buildings, roads or other impermeable surfaces, a strategic surface water drainage strategy for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be based on the parameters set out in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (appendix 17.1 of Environmental Statement Volume 3), Report no 10011224002, Date 3/8/18, Prepared by Arcadis or any subsequent, revised version that has first been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*The scheme shall include phasing arrangements, details of primary infrastructure for each phase and plans for drainage asset operation, maintenance and contingency. The scheme shall set out what information, design parameters and design details will need to be submitted at the Reserved Matters stage for each phase of the development.*

*The development shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.*

**Reason**

*To ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage and to prevent an increased risk of flooding on or off site. This condition is pre-commencement because commencing development prior to agreeing this scheme could jeopardise the delivery of a strategic site-wide solution.*

**Condition 2**

*Any reserved matters application shall include a detailed surface water strategy pursuant to the reserved matters site for which approval is sought. The strategy shall demonstrate how the management of water within the reserved matters application site for which approval is sought accords with the approved details of the strategic site wide surface water strategy. The strategy shall be based upon a SuDS hierarchy, as espoused by the publication 'The SuDS Manual CIRIA C753'. The strategy shall maximise the use of measures to control water at source as far as practicable to limit the rate and quantity of run-off and improve the quality of any run-off before it leaves the site or joins any water body.*

*The strategy shall include details of all flow control system and the design, location and capacity of all strategic SuDS features and shall include ownership, long-term adoption, management and maintenance schemes and monitoring arrangements/responsibilities. The strategy should also demonstrate that the exceedance of the designed system has been considered through the provision of overland flow routes.*

*The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details and no building pursuant to that particular reserved matters site for which approval is being sought shall be occupied or used until such time as the approved detailed surface water measures have been fully completed in accordance with the approved details.*

**Reason**

*In order to reduce the risk of flooding, to ensure adequate flood control, maintenance and efficient use and management of water within the site, to ensure the quality of the water entering receiving water courses is appropriate and monitored and to promote the use of sustainable urban drainage systems to limit the volume and rate of water leaving the site*

**Condition 3**

*Prior to the commencement of any built development phase the associated surface water infrastructure works (including attenuation features, pipe work, controls and outfalls) shall be completed in accordance with the agreed site-wide drainage strategy, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority*

**Reason**

*To ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding to third parties*

**Condition 4**

*Details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted. The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.*

**Reason**

*To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publically adopted, in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

**Informatives**

1. Constructions or alterations within an ordinary watercourse (temporary or permanent) require consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority under the Land Drainage Act 1991. Ordinary watercourses include every river, drain, stream, ditch, dyke, sewer (other than public sewer) and passage through which water flows that do not form part of Main Rivers (Main Rivers are regulated by the Environment Agency). The applicant should refer to Cambridgeshire County Council's Culvert Policy for further guidance:  
<https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/planning-and-development/water-minerals-and-waste/watercourse-management/>

Please note the council does not regulate ordinary watercourses in Internal Drainage Board areas.

2. Surface water and groundwater bodies are highly vulnerable to pollution and the impact of construction activities. It is essential that the risk of pollution (particularly during the construction phase) is considered and mitigated appropriately. It is important to remember that flow within the watercourse is likely to vary by season and it could be dry at certain

times throughout the year. Dry watercourses should not be overlooked as these watercourses may flow or even flood following heavy rainfall.

## **5 COUNTY PLANNING AND STRATEGIC WASTE**

- 5.1 The County Council in conjunction with Peterborough City Council adopted the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and are the responsible authority for this matter and its recommendations are material consideration in the determination of the planning application.
- 5.2 Officers have reviewed the following documentation:
- Bourn Airfield – Site Boundary Plan
  - Bourn Airfield – Indicative Phasing Plan
  - Bourn Airfield – Parameter Plan – Land Use
  - Bourn Airfield – Environmental Statement – Volume Three – Appendix 4.1:
  - Framework Construction Environment Management Plan // August 2018.
- 5.3 At this time, officers have not been able to view the Site Waste Management Strategy which is listed in the applications supporting documentation, but does not appear to have been published on the website.
- 5.4 Officers wish to make the following comments:

### **CS28 Waste Minimisation, Re-use, and Resource Recovery**

Policy CS28 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011) seeks to encourage waste minimisation, re-use and resource recovery. The applicant's awareness and commitment in the Environmental Statement to prepare Detailed Site Waste Management Plans are welcomed. Unfortunately, officers have not been able to view all the documentation as set out above. Officers have also not been able to locate a completed RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit. To ensure the development complies with Policy CS28. It is therefore requested that the following condition be imposed in the event that planning permission is granted:

#### ***Detailed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan***

*Prior to the commencement of development or any reserved matters approval, a Detailed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (DWMMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The DWMMP shall include details of:*

- i) Construction waste infrastructure including a construction material recycling facility to be in place during all phases of construction*
- ii) anticipated nature and volumes of waste and measures to ensure the maximisation of the reuse of waste*
- iii) Measures and protocols to ensure effective segregation of waste at source including waste sorting, storage, recovery and recycling facilities to ensure the maximisation of waste materials both for use within and outside the site*
- iv) Any other steps to ensure the minimisation of waste during construction*
- v) the location and timing of provision of facilities pursuant to criteria i) to iv).*
- vi) proposed monitoring and timing of submission of monitoring reports*
- vii) the proposed timing of submission of a Waste Management Closure Report to demonstrate the effective implementation, management and monitoring of construction waste during the construction lifetime of the development*



*viii) a RECAP Waste Management Guide toolkit shall be completed, with supporting reference material*

*ix) proposals for the management of municipal waste generated during the occupation phase of the development, to include the design and provision of permanent facilities e.g. internal and external segregation and storage of recyclables, non-recyclables and compostable material; access to storage and collection points by users and waste collection vehicles The Detailed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.*

*Reason: In the interests of maximising waste re-use and recycling opportunities; and to comply with policy CS28 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011) and the Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (RECAP) Waste Design Guide 2012; and to comply with the National Planning Policy for Waste October 2014; and Guidance for Local Planning Authorities on Implementing Planning Requirements of the European Union Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC), Department for Communities and Local Government, December 2012.*

### **CS31 Waste Water Treatment Works Safeguarding Areas - Bourne Waste Water Treatment Works (W7E)**

Bourn Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) is located adjacent to the southwestern boundary of the site. Policy CS31 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011) seeks to safeguard waste water treatment works through a presumption against occupied development within the safeguarding areas shown in the Proposals Map of which Bourne WWTW is identified under Policy W7E.

The Indicative Phasing Plan and the Parameter Plan – Land Use identify the area of the development that is within the WWTW safeguarding area to be used for ponds and associated with the sites sustainable drainage scheme. The proposed land use would appear to be an appropriate and is unlikely to conflict with the WWTW. Officers are satisfied that the proposal does not conflict with Policy CS31.

## **6.0 LIBRARY**

- 6.1** The new community at Bourn Airfield will comprise of approximately 3500 homes and nearly 9000 residents and is close to established communities and services. Cambourne Library is the main focus for library provision in the Cambourne and Bourn area. However, the library service provision at Cambourne would not be able to fully support the needs of the Bourn Airfield community without some additional provision being made within the new community from the early stages of development. During the first years of development there could be a lack of early transport options which would potentially isolate residents and make it difficult for people to access community activity, including library services at Cambourne.
- 6.2** The County Library Service propose a satellite library facility at Bourn Airfield based within a shared multi-purpose community building to provide access to library services, as an appropriate mitigation project.
- 6.3** The Council's vision for this project is for a modern library facility located in a shared building with partner services. This is in line with Cambridgeshire County Council's policy for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Library Service which recognises the importance of developing community hubs where library services are provided in shared buildings in partnership with

other service providers. Other service providers may include information and advice services, health services, adult learning services and Children's Centres.

- 6.4 A Library Specification has been produced for this project and officers would look to work with the local authority and applicant to evolve this design and bring forward a suitable facility that meets the needs of the development. It is expected that the development provides the space at nil cost to the Council and financial contribution towards fit out/stock of the library.

## **7 TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT**

- 7.1 These comments have been prepared by the TA Team in consultation with Public Rights of Way (PROW). CCC Highways and Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) have responded separately.

- 7.2 Transport officers recommends a **Holding Objection**: (i) Further information is required before the development impacts can be fully assessed and TA approved, (ii) The mitigation measures and contribution amounts, including the GCP have not been fully agreed. (iii) Public Rights of Way requirements not yet satisfied. Please see detailed response below for requirements:

### **Planning Policies (chapter 3 of the TA)**

- 7.3 Policy TSCSC 21: Planning obligations for Bourn Airfield and West Cambourne sets out various mitigation that is required as part of the Bourn Airfield application. This includes any mitigation measures that are needed at the junctions of the A428 and the A1303 and the A1198. Some of these junctions have not been surveyed and assessed and therefore as outlined later in this documents should be assessed.

### **Existing Accessibility (Chapter 5 of the TA)**

- 7.4 Paragraph 5.9 States that the existing junctions operate below capacity during the peak periods in the base scenario. This is not accepted by the County Council as there are significant queues experienced along Madingley Road and at the Caxton Gibbett Roundabout. Junction modelling needs to reflect the current operation of the network and be validated against queuing levels.
- 7.5 Paragraph 5.10. Accident statistics for the latest 60 months should be provided and assessed for the junctions along the B1046 southern corridor into Cambridge via Bourn, Toft, Caldecote, Comberton and Barton. The amount of traffic through these villages is likely to increase as a result of this development and the TA should assess the impact this would have on these areas.

### **Trip Generation and Traffic Impacts (Chapter 8 of the TA)**

- 7.6 Paragraph 8.14 The West Cambridge trips have now been taken into account, however this is only for the Madingley Road Network. There are West Cambridge trips on the Madingley Road corridor toward Madingley Mulch and also on the M11 off and on slips that should be taken into account if they haven't already done so.

- 7.7 Paragraph 8.19 It is not clear what Test 5 and 6 include when the test refers to 'cumulative'. Further clarification is required as to whether this is the list of committed developments set out in paras 8.11 to 8.13.
- 7.8 The TA guidelines set out in section 1 of this TA state that the future year assessments should be as follows:
- Base year
  - Base + committed development
  - Base + committed development + Development
- 7.9 It is not clear why in Tests 5, 6 6b and 6c the cumulative assessment has been added on top of the development flows rather than the other way round. Further detail is required.
- 7.10 Paragraph 8.35 It is essential that the junction design ensures that the access onto the Broadway bans left turns out of the development as well as **banning right turns in**, coming from the direction of Bourn. The only movements permitted for all traffic should be right turn out and left turn in. It is not clear if this is the case so far. This should be clarified.
- 7.11 Paragraph 8.68 States that all the stand-alone junctions assessed operate within capacity and it is only the cumulative assessments that pushes the junctions over capacity. This is not accepted. The Madingley Road junctions are currently experiencing queuing during the peak hours. The base models need to ensure they reflect this existing queuing.
- 7.12 Paragraph 8.69 The TA suggests that the Madingley Road corridor is only due to go over capacity under the Base + Growth conditions. As stated above this is not the case as several junctions including the M11 off slip, the Park and Ride junction and the High Cross junctions are all currently experiencing queuing during the am and pm peaks. Therefore the base models should be rectified to replicate this so the future year assessment are accurate.
- 7.13 Reviews of the junction assessments are currently ongoing. Discussions are taking place with the developer's transport consultants to try to agree suitable models. CCC position is reserved pending the outcome of these discussions.
- 7.14 Cambourne had to build its own access onto the A428, which is very well used and can be very busy. It's not made clear in the TA why this wasn't a requirement for Bourn airfield. Further information is required detailing why this access option was not pursued.
- 7.15 As above, the TA needs to show that the existing A428 access has capacity to accommodate the additional trips. The Hardwick A428 dumbbell junction should be surveyed and assessed to demonstrate that this will not go over capacity during the peak hours. This has not been undertaken to date and since this is the main access onto the A428 for all development traffic this should be undertaken to show there is capacity.
- 7.16 Measures required to mitigate the traffic impact of the development on the villages of Bourn, Caldecote, Toft, Comberton and Barton should also be provided. Further information is required detailing proposed schemes along with a breakdown of costs. It is agreed that annual surveys will be required to monitor the traffic flows through the villages.

## **Access for Pedestrians and Cycles (Chapter 6 of the TA)**

- 7.17 Paragraph 9.2. The development proposes to provide a new pedestrian and cycle network to link into the existing network in the surrounding area. This includes direct and segregated pedestrian and cycle links to Cambridge, Cambourne/ Highfields, Caldecote, Hardwick and Bourn. Further information is required on the details of these proposed links to the surrounding villages before these can be agreed. Currently there is little provision available so to fulfil this requirement upgrades will be needed.
- 7.18 Paragraph 9.5. A dedicated strategic public transport route is to be provided through the development. This is being discussed through ongoing discussions with the developers to ensure the provision is to the correct standards and requirements. CCC's position is reserved subject to the conclusions of these discussions.
- 7.19 Paragraph 9.7. An improvement to the Cambridge Crossroads junction has been proposed to improve cycle connectivity. Comments for the Highways DM officer should be reviewed.
- 7.20 Walking distances should be shown in real distances rather than as simple radii. This should be amended.
- 7.21 Figure 8.10. The proposals shown in figure 8.10 will require a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.

## **Public Transport Accessibility (Chapter 10 of the TA)**

- 7.22 Paragraph 10.1 The proposals include a public transport package. This includes a diversion of the Citi4, X3 and the 18 bus route through the site. CCC does not object to these improvements in principal, however additional information is required before these can be agreed – including expected patronage and viability figures.
- 7.23 Paragraph 10.6 as part of the Travel Pack for households it is proposed to provide all residents with *up to* 1 year of free travel by bus. This will be a good benefit and promote sustainable travel. The bus ticket offer should be for *at least* 1 year rather than *up to* 1 year.
- 7.24 The TA doesn't specify what exactly will be provided out of the various options, and how much funding will be available. Further information should be provided before this can be agreed.
- 7.25 Paragraph 10.16 and tables 10.1 and 10.2 The Beaulieu example used in the TA shows that some good changes in mode share have been achieved towards bus use. It is not clear whether these figures include data following the end of the free annual bus pass or whether they just include data when the bus passes have been still active. Further clarification is required.

## **Proposed Mitigation (Chapter 12 of the TA)**

- 7.26 The TA sets out various mitigation proposals:-
- Delivery of the dedicated strategic Public Transport Route within Bourn Airfield – See comments from GCP team within this report.

- Contribution towards delivery of a traffic calming and pedestrian improvements scheme on Broadway and monitoring of movements through the surrounding villages – Further information is required on the proposals and the contribution before this can be agreed.
- Contribution towards the delivery of the wider dedicated strategic public transport route – This is a key requirement with the financial amount to be agreed.
- Delivery of off-site pedestrian and cycle improvements – Further details are required showing the proposed improvements.
- Delivery of the bus strategy – As detailed in the above response, further evidence on the proposed viability and patronage is required.
- Implementation of Travel Plans – Confirmation should be provided that this will include an annual pass for 4 residents of each household.
- Provision of a Cycle Voucher for residents - The TA states that the Travel Plan coordinator will endeavour to enter an agreement with a cycle company to provide residents with a vouchers to obtain discounts to buy a cycle - This needs to be a definite part of the Travel pack rather than just an endeavour. Confirmation that this is agreed is required.

## **Appendices**

- 7.27 Appendix C contains some queue length surveys. For the M11 off slip/ A1303 Madingley Road, the queuing shown on Arm C in Lane 2 shows that between 7.30am and 9.30am the maximum queuing was 31 cars/LGVs, with an average of around 22 vehicles. Further explanation is required as to why this is not shown to be more extensive as the queuing can often stretch back close to the Madingley Mulch roundabout.

## **Appendix E – Trip Generation**

- 7.28 There doesn't appear to be full multi-modal trip generation provided within the TA. A Technical Note in the appendices details the proposed vehicular trips but doesn't give details on the other mode trips. Full daily multi-modal trip generation is required, broken down mode and by peaks.
- 7.29 It is not easy to see exactly what the proposed trip generation is for anyone looking at the TA. The majority of information is hidden in Technical Notes in the appendices rather than the main bulk of the TA which doesn't appear very transparent. Summary tables should be provided within the TA.
- 7.30 Table 4.4 in Appendix E shows the resultant trip rates for car drivers by journey purpose. This differs a fair amount from the %s in table 4.2. Further clarification is required detailing exactly how these figures have been reached to make it clear.

- 7.31 Paragraph 4.30 states that 2021 flows for West Cambridge have been included. Further clarification is required as to whether the 2031 West Cambridge flows have also been considered.
- 7.32 The development seems to be quite heavily skewed towards the Cambourne/ Bourn side of the development. The access onto the Broadway is intended as a secondary access and the main one was to be onto the Caldecote roundabout. With the high density development being on the Cambourne side this is likely to increase the number of vehicles accessing and egressing the site via the Broadway access. The TA should show how the route through the development will be more attractive. Therefore we require the junction of the Broadway/Old A428 to be surveyed and assessed to show whether there is sufficient capacity. The distribution should be reviewed with this in mind and any alterations or sensitivity tests undertaken.

### **Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP)**

- 7.33 Full comments have been put together by GCP and these should be referred to.
- 7.34 CCC require the development to do the following aspects.
1. Contribute an agreed amount towards the GCP scheme between Cambourne and Cambridge.
  2. Facilitate and deliver a route through the Bourn airfield development site that ties in with the wider GCP scheme.
  3. The proposals should allow for a scheme that the GCP team is satisfied with.

### **Comments from the Asset Information Definitive Map Team (PROW)**

- 7.35 The redevelopment of Bourn Airfield provides an opportunity to reconnect and enhance the existing right of way network which has not previously been possible during the time of the Airfield's operation. We welcome the proposals to create the proposed pedestrian and cycle links as part of the development, as they meet the requirements of the County Council's adopted Rights of Way Improvement Plan to create links with new and existing communities. Providing improved rights of way infrastructure also encourages healthy lifestyles, in line with national and local policies on both physical and mental health and well-being, including those of the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board. We are however disappointed that no indication has been made that off-road, leisure and utility routes will be designed and made available to all Non-Motorised Users (MNUs), including equestrian users. We would therefore object to the proposals as they currently stand and therefore place a Holding Objection to allow the applicant to address these issues.
- 7.36 We would emphasise the importance of ensuring that good soft-user infrastructure is in place before residents and community facilities. Experience from other major developments where community facilities were created before infrastructure was in place showed that people quickly fell into poor habits, becoming reliant on their own private cars rather than walking or cycling. This is strongly evidenced by a report entitled 'Lessons from Cambourne' in 2007, which is particularly pertinent as Cambourne is adjacent to this site. This report stated:

*“There is a lack of connection to surrounding villages and Cambourne is poorly integrated into the surrounding countryside. A new settlement should have good pedestrian and cycle links to local footpaths and bridleways and these rights of way need to be established well in advance of construction.”*

- 7.37 We expect this site to learn the lessons from Cambourne and ensure good NMU links are provided to surrounding villages, and that these links are delivered well in advanced of any occupation.
- 7.38 Unfortunately, it does not appear that this submission has adequately evaluated the needs of all NMU users, including equestrians when coming to this proposal. No reference at all is made to off-highway routes being made available to all NMU users, choosing rather to make reference to ‘Pedestrian/Cycleway’ links across the site. It therefore does not appear that this submission has met several local policies with regard to NMU provision
- 7.39 The County Council’s adopted statutory Rights of Way improvement Plan (ROWIP) contains an assessment of the extent to which the local rights of way network meets the present and likely future needs of the public, including the opportunities provided by local rights of way for exercise and other forms of open-air recreation and enjoyment and the accessibility of local rights of way network to new residents. Within the ROWIP there are a number of Statements of Action (SOA) which priorities specific issues to be addressed and potential solutions and improvements which could be made.
- 7.40 The relevant SOAs in this instance include:
- SOA2 (5) ‘Enable increased access to PROW to facilitate healthy lifestyles.’
  - SOA3 (1) ‘Ensure that RoW are protected from inappropriate use during development and that new facilities are provided to a good standard.’
  - SOA3 (3) ‘Liaise with planners and developers to provide new countryside access provision to link new development into an enhanced network catering for increased population. To include new routes, status upgrades, improved facilities and improved information, signage and interpretation.’
  - SOA5 (3) ‘Prioritise bridleway improvements on grounds that bridleway users currently suffer highest risk on roads and bridleway network is currently most disjointed. Ensure that bridleway improvements have least possible effect on pedestrians so as to maximise benefit to widest user community, subject to available funding. Support alternative mechanisms of delivery where necessary.’
- 7.41 The ROWIP would therefore strongly support the delivery of an upgraded Public Right of Way network across the Bourn development. The provision of Bridleways instead of cycleways, where appropriate, would also satisfy the aims of the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy. A copy of the ROWIP and Health and Wellbeing Strategy can be found on our website at <https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/transport-plans-and-policies/local-transport-plan/> and <https://cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/jsna/health-and-wellbeing-strategy/> respectively.

## **Request for improvement to the Rights of Way network**

7.42 The improvements listed below would allow the communities of the new settlement to have better direct links to communities further afield such as Bourn, Cambourne, Highfields Caldecote, Hardwick and Caxton. These improvements when connected to the developer's proposed on-site routes would create an opportunity for a greater circular route in and out of the proposed site for those wishing to take a longer recreational route beyond the new settlement. Research has strongly shown that people want circular routes for many day-to-day purposes such as dog-walking, health walks and running. These improvements would significantly add to the health and wellbeing of both communities and users from further afield in accordance with the policies noted above. These improvements should be secured directly through a planning condition in the first instance or through appropriate S106 obligations.

- The County Council supports the provision of well-established green routes throughout the development. The County Council recommends that the most strategic routes be recorded as Public Rights of Way with the expectation that other connecting routes within the site would remain privately maintainable. This approach has been successfully implemented in Cambourne and at Northstowe. The Masterplan for Cambourne included the provision of new public rights of way which are almost complete. This was an important blueprint and the County Council requests that the Bourn Masterplan be amended to include PROW along the lines suggested.
- The PROW network should become an integral part of the development and enhanced, directional signage will need to be incorporated into the development to ensure that future residents are aware of the network available. This could also include the installation of interpretation boards (which can link to wildlife and biodiversity aims) and sufficient inclusion within resident travel plans.
- Off-site NMU improvements should be considered to improve links from and improvement to long-distance paths such as the Pathfinder Long Distance Walk, Harcamlow Way and Wimpole Way (see <https://www.visitcambridge.org/things-to-do/sport-and-leisure/walking>). If improvements cannot be directly secured by the developer then financial contributions should be considered in lieu of this.
- It is noted that the Masterplan indicates several green routes around the perimeter of the site. There should be an aspiration for establishing a circular perimeter route of Bridleway status around the development. This infrastructure is proving to be highly successful in other large scale developments in Cambridgeshire such as Cambourne
- If the northern expressway route takes the form of a busway construction, then any adjacent maintenance track should be dedicated to a Bridleway status, similar to what has been successfully implemented for the Cambridge to St Ives Busway.

7.43 It is noted that NMU links are envisaged between the south of the site and Public Bridleway No. 15. Whilst this is welcomed, there is no reason why this should not be inclusive of all NMUs including equestrians. Therefore, this route should be created with the status of Bridleway, enabling it to connect the existing Rights of Way network and the proposed



circular route detailed above. The development should provide a green infrastructure scheme, setting out what mitigations and enhancements the development proposes both on and off-site. This should set out the principles of what routes will be promoted and general standards set on the routes alignments, surfacing, boundary treatments and status. Guidance on the integration of public rights of way into a development is available on the County Council's website at <https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/libraries-leisure-&-culture/arts-green-spaces-&-activities/rights-of-way/>

- 7.44 This scheme should be delivered as part of a reserved matters application and should be secured by S106 or condition. The Cambourne Master Design Guide provides a model example of the detail that could have been provided at this outline stage (see Appendix A) for a green infrastructure scheme.
- 7.45 The County Council's Asset Information Definitive Map Team therefore requests a Holding Objection on this planning application for the reasons cited above. If you are minded to allow this application, the County Council requests that the following condition is included in the planning permission.

*Prior to the commencement of development, a green infrastructure scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA in consultation with the LHA. Such scheme shall include provision for:*

- i. the design of amenity and public rights of way routes and their surfacing, widths, gradients, landscaping and structures within the development and on the fringe connecting with other communities*
- ii. any proposals for diversion and closure of public rights of way and alternative route provision*

*Reason: In the interests of the health, amenity and safety of the public.*

- 7.46 Officers strongly encourage the applicant to contact the County Council's Asset Information Definitive Map team to agree improvements to the next submission in respect of public rights of way.
- 7.47 The County Council's Asset Information Definitive Map team are willing to assist the developer during the design stage to understand the needs and aspirations of the Public Rights of Way network in this area. The Transport Assessment team will progress any further discussion, in consultation with the Asset Information team, with regard to S106 and conditions.

## **Conclusion**

- 7.48 Until this additional information has been provided and agreed, the County Council are unable to state whether or not this development is acceptable in highway terms. Therefore we request that this application not be determined until such time as the additional information has been provided and agree

## **8.0 GENERIC S106 MATTERS**

### **Indexation**

- 8.1 Whilst the detail of the s106 agreement will be a matter for further discussion and negotiation, should there be a resolution to grant outline planning permission, it is stated herewith that the Council requires all financial contributions to be index linked from the date of project cost, as given, to the date of payment in accordance with the BCIS or RPI (whichever is appropriate) Index.

### **Security**

- 8.2 The Council will require that large financial contributions be protected by means of Parent Company Guarantee or Bond – mostly likely a bond for this development, with the threshold for coverage to be set at an appropriate level to be agreed between the Council and applicant.

**ENDS**

**8<sup>th</sup> November 2018**