



My ref: SC/JR/Endurance

Your ref:

Date: 28<sup>th</sup> October 2013

Contact: Juliet Richardson or Stuart Clarke

Direct dial: 01223 699 868 / 01223 688874

E Mail: [Juliet.Richardson@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:Juliet.Richardson@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)  
[Stuart.Clarke@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:Stuart.Clarke@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)**Economy, Transport & Environment**  
Executive Director, Alex PlantAlkis Riziotis  
Team Leader, Development Control  
East Cambridgeshire District Council  
The Grange, Nutholt Lane  
Ely  
CB7 4EECastle Court  
Shire Hall  
Castle Hill  
Cambridge  
CB3 0AP

Dear Alkis,

**BY EMAIL****Proposal:** Residential led development of up to 1,200 homes with associated employment and community uses (including care home and extra care home). Supporting infrastructure, and open space/landscaping on land to the west of Lynn Road in Ely.**Location:** Land North Of Cam Drive Ely Cambridgeshire**Reference:** 13/00785/ESO

Thank you for consulting Cambridgeshire County Council officers on the above planning application by Endurance Estates – a major phase of development for the wider Ely North proposals.

Council officers are supportive of the growth agenda and note that this development comes forward under the extant and emerging Local Plan's for East Cambridgeshire and the developer-led Master Plan (to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document by East Cambridgeshire District Council either later this year or early 2014).


County officers within the various services affected by the proposed development have now been consulted on the planning application as well as being involved in previous consultation and workshop events.

These comments are an officer response only. They have not been endorsed by Members, due to the timescales involved, although the Lead and Local County Members have been made aware of the planning application.

Set out below is a summary note of the key comments made and also there is an appendix of full officer comments and attachments.

If you have any queries in relation to the response, please do not hesitate to contact myself or Stuart Clarke.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading 'Juliet Richardson', is centered within a yellow rectangular box. The box is itself centered within a larger, light yellow rectangular frame.

**Juliet Richardson**  
**Development & Growth Manager**

Enc.

## SUMMARY COMMENTS

### **Adult Social Care**

Officers would support 100% all dwellings meeting Lifetime Homes standards.

The developers' commitment to Building for Life standards is welcomed and supported.

Sufficient C2 (residential institution) land should be available in the development and the developer should be encouraged to partner with specialist developers of Extra Care/sheltered and residential accommodation to bring forward suitable facilities as part of this development.

Evidence suggests that a development of this size will place a considerable burden on this service provision, particularly during the early phases of occupation when the needs of the community are high. Failure to provide early intervention support often results in quick escalation of need which can have a negative affect on the community feel of a development.

In order to mitigate this funding for a Family Worker and a Community Development Worker for the first two years of the site's occupation would be requested to ensure those early support systems are in place and avoid escalation of need.

### **Public Health**

No comment.

### **Education**

The application is generally supported and contains suitable urban design principles that have adequately accounted for in the design and layout of the school and its surrounding land uses. However, concern is raised regarding noise pollution to the school. Insufficient detail is available on how this will be adequately mitigated against. It is considered that further information needs to be provided on this matter prior to the determination of the application. Other areas of concern related to noise and dust emissions to the school during the construction period of the wider site can be adequately dealt with by way of planning condition.

The Illustrative Masterplan on page 73 shows a proposed layout for the school site, with the school building fronting the primary road to the west. This has been informed by discussions held between the applicants and CCC Education. Support is provided to the location and massing of the school building and layout as shown on the masterplan.

Paragraph 5.2 of the Design and Access Statement states that school site will have an area of 3.3 hectares, this is supported.

The Urban Design Framework plan on page 122 sets out that the primary school will be 1 or 2 storeys in height. This is appropriate and provides the flexibility that CCC Education need.

Page 126 relates to building heights and states that the primary school will have a minimum building height of 5 metres, with a maximum building height of 10 metres or 6 metres for the

single storey elements. The proposed school height is likely to be broadly consistent with the parameters (see detailed comments in appendix [a])

In relation to the school site the ES contains a summary of noise impacts but does not provide adequate information to assess the noise impact to the school. Of particular concern is paragraph 10.8.43:

### **Library Facilities**

Library provision is not mentioned in the Endurance Estates Design and Access Statement, however, community facilities in relation to the wider north Ely developments have been discussed as being in "The Greens" area of the Highflyer Farm development, on which County officers have previously commented on.

The County position on the North-Ely Development Framework of August 2012 is still valid – that a micro-library to meet local day-to-day needs and enhancement of the resources available at the existing Ely library to meet wider, more specialised needs is required.

### **Sustainable Drainage and Water Management**

#### **Flood risk and water quality**

Flood risk and water quality has been considered during the construction phase.

However further consideration is needed in terms of likely impacts of built development. Any proposed development of the site should be consistent with guidance provided by the Environment Agency and other key stakeholders and if necessary should require engagement with these stakeholders.

As you are aware a Flood Risk Assessment should be undertaken as part of any proposed development to ensure the site is developed in a sustainable way using SuDs to control flows on site. Account should be taken of section '3.5.7 EN7 - Flood risk' in East Cambridgeshire District Council's adopted Core Strategy that states "new development being located and designed to minimise resource and energy use and reduce the risk of flooding" and that "All applications for new development must demonstrate that appropriate surface water drainage arrangements for dealing with surface water run-off can be accommodated within the site"

Regard should be had to any emerging legislation related to the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/29/contents>.

#### **Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs)**

We only have a watching brief regarding SuDs. However, the incorporation of SuDs within this development (water storage areas, ponds and swales as part of the proposed street layout, greenways and green infrastructure) is welcomed as being consistent with policy EN7 of the adopted East Cambridgeshire Core Strategy.

The final design of the SUDs to be used as part of this development should be identified in consultation with the Environment Agency, Anglian Water, Internal Drainage Board and Cambridgeshire County Council. For example there is a need to ensure that attenuation run off from this site should be carefully managed. Also that the SuDs are adopted and provision is made for its maintenance, in perpetuity.

## **Works on water course**

Please note any watercourses within the site which require certain works (e.g diversions and/or culverting) will require prior written consent from Cambridgeshire County Council under the Land Drainage Act 1991. This is irrespective of any planning permission given. Failure to obtain such consents may result in Enforcement action.

## **Rights of Way**

Comments to follow as part of transport response

## **Minerals and Waste**

The Endurance Estates Site does not fall into any Minerals or Waste Safeguarding / Consultation Areas.

A Waste Audit and Strategy does not appear to have been completed for the proposed development as required by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS28 (July 2011).

It does not appear that a RECAP Toolkit has not been completed for the proposed development as required by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS28, and the adopted RECAP Waste Management Guide.

Further details and suggested planning conditions are provided in the appendix to this summary note.

## **Archaeology**

County officers consider further detail to be necessary in the accompanying Environmental Statement concerning the proposed archaeological mitigation strategy. These details are set out in the accompanying appendix and broadly relate to:-

- Preservation mitigation; and
- Implementation of investigation works.

## **Ecology**

Officers welcome the inclusion of an ecological assessment within the Environmental Statement (chapter 7). However, there is concern about the accuracy of the ecological assessment, given that the Extended Phase 1 survey of the site is over 2 years old (conducted in April 2011) which may be considered out-of-date. For example, the trees referenced within Target Note 7 of Figure 7.1 (Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and Pond Great Crested Newt HSI Results, Appendix 7.1) are absent from the Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment drawing (Hayden's Arboricultural Consultants, 2013). The ecological assessment also fails to consider the impact of the proposals on invertebrates and flora.

The all survey works upon which the ecological assessment has been based should be provided within appendix 7 of the Environmental Statement. Disappointingly, the Extended Phase 1 survey report has not been submitted and the following reports have information absent, as follows:

- Statement (Appendix 7), with the following information absent:
  - no Extended Phase 1 survey report provided, including methodology for Pond Great Crested newt HSI survey
  - no methodology or detailed description of ponds or assessment of HSI scores provided for Pond Great Crested Newt HSI results (Appendix 7.1)
  - figure(s) showing the results of the survey work were absent from the Hedgerow Survey report, November 2012 (Appendix 7.2)
  - figure(s) showing the results of the survey methodology & survey work were absent from the Breeding Bird Survey report, November 2012 (Appendix 7.4)
  - figure(s) showing the results of the survey methodology & survey work and details of the survey conditions (dates, times & weather conditions for the transect and static detector surveys) were absent from the Bat Survey report, November 2012 (Appendix 7.6)

It is essential that an up-to-date review of the Extended Phase 1 Habitat survey is undertaken, including an initial assessment of invertebrates and flora, and the additional information for the survey reports is submitted to clearly demonstrate the ecological interest at the site and that the ecological assessment provided within the Environmental Statement is correct. This information should be provided prior to the determination of the planning application because the impact of the development on ecology, including protected species and habitats / species of principal importance for conservation in England, is a material consideration in the planning process ([Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and Their Impact Within The Planning System](#)).

Notwithstanding the above concerns regarding the lack of information, based on the assumption that the ecological assessment is accurate, further detailed comments are included in the appendix attached to this note.

## **Transport**

Officers are currently reviewing the transport assessment and the impact on the transport network and will provide a full response in due course.

The results of the Road Safety audit are expected in the middle of November, therefore it is expected that a full transport response will be provided by the end of November 2013. An interim response detailing any clarification points or additional information that are required may be provided sooner.

In addition, we are still awaiting the submission of the Joint Transport Strategy for Ely North, which is required to enable an assessment of the application.

**ENDS**

