

**LAND NORTH OF CHERRY HINTON – OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION
CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

To: Economy and Environment Committee

Meeting Date: 12th July 2018

From: Graham Hughes - Executive Director, Place and Economy

Electoral division(s): Cherry Hinton and Fulbourn

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

Purpose: To consider the Council's response to an outline planning application for 1200 new homes at Land North of Cherry Hinton.

Recommendation: Committee is asked to consider and endorse the response previously submitted by Officers.

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

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Proposals for between 10-12,000 new homes have long been established at Cambridge East through the adopted Cambridge East Area Action Plan (2008) and policies in the emerging Local Plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. A Land North of Cherry Hinton Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Final Draft) has also been approved by the respective councils in February and March 2018 for adoption with their Local Plans in due course.
- 1.2 The Cambridge East development proposal comprises three land areas being, (1) Land North of Newmarket Road, (2) Cambridge Airport and (3) Land North of Cherry Hinton. All are within full or part ownership of Marshalls. Whilst development of the airport site is on hold until at least 2031, development at Land North of Newmarket Road (1,300 dwellings) and Land North of Cherry Hinton (1,200 dwellings) can proceed in advance of that site.
- 1.3 Outline planning permission (S/2682/13) for Land North of Newmarket Road was granted in November 2016 and now outline planning permission is being sought for Land North of Cherry Hinton (18/0481/OUT).
- 1.4 Land North of Cherry Hinton (hereafter LNCH) is located to the south east of Cambridge Airport between the northern edge of Cherry Hinton and Teversham. It will form a new neighbourhood for Cherry Hinton. Diagram 1 below shows the location of the site in relation to Cambridge city centre.

Diagram 1: Land North of Cherry Hinton (Source: Application plans)



- 1.5 The 47 hectare site is currently in agricultural use and is being jointly promoted by Marshall and Endurance Estates. It straddles the boundary of Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Councils.
- 1.6 In summary, the development will provide:-
- Up to 1,200 homes;
 - Primary school (420 places);
 - Secondary school (600 places initially);
 - Local centre and community hub; and
 - Open space.
- 1.7 The development is broadly consistent with national and local planning policy and will contribute significantly to the growth agenda for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire. The planning application is supported in principle, subject to agreeing the below comments, securing planning obligations through a section 106 agreement, planning conditions and any other legal agreement necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

2. MAIN ISSUES

- 2.1 Prior to submission of the planning application, pre-application and SPD discussions were held with Council officers to determine the main issues for the development site. They included the treatment of traffic movements both through and around the development and provision for education infrastructure both for the development and wider Cambridge east area.
- 2.2 Extensive debate, which included consultation with the general public and local and lead Members from all the local authorities, surrounded whether or not there should be a through road between Coldham's Lane and Cherry Hinton Road. It was decided on balance that a through road would be provided. This approach will need careful design of the road hierarchy to ensure the delivery of a people friendly environment.
- 2.3 It has also been agreed that a new on-site primary school (with early year's provision) will be required to accommodate children from the development. The school could provide for up to 420 pupils eventually, depending on whether additional development comes forward on part of the adjacent airfield site, so a review mechanism will be agreed with the applicant to ensure the appropriate size of school is provided. The school will be delivered when it is needed and officers are working with the applicant and local authorities to agree a suitable timescale for delivery, as the school is unlikely to be needed for the first occupations of the site.
- 2.4 A secondary school will also be delivered on the northern edge of the development to provide not only for this development but also Land North of Newmarket Road, other development and increasing need from existing communities. Extensive discussion and searches for a suitable site has taken place over the last few years and this site represents the best available opportunity to provide this infrastructure for the community. The school could include community access to playing facilities and again officers are working with the applicants and local authorities to ensure that the school comes forward in a timely manner. The school playing fields will be provided on green belt land, which is acceptable in town

planner terms, however, careful design of that space will need to ensure it does not have a detrimental impact on the green belt.

- 2.5 LNCH lies within the search area for a potential strategic household waste and recycling facility, however, it is accepted that the development is already providing for strategic infrastructure through facilitating a secondary school and therefore a recycling facility would not come forward on this site at this time.
- 2.6 Appendix 1 contains the officer response made to the outline planning application response, which has already been submitted in order to meet the local planning authority deadline. Appendix 2 contains the detailed Transport Assessment response made. Any comments Members might have will be passed to the local authority for their consideration.
- 2.7 Officers will work with the applicant and local authority to progress the Heads of Terms for a S106 Agreement and agree suitable planning conditions. This will secure the necessary infrastructure to make this development acceptable in planning terms. There have been no viability discussions raised to date.
- 2.8 Table 1 below sets out the main S106 contributions sought by the Council.

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

Contribution Infrastructure	Development Contribution Amount (apportioned where appropriate with Indexation Date)).	Project details and delivery
Primary School (with early years provision)	£7,440,000 (4Q17)	315 place (1.5FE) primary school with Early Years provision to be delivered subject to review mechanism. School could be up to 420 places (with additional contributions if necessary from other development)
Secondary school	£5,553,750 (4Q16)	6FE secondary school to provide for development and wider need. Transfer of school site at 200 dwellings for building works
Library	To be confirmed	Towards Cherry Hinton Community Hub project
Public Health	To be confirmed	Range of support workers to support need in the emerging community.
Transport	To be confirmed	Range of mitigation transport measures proposed and subject to negotiation (n.b. the TA team has responded challenging the ambition of these proposals with a view to securing an enhanced package): Walking / Cycling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coldhams Lane N: 3m Shared footway/cycleway

Contribution Infrastructure	Development Contribution Amount (apportioned where appropriate with Indexation Date)).	Project details and delivery
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airport Way: 3m shared footway cycleway • CH Road (Teversham): footway widening between new site access and Marshalls Close • Public realm improvements at Norman Way / Coldhams Lane crossing • Provision of surfaced path across Coldhams Common from Barnwell Road to Chisholm Trail • Extension of Cherry Hinton High St works • Contribution to scheme at Coldhams Lane roundabout • Walking and cycling fund as part of Travel Plan <p>Buses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of direct service to City Centre / Railway Station via Coldhams Lane. • Bus Stop improvements <p>Others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New access junctions at Coldhams Lane, Airport Way and additional arm to Gazelle Way roundabout • Traffic Management on Church End • Travel Plan • Construction Traffic Plan

2.9 There are no objections in principle to this development.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

The development will provide employment opportunities during the construction phases and subsequent delivery of the schools and local centre to develop the local economy for residents and support and enhance the provision at Cherry Hinton and Cambridge.

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 living facility.

3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

This has been assessed through the HIA and officers have suggested the developer make contributions towards funding workers who can support these groups of people within the community.

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 developers and Cambridge City 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 or No Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?	N/A Name of Officer: Paul White

Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes or No Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes or No Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes or No Name of Officer: Joanna Shilton
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes or No Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes or No Name of Officer: Iain Green

Source Documents	Location
<u>Outline Planning Application (18/0481/OUT)</u> OR https://idox.cambridge.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage	Click on link in source documents. Room 304, Shire Hall, Cambridge

APPENDIX 1: OFFICER RESPONSE TO OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR LAND NORTH OF CHERRY HINTON



County Council Officer Comments

Outline planning application (all matters reserved except for means of access in respect of junction arrangements onto Coldhams Lane, Cherry Hinton Road and Airport Way) for a maximum of 1200 residential dwellings (including retirement living facility (within Use Class C2/C3)), a local centre comprising uses within Use Class A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/B1a/D1/D2, primary and secondary schools, community facilities, open spaces, allotments, landscaping and associated infrastructure.

18/0481/OUT

Summary Response

- i This note sets out the County Council officer comments on the above outline planning application in response to a consultation by Cambridge City 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 July 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 Cambridge East proposals and broader growth agenda for Cambridge and Cambridgeshire. It is recognised that whilst the development is intended to provide for itself, in terms of infrastructure mitigation, it is also enabling wider benefits for secondary education across a broader area.
- iii Support for this planning application is subject to 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 demonstrated to 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 – comments awaited
 - County Planning ✓
 - Digital Infrastructure & Connecting Cambridgeshire – no comments received
 - Education ✓
 - Energy Investment – no comments received
 - Floods and Water ✓
 - Library ✓
 - Minerals and Waste ✓
 - New Communities ✓
 - Public Health ✓
 - Strategic Waste ✓
 - Transport Assessment & Highways – comments to be provided separately
- 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.

Service Comments

1 EDUCATION

- 1.1 These comments are specific to the Council's role as the Local Children's Services Authority in response to the applicant's proposal, and Council's requirement, to provide sufficient on-site land for a 2 form of entry primary school and 6 form of entry secondary school with associated, proportional financial contributions towards the build costs.
Environmental Impact Assessment: Chapter 13: Socio-Economics
- 1.2 The applicant has identified a number of schools to be included in the EIA baseline assessment, which the Council highlights some issues of concern with. These are set out below.
- 1.3 The Council has a statutory duty to "*secure a school place in a state-funded school for all pupils aged 5-16 years of age whose parents request one*".¹ Given this statutory duty, it is inappropriate to include non-state-funded schools within this assessment because whilst it is accepted that some families moving into the development may take a place at one of these schools, these numbers would be insignificant. Moreover, in planning the response to the mitigation of the proposed development, relying on this eventuality could leave the Council unable to fulfil its statutory duties.
- 1.4 The EIA assumes a radius of 5km from the proposed development site to identify the schools to be included with the assessment process. Whilst this distance is appropriate for identifying secondary schools (5km is in line with the statutory walking distance for secondary aged pupils of 3 miles), this is not appropriate for assessing primary place provision, where the statutory walking distance for primary aged pupils is 2 miles (or just over 3km).

¹ Education Act 1996, Section 14

- 1.5 As an urban extension of Cambridge it would be expected that residents of the development should be encouraged to walk or cycle to the local school. There should not be an expectation that the Council should be required to provide free home-to-school transport on the basis of either distance or the absence of an available walking route to a local school.
- 1.6 Within table 13.17, it is unclear where the data source for this information has been drawn from. The two headings 'Places' and 'Capacity' are confusing.
- 1.7 It is assumed that 'Places' refers to the overall capacity of the school as indicated by the school's Planned Admission Number (PAN) and Net Capacity Assessment (typically we would expect to see this as capacity). Whilst there are a few adjustments which may be needed, these figures broadly align with the Council's understanding.
- 1.8 The column, 'Capacity' appears to refer to the number of current vacancies at any given time – as calculated by subtracting the number of pupils on roll from the total number of places (capacity) available at the school. These numbers will fluctuate frequently. However, it is accepted that there is a need for the EIA to fix these to reflect a baseline. Nevertheless, the current EIA does not provide any indication as to the source of this information, which makes providing any comment on the appropriateness of the assumptions difficult.
- 1.9 For reference, in relation to the issues raised above, the table below provides a summary of the state-funded schools within a 2 and 3 miles radius of the proposed development.

State-funded primary aged provision (within 2 miles of site)	State-funded secondary aged provision (within 3 miles of site)
Abbey Meadows Primary School	University Technical College (Years 10-13 only)
Bewick Bridge Primary School	Chesterton Community College
Cherry Hinton CE Primary School	Coleridge Community College
Colville Primary School	North Cambridge Academy
Fen Ditton Primary School	Parkside Community College
Morley Memorial Primary School	St Bede's Inter-Church
Queen Edith Primary School	The Netherhall School
Queen Emma Primary School	Trumpington Community College
Ridgefield Primary School	
St Matthew's Primary School	
St Philip's CE Primary School	
Teversham CE Primary School	
The Spinney Primary School	

Table 1: State Funded Primary and Secondary Schools within Walking Distance of Development Site

- 1.10 It is unclear why the Ofsted rating of each educational establishment is included. This does not provide any additional information or context to support an assessment as an Ofsted rating can, and does change frequently and a number of those included in the report have already changed and are out of date.
- 1.11 The Council has significant concerns with the approach taken in projecting the future position and impact of the proposed development. The information provided within the report is not clear, with limited detail or references provided with the report.
- 1.12 For example, footnote 45, page 491, references the extent to which the development increases the number of children within each education phase. This is based on the Council's detailed pupil yield, and an unspecified 'desired urban form' – para 13.5.19. There is no detail about either the desired urban form, what this may look like or a breakdown of how this might lead to actual projects of future demand arising from the development. This is standard information which the Council would expect to be able to review and reference to ensure that the assumptions and outcomes of the EIA are robust.
- 1.13 A further example of the Council's concerns relates to the robustness of the report and can be demonstrated by the lack of detail and transparency in table 13.23. Specifically, this quotes a [Cambridgeshire Insight](#) report (2016) in relation to the scale of growth projected.
- 1.14 Footnote 50 of the EIA states that indicative increases of 5% and 22% for primary and secondary respectively have been assumed. In contrast, the report's district summary (page 9) projects demand for primary places will increase by 7.3% over the next 5-year and 10.2% over the next 10-years. For secondary provision demand is projected to increase by 23.4% over the next 5-years and 38.54% over the next 10-years.
- 1.15 Even allowing for the 18 month-2-year period since the 2016 report was published, it would seem unlikely that there had been such a significant drop in the projected growth in demand. Certainly, there are no justifications for the assumptions made within the EIA provided. Without these to provide a balanced assessment of the projected future demand officers are not able to support the findings within the EIA report.
- 1.16 The Council requires greater clarity around the data and underlying assumptions within the EIA assessment. Without having the opportunity to understand this data and ensure that the decisions made around the mitigations sought within the development.
- 1.17 Given the lack of detailed information it is difficult to provide meaningful comment upon the conclusions within the EIA study.

Design and Access Statement / Parameter Plans

- 1.18 The Council accepts that the schools must, by necessity, play a central role in providing a civic presence. This is especially true in new communities where they are frequently amongst the first public buildings to be delivered. Nevertheless, the Council objects to the view that schools should be identified as being landmark buildings, section 8.15.

- 1.19 It is the Council's view that the expectations which arise from the use of this terminology are inappropriate in the context of delivering new schools. In a period where there are significant constraints of public finances and with the desire to squeeze capital contributions this can create future conflict, which does not necessarily support the delivery of high quality design.
- 1.20 *The Council accepts that there should be expectations placed on these buildings to provide a strong civic presence, but the term 'Landmark building' should be amended.***
- 1.21 The school sites identified in the Design & Access (D&A) Statement and Parameter plans are considered to be acceptable, subject to meeting the detailed site requirements approved by the Council's Cabinet and shared with the developer. It is highlighted that the impact of any noise bunds required on the secondary school site must not compromise playing pitch standards and there will need to be careful management of the school and community use pitches to ensure they remain accessible and playable for the school and local community.
- 1.22 It is considered at this stage that the main potential issues will be the:
- location and details of the green corridor / SuDS channel adjacent to the primary school site; and
 - the impact of noise mitigation for the secondary school site.
- 1.23 It is not anticipated at this stage that there will be any significant issues, but the Council would only be able to confirm once more detailed assessment of the sites are concluded as part of the site transfer process.
- 1.24 It is acknowledged that the proposed phasing plan set out in the D&A statement is purely indicative. Nevertheless the Council has a number of concerns:
- 1.25 Primary School Site
- As is indicated in the EIA statement there is likely to be some surplus primary school capacity in the local area at the outset of the development. Given this it is not considered essential to have the school site from the outset of the development. Having the primary school site in phase 1 may, therefore, not be necessary.
 - The fact that the school site would be isolated in the first instance would be far from ideal.
- 1.26 *The Council recommends that the primary school site is planned for a later phase of development, to be agreed in discussion with the applicant and local planning authority.***

1.27 Secondary school site

- It is likely that there may be a period from the commencement of development until there is significant demand for secondary school places. However, the allocation of the secondary school within the development is in part to mitigate the impact of other developments as well as meet existing demand. In this context, and given the potential timescales currently being discussed across a number of stakeholders, there may be a requirement to secure the site ahead of the second phase of development.
- It is anticipated that the development of the main access road would enable the delivery of the majority of the infrastructure required for the delivery of the secondary school site. It is likely therefore that there would be opportunities for the secondary school to be brought forward at an early stage in the development, as required.

1.28 *The Council recommends that the secondary school be shown as a separate phase, not linked to residential development to provide clarity that this could be delivered, as necessary, following commencement of development.*

1.29 In broad terms, the Council supports the on-site provision for both primary and secondary provision and has no significant objections to the development proposals as set out within the outline application documents. However, there are areas where it is considered that further clarity and / or detail is required to enable an effective assessment of the proposals, as set out above and it would be helpful to have clarification of these issues and concerns.

1.30 Set out below are matters of detail in relation to triggers and costs.

Triggers

- 1.31 There is a strong agreement between the Council and applicant to ensure that some of the challenges which arose as a result of the opening of other primary schools are not repeated to ensure effective delivery of school places as and when needed for the development. In order to achieve this it is important that all stakeholders work together to ensure that there is an appropriate balance between surplus capacity and growing demand for places.
- 1.32 This is necessary to ensure that all the schools in the area, existing and new, can deliver high quality education provision. It will also support the integration of the two communities, current and new.
- 1.33 It has been noted on a number of occasions, including by the developer, throughout pre-application discussions that there is a level of surplus capacity within local schools. One significant challenge for the Council is that the proposed development is projected to commence around 2022. This is beyond the period of the demographic forecasts available to the Council. However, it is noted that the current levels of surplus capacity within Cherry

Hinton would allow for a reasonable level of housing development before any further capacity would be required.

- 1.34 It is proposed that the new primary school on the development should not be opened from the outset of the development. Instead, there should be an agreed period of house building and a process to review capacity and demand, including demographic forecasts, to confirm and agree an opening timescale for the new primary school.
- 1.35 Based upon the indicative housing trajectory provided by the developer, it is suggested that this review should occur **no later than 500 dwellings**. Following the review and confirmation of the timescales for delivery of the new primary school, the Council would write to the developer to confirm the timescales for transfer of the site, with transfer to be at least 6 months from date of the review.
- 1.36 Upon transfer the Council would expect the 2.3ha to meet the requirements set out in the Council's site specification (shared previously) and established precedents from previous S106 agreements, including Wing. This would be required in order to ensure that the school would have capacity to accommodate the potential demand arising from additional development, specifically the additional Marshall's land.
- 1.37 It would be expected that developer contributions would fall in line with the Council's adopted triggers:
1. 10% payable on the transfer of the school site;
 2. 65% payable 12 months following transfer of the school site; and
 3. 25% payable 24 months following the transfer of the school site.
- 1.38 It is accepted that even with no surplus capacity within surrounding primary schools, the demand projected from the development would not require a full 2FE school on the site. This would only be anticipated on the basis of the additional Marshalls land adjacent to the site (and therefore not part of this planning application).

Table 2: Estimated cost for primary school provision at LNCH

	Type of provision	Cost Estimate	Index date
LNCH site (1,200 homes)	1.5 FE primary school	£7,440,000	4Q17
Marshall additional (600 homes)	Cost of additional core facilities	£560,000	4Q17
	0.5 FE expansion of primary	£920,000	4Q17
Total	2 FE Primary	£8,720,000	4Q17

- 1.39 These costs, at this stage of the process, are indicative, and 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.
- 1.40 In order to ensure the most efficient design and delivery approach, the Council would seek to secure the accommodation to mitigate the current development and the additional Core Facilities from the outset of development. This ensures that elements such as the hall, kitchens, office and staff accommodation (which can be more expensive to expand at a later date) can be planned into the initial design. In order to achieve this, the Council would seek to secure an undertaking from Marshalls that this additional early expenditure would be reflected within any future S106 contribution, if the additional 600 homes were to be delivered.
- 1.41 Following the review at 500 occupations, if it is concluded that the size of the school proposed can be reduced and still mitigate the impact of the housing development, it is accepted that these costs would need to be reviewed. The costs sought at this stage would need to be adjusted to reflect the proportion of the school needed to mitigate the development. This would include a review of the overall baseline costs should there be a reduction in school size.

Secondary school

- 1.42 The County Council undertook an extensive review of secondary education requirements in Cambridge City between 2012 and 2016. The outcomes of this work was presented to the Council's Children and Young People's Committee in [February 2017](#). This work showed that the Council was in a position, through the opening of a new school in the Northwest Fringe and the expansion of existing schools to secure sufficient provision up to around 2023/4. It also showed that in this period the greatest pressures would be towards the north of the City, with some significant pressure in the Parkside catchment area.
- 1.43 The analysis suggested that the combination of existing demographic pressures and the build out of the proposed Local Plan allocations, including Wing, LNCH and Wort's Causeway, would mean that additional secondary education capacity would be required in the south and east of the City by around 2023/24. Ultimately, this could require at least 4-5 FE additional capacity, with officers considering that ideally a site of 6FE would be required to ensure that future housing developments could be mitigated.
- 1.44 It is accepted by all parties, including colleagues from the ESFA, that the LNCH development cannot be expected to pay for the full school or site area. It is accepted that there would, therefore, need to be an apportionment of these costs between the LNCH site, projected Marshall's additional site, other sites (such as Wing) and the Council's Basic Need / EFSA Free School Capital funds.

Table 2: Estimated cost for secondary school provision at LNCH

	Type of provision	Cost Estimate	Index date
Overall cost	6FE Secondary School (Based on Cambourne West)	£22,215,000	4Q16
LNCH site (1,200 homes)	1.5 FE secondary (cost at 0.25 of 6FE costs)	£5,553,750	4Q16
Marshall additional site (600 homes)	0.5 FE secondary (cost at 0.08 of 6FE costs)	£1,777,200	4Q16
Other sites (e.g. Wing) and Basic Need	4 FE secondary (cost at 0.67 of 6FE costs)	£14,884,050	4Q16

Table 3: Estimated site apportionment for secondary school provision at LNCH

	Proportion of site	Approximate developable footprint ²	Approximate playing field requirements	Overall site requirements
Overall 6FE secondary site (based on BB103)	100%	1.6 Ha	3.2 Ha	5.7 Ha
LNCH site (1,200 homes)	25%	0.4 Ha	0.8 Ha	1.4 Ha
Marshall additional site (600 homes)	8%	0.1 Ha	0.3 Ha	0.5 Ha
Other sites (e.g. Wing) and Basic Need	67%	1.1 Ha	2.1 Ha	3.8 Ha

- 1.45 In line with previous discussions, the Council considers that it is unlikely that the new school would be needed in advance of 2023/24. However, it is recognised that the EFSA and identified sponsor (Knowledge Schools Trust) may have ambitions and aspirations to bring the opening forward from the date. For the purposes of the S106, and in line with the proposed housing trajectory, as shared with the Council, it is suggested that the trigger for transfer of the site should be no later **200 homes** across the development. It would be expected the site would be transferred in line with the Council's standard site specification, as with the Primary School site.
- 1.46 If there is a desire for the school to open earlier, driven by growth in demand outside the development, the Council would wish to see a clause in the S106 which facilitates this. If these circumstances arise it would be accepted that there would be a need for the Council / EFSA to help bear the short-terms costs for any outstanding infrastructure. This would be

² The developable area includes allowances for buildings, hard informal and formal space and informal soft space, habitat areas and areas for parking, deliveries and other ancillary spaces.

on the understanding that these costs would be recouped as the development reached these elements are part of the build out.

- 1.47 It is however, the Council's view that the period up to 200 homes would provide sufficient opportunity for the developer to put in place the necessary infrastructure, and therefore, it may be possible that there is no need to secure mechanisms for early delivery. This is especially true given as the main spine road and junction through the site sits alongside the proposed secondary school.
- 1.48 Reflecting the fact that the majority of the demand for the proposed school comes from outside the development, it is suggested that the approach adopted for Wing should be replicated for the LNCH site.
- 1.49 Upon transfer the Council would expect the 5.7 Ha site to meet the requirements set out above and in the Council's site specification (shared previously) and established precedents from previous S106 agreements, including Wing.
- 1.50 It would be expected that the triggers for developer contributions would be consistent with those agreed for the Wing development, being:
 1. 40% payable by no later than 500th dwelling;
 2. 30% payable by no later than 800th dwelling; and
 3. 30% payable by no later than 1000th dwelling.

2 MINERALS AND WASTE

- 2.1 Officers have held discussions with Peter Brett (applicant's appointed consultant for waste management matters) regarding what is required in respect of the management of waste on the site, and Waste Management Strategy.
- 2.2 However, whilst some of the information requested by council officers has been provided it has not been possible for the applicant to provide all of the information at this outline planning application. Nonetheless, there is a written undertaking in the Site Waste Management Plan and the Waste Management Strategy that additional information will follow under reserved matters applications (if the application is approved); and when a principal contractor is appointed. This includes an estimate of waste arising from demolition; and further details about the resource, re-use and recycling protocols and the site arrangements which will be put in place to manage the waste in a sustainable manner.
Officers are satisfied with the submission, provided that the further information comes forward in due course.
- 2.3 In respect of wider policy matters the majority of the site falls in the **Cambridge East Area of Search. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012)** and the relevant policies in the overarching **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011)** should be fully considered as it makes allocations which are directly relevant to this site. The proposed development falls within a substantial part of an Area of Search allocated by the **adopted Site Specific Proposals Plan for waste management development (Policy SSP W1E)**. Potential uses are identified as being: recycling facility, household recycling centre, temporary inert waste recycling, materials recovery facility and other suitable new waste management technologies.

- 2.4 Whilst the Planning Statement refers to the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, it makes no reference to the associated Site Specific Proposals Plan referred to above. The provisions of neither of these adopted Plans, including the allocation in this area, are taken into account in the application; despite these plans being part of the adopted Development Plan for the area; and it being a requirement of the Final Draft Cherry Hinton SPD (para 2.6).

The Cambridge East Area of Search is surrounded by a Waste Consultation Area designated through Site Specific Proposal Plan Policy SSP W8H, and Policy CS30 of the adopted Core Strategy. This latter policy requires that development will only be permitted within this Waste Consultation Area when it is demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations. Neither the ES or the Planning Statement address these matters; or the cumulative effects of development in the area (which the EIA process is obliged to take into account) as other parts of the Area of Search have / are being proposed for development. Thus the scope for accommodating the allocated uses is rapidly diminishing. **This matter needs to be taken into account when determining this planning application and the balance of infrastructure provision.**

- 2.5 **Officers raise no objection in principle on mineral and waste grounds and request that suitable planning conditions be agreed, in consultation with County Council officers, to secure the necessary information to determine whether the proposed development is acceptable in planning terms.**

3.0 LIBRARY

- 3.1 Cherry Hinton Library is situated in the heart of Cherry Hinton, approximately a mile from the centre of the proposed development. This facility currently provides the local library service to residents, together with the Central Library in Cambridge City centre, and is open 5 days a week for varying periods of time.
- 3.2 As a result of the proposed development, if implemented, and other plans for community provision in Cherry Hinton, there will be additional demands placed on the library service. Whilst potential for a small micro-library has been discussed on the development site, it is considered that the provision of a library services for residents is best met off-site.
- 3.3 The existing Cherry Hinton Library will not be adequate for new communities with an increasing population. To help sustain a library service in this locality, the Council is working with the commercial market, third sector and Cambridge City.
- 3.4 Considering the demographic make-up of both the local community and emerging new community, there is a need and demand for the project that will ensure the social market receives suitable services and benefits. Consideration is being given to accommodating additional services to ensure cultural and civic participation from new residents.
- 3.5 The model used for other successful projects such as Clay Farm, LAPs and new library projects in other emerging communities will inform this project.

- 3.6 Council officers will work with the local planning authority and developer to ensure a contribution towards this project is proportionate and appropriate to mitigate the development impact.

4.0 SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE

- 4.1 Officers have reviewed the documents below and can confirm as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) that there are **have no objections in principle** to the proposed surface water drainage design.
1. Land North of Cherry Hinton Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Peter Brett Associates (ref: 37305) dated March 2018.
 2. Illustrative Masterplan Rev J (ref: 2346 03 /SK033) dated March 2018
- 4.2 The report proposes that a combination of urban rills, linear detention areas, detention basins and below-ground storage will be used to provide conveyance and attenuation across the site. Discharge will be restricted to a maximum of 2.89 l/s/ha to the existing Main Drain and the land drain along Cherry Hinton Road and Airport Way.

Surface Water Drainage Informatives

- 4.3 Within the appendices of the FRA, several options for the strategic surface water drainage features are proposed. One of these is to have attenuation as an above-ground feature which can be utilised as amenity space most of the time. During more extreme events such as the 1 in 30 or 1 in 100, some flooding of these spaces is expected (to a depth of 248 mm and 617 mm respectively). The two other options rely on a below ground system of filter drains with cellular crates or box culverts. The LLFA's preference in this case is for above-ground attenuation as it provides multiple benefits (i.e. use as open space as well as attenuation).
- 4.4 There is some discrepancy between the FRA and the Illustrative Masterplan. The Masterplan does not appear to show the full extent of the main watercourse flowing through the centre of the site.

Surface Water Drainage Conditions

1. Condition

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 Land North of Cherry Hinton Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Peter Brett Associates (ref: 37305) dated March 2018 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.

2. Condition

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 and 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 safeguard against 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

3. Condition

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 building. 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 unadopted drainage systems in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 103 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Ordinary Watercourse Modelling Comments

- 4.5 Officers have reviewed the ordinary watercourse modelling and whilst there are a few areas where officers would like to see the evidence base to strengthen to support the conclusions officers consider that the report is fundamentally suitable. Officers would like to see some additional information at the detailed design stage and this can be secured by condition (see below)

Ordinary Watercourse Modelling Informatives

- 4.6 Please see the attached Modelling Report Review prepared by Capita dated 3 May 2018 for comments and recommendations.

Ordinary Watercourse Modelling Conditions

4. Condition

No work shall commence on site until updated modelling report has been supplied to LA and approve by the LLFA. This should be accompanied by model files.

Reason

To ensure that outstanding model review comments are satisfactorily addressed.

- 4.7 A copy of the Council's consultant report is attached.

5.0 NEW COMMUNITIES AND PUBLIC HEALTH

- 5.1 Public health is an important consideration for new development whether it be an urban extension or new greenfield location, to protect and improve residents health and wellbeing and reduce any health inequalities and it is acknowledged that the applicant has submitted a detailed Health Impact Assessment as part of the outline planning application.
- 5.2 As part of the discussions for the SPD, a number of support workers or projects were identified that can contribute towards the success of the development, and include:-
- Mental health community development workers
 - Kickstart funding
 - Independent Domestic Abuse Advisor
 - Locality workers
 - Children centre workers (and associated equipment for the centre)
 - Social care provision
 - Community development workers
 - School nurse
 - Health visitors
 - Healthy New Town Legacy
- 5.3 Council officers would like to work with the applicant and local planning authority to discuss how these workers can contribute towards the development and seek appropriate developer contributions to support some or all of these roles.
- 5.4 Further, the Council support the application of the New Housing Development and Built Environment Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for Cambridgeshire in determining this application and highlight in particular the potential health impacts arising from the adjacent

airport (such as noise) and also encouraging healthy lifestyles through provision of sufficient open space and recreation opportunities as well as the promotion of active, sustainable travel measures. Officers would refer the local planning authority to the Council's comments made on the SPD with regard to public health.

6.0 GENERIC S106 MATTERS

Indexation

- 6.1 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

- 6.2 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

11th May 2018

APPENDIX 2: TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT COMMENTS

Land North of Cherry Hinton

Application Ref: 18/0481/OUT: CCC Ref: 976

TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT COMMENTS

PREPARED BY: Transport Assessment Team

AUTHOR: Jez Tuttle

CHECKED BY: David Allatt

DATE: 22nd May 2018

Background

The document reviewed is the Transport Assessment dated March 2018, to accompany a planning application for the following;

- Mixed use residential led scheme providing up to 1,200 dwellings (Class C3);
- Potential retirement living facility; up to 90 bed spaces (Class C2/C3 within 1,200 above);
- Local centre; up to 1,850 sq.m floorspace (Use Class A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/B1a/D1/D2 flexible units – of which a food store will not be more than 500sq.m);
- Community hall (Class D2); up to 250sq.m (within 1,850sq.m above);
- Primary School 2FE;
- Secondary School 6FE;
- New primary access street from Cherry Hinton Road to Coldhams Lane (that passes through the local centre), as well as other access routes;
- Pedestrian, cycle and vehicle routes and parking, and;
- Open space and landscaping; including pocket parks, play areas, playing fields allotments, SuDs water features, and formal and informal open space.

CCC is supportive of the principle of development in this location and have supported the development of the Supplementary Planning Document for the site. At this stage we cannot sign off the TA / mitigation package given the deficits set out below. Further information is required from the applicant.

Previous scoping comments

The general methodology behind the Assessment has previously been agreed with CCC. However the following issues that were raised at scoping stage do not appear to have been addressed:

- It is unclear why the junction counts undertaken were 'part classified' rather than fully classified as previously requested.
- The Transport Assessment needs to include option testing for the access onto Coldhams Lane. It needs to be demonstrated that all access options have been explored. The introduction of new signalised junctions results in additional maintenance costs to the County Council. Whilst Commuted sums can be secured, these provide only short term funding and therefore signals should only be installed where there is no other option available.
- CCC recommends that a parking needs assessment is undertaken to investigate existing car ownership levels nearby to better establish the appropriate level. It is important to recognise that a balance needs to be struck between parking provision potentially encouraging high levels of car ownership and seeking to manage the demand to travel by car.

Key comments from this review

- The proposed active travel improvements do not appear to consider comprehensive routes to key destinations from the site, proposing 'part' solutions;
- The growth factors used cannot be accepted at this stage;
- The proposed development active travel mode share is considered to be too high for the 'core test';
- The modelling results cannot be verified / accepted at this stage given that (1) core test car trips may change and (2) the geometric parameters used have not been submitted;
- Results of the model validation exercise have not yet been submitted;
- Whilst it is acknowledged that hard highway infrastructure works are not considered to be the correct way forward, highway mitigation measures may be required depending on the results of the modelling, and;
- The proposed mitigation measures are not sufficiently comprehensive.

Detailed Comments

Para 3.2.2 and Table 3.1 – The distance to each of the destination facilities should be measured from the furthest point on the site to give a 'worst case' scenario. The nature and permeability of the links through the site should also be taken into consideration.

Para 3.2.5 – Again, the distances to the destination facilities should be represented by a 'worst case' scenario and consider the distance from the furthest point on the site.

Para 3.3.37 – Improvements should also be identified that link the site with ‘The Tins’ cycle route. Whilst the report mentions measures on Church End it does not appear to consider Norman Way, despite identifying this route a potential cycle route in Para 3.3.25.

The proposed route along the north side of Coldhams Lane would take cyclists commuting into the city off their desire line at Nuttings Road. A direct route would be very difficult to provide in a safe manner given that the existing carriageway and footways narrow to pass beneath the railway bridge to the west. Alternative routes to the city centre for commuter cycle trips from the site should therefore be explored.

Para 4.5.1 – Evidence should be supplied within the TA that the scope of the base surveys has been agreed with CCC.

Para 4.5.8 and Table 4.7 – It is unclear how the 24 hour estimated flows have been calculated, this must be clarified.

Para 5.3.8 and Table 5.2 – Evidence should be supplied that the sites have been agreed with CCC. Some of those contained within the scoping note appear to be absent from the committed developments.

Para 5.4.2-5.4.5 – TEMPRO factors can be analysed by Ward therefore a more refined calculation should be undertaken to compare the growth associated with the sites, with the adjusted TEMPRO background growth.

Para 7.4.14 – The use of floating bus stops is welcomed provided there have been no inherent issues with the similar facilities along Huntingdon Road in Cambridge.

Para 7.5.15 and Drawing 37305/5501/001 – Junction 1 Airport Way / Cherry Hinton Road

Access Signalised Junction – Further Comments on the geometry/design will be made by Development Control Officers.

Para 7.5.15 and Drawing 37305/5501/002 – Junction 2 Cherry Hinton Road/Gazelle Way/Roundabout Access – The provision for cyclists and pedestrians across this road consists of an uncontrolled crossing with a central refuge tapered at one end and the entry and exit lanes are at least 4.5m wide at the crossing. The design does not incorporate measures to slow vehicles leaving the roundabout and heading into the new development. The central refuge appears to be 3m wide i.e. only just about able to accommodate cargo cycles.

Furthermore there appears to be no improvements proposed for pedestrians and cyclists across the Cherry Hinton Road arm of the roundabout or along Gazelle Way. This is the route that will be used by residents going to Tesco's.

Further Comments on the junction geometry/design will be made by Development Control Officers.

Para 7.5.15 and Drawing 37305/5501/003 – Junction 3 Coldhams Lane / Site Access Signalised Junction – Further Comments on the geometry/design will be made by Development Control Officers.

Para 8.2.3 – More commitment must be given to walking and cycling improvements, these are the key to reducing vehicle trips to an acceptable level. Schemes must be identified at this stage with preliminary designs being produced to show that they are deliverable in practice.

Para 8.3.4 – Confirmation must be provided to show that the bus operators/CCC Passenger Transport Team are satisfied that this service would be viable in light of the issues experienced at the Wing development.

Para 8.4.1 – Whilst the Policy of CCC is to promote walking, cycling and passenger transport to mitigate the impacts of new development, there will be a need to provide some form of highway improvements where necessary.

Para 10.2.3 and Table 10.1 – This table refers to residential trips rates. However education and shopping trips are also included. It is unclear how these trip rates have been derived.

Para 10.2.6 – The correspondence from CCC agreeing the trip rates referred to above should be submitted.

Para 10.4.1 – The internalisation of primary school trips is dependent on the school being completed and open for the first intake of pupils. If this cannot be secured via the planning process, i.e. restrictions on occupation, this assumption could not be accepted.

Para 10.6.1 – The internalisation of trips will again be dependent on the delivery of the Primary School.

Para 11.4.12 – Evidence will be required that the trips accessing the Secondary School as part of a work trip via Airport Way will be 'pass-by trips' and not 'diverted' trips from another part of the network.

Para 11.4.15 – Evidence should also be provided that trips to school via public transport are viable and school children will not simply be dropped off by car as it is more convenient.

Para 12.2.3 and Table 12.1 – Whilst it is recognised that the Cambridge mode share for active travel is higher than National data, using the general Cambridge data as a starting point means that the results will not reflect the location of this site which is on the periphery of the city.

Para 13.2.12 – Again evidence is required that the trips from Airport way to the Secondary School as part of a work trip are all 'bypass' trips (see comments on Para 11.4.12).

Para 14.4.5 and Table 14.2 – The overall vehicle trip generation would appear to be lower than expected for a site which is on the periphery of the city where cycling and walking to the major employment areas is less likely than for areas closer to the City Centre (again see comments relating to Para 12.2.3 and Table 12.1).

Para 14.4.11 – Diagrams showing the geometric parameters for each of the junctions tested should be submitted in order that the modelling parameters can be verified. A comparison table should be submitted showing the modelled queues against the observed for all tested junctions in the base year. This should be carried out for both the 'Google' based data and 'HERE' (satellite navigation) based data scenarios.

The proposed mitigation measures are noted. However comments at the beginning of this review should be taken into consideration in respect of the need to commit to providing quality active travel measures/routes to the City Centre as well as highways works where required.

Conclusion

The conclusions of this Transport Assessment cannot currently be accepted. An amended Transport Assessment addressing all of the above comments should be submitted to the LHA for approval prior to the determination of this application.

The comments of the LHA development control team should also be sought in respect of junction designs, safety audits and internal site layout.