

**LAND NORTH OF CHERRY HINTON SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD):
CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

To: Economy and Environment Committee

Meeting Date: 14th September 2017

From: Executive Director – Economy, Transport and Environment

Electoral division(s): Abbey, Cherry Hinton and Teversham

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

Purpose: To consider and approve the County Council's response to the consultation draft Supplementary Planning Document for Land North of Cherry Hinton

Recommendation: The Committee is requested to:

- a) consider and approve the response as set out in Appendix 1; and
- b) delegate to the Executive Director (Economy, Transport and the Environment) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the response.

<i>Officer contact:</i>		<i>Member contacts:</i>	
Name:	Juliet Richardson	Names:	Cllr Ian Bates / Cllr Wotherspoon
Post:	Business Manager	Post:	Chairman / Vice Chairman
Email:	Juliet.Richardson@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	ian.bates@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 699868	Tel:	01223 706398

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The emerging local plans for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire allocate land for residential development at Land North of Cherry Hinton (LNCH) in accordance with the adopted Cambridge East Area Action Plan (2008).
- 1.2 The proposed allocation comprises of approximately 47 hectares of agricultural land and is located between Cherry Hinton Road/Airport Way and Cambridge Airport.
- 1.3 Figure 1 below shows the location of the site and proximity to Cambridge City Centre.



Source: LNCH SPD

Figure 1: Site Location

- 1.4 The site forms part of the wider Cambridge East proposals to eventually provide between 10,000 and 12,000 homes. This will be the second location to come forward for development in the quarter, following the issue of outline planning consent for Land North of Newmarket Road (known as “Wing”) in November 2016. An area immediately west of the site has been identified as having long term potential for further housing, outside of the emerging local plan timescale, but in accordance with the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.
- 1.5 The Council has supported the Cambridge East allocations as part of the broader growth agenda in Cambridgeshire and is actively planning for infrastructure to help facilitate this.

- 1.6 To shape future planning applications for the LNCH site, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are jointly preparing a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD will support the policies contained in the Local Plans and Cambridge East Area Action Plan (2008), and provide planning and design guidance to developers. The SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
- 1.7 Following a series of workshops, which included both County officers and local members, the consultation draft SPD has been published for comments with a deadline of 2nd October 2017.

2. MAIN ISSUES

- 2.1 LNCH is planned to deliver up to 1,200 new homes with supporting infrastructure, including a primary and secondary school, employment, leisure and community facilities. Access to and from the site will be from both Coldhams Lane and Cherry Hinton Road/Airport Way for vehicles, with other potential linkages for pedestrians and cyclists provided to the surrounding area. The route of the spine road will require careful planning to ensure it does not encourage its use as a 'rat run' for motorists.
- 2.2 The delivery of these schools and sustainable transport options are the main priorities for the County Council when development comes forward.
- 2.3 Appendix 1 contains the full officer response and set out below, in paragraphs 2.3 to 2.8, are the salient issues for consideration by committee. Due to the nature of planning policy consultation processes, it may be necessary to enter representations as 'support', 'object' or 'comment' and therefore two objections are recommended in relation to Minerals and Waste and Transport.

EDUCATION

- 2.4 The SPD establishes that any development will need to provide for a new on-site 2 form of entry primary school (420 places) with early years provision. This will be secured through provision of a fully serviced site and funded, in part, by a s106 contribution. The SPD indicates the position of the primary school, close to the local centre, and this is broadly supported by education officers as an appropriate location. This will be subject to reasonable flexibility to respond to adjacent land uses and building heights.
- 2.5 The SPD also identifies a gas main running through the site. It would not be acceptable for this gas main to be situated beneath any part of a school site. The SPD recognises that there is potential to re-route the gas main to ensure the route of the pipe is compatible with development. County Council officers recommend that this requirement is secured in the SPD to facilitate the delivery of the new primary school.
- 2.6 A new secondary school in east Cambridge is necessary to provide new capacity for children from LNCH (and Wing) and also to meet increased demand from Cambridge. The SPD provides a site for a secondary school, where the school buildings will be within the boundary of the LNCH site, and playing fields within the green belt. This approach, and indicated location for the secondary school, is broadly acceptable to the Council, provided that the local planning authorities demonstrate that the green belt tests are satisfied, such

that it would not prejudice a planning application for a new secondary school.

MINERALS AND WASTE

- 2.7 The SPD omits to include the planning policy of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mineral and Waste Core Strategy (2011), and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mineral and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012); both of which are part of the adopted development plan for the area. These policies will need to be referred to in the policy section, and addressed. Officers recommend an objection to the SPD on this point to ensure this is addressed in any approved SPD.

TRANSPORT

- 2.8 The SPD should highlight that the requirements of the final spine road design will be determined by the County Council and local authorities prior to submission of a planning application. The wording in the consultation version suggests that this will be decided through the planning application process, but the County Council require this to be decided prior to a planning application being submitted. Therefore, officers recommend an objection on this point until the wording is altered to “prior to submission of a planning application”.

PUBLIC HEALTH

- 2.9 The SPD has been compared to the New Housing Developments and the Built Environment Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) for Cambridgeshire and its nine key themes. Full comments are provided in Appendix 1.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

There are no significant implications for this priority. Any development may include employment opportunities for the local economy.

3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

There are no significant implications for this priority. Any planning application coming forward will need to demonstrate how it provides for healthy and independent lives in accordance with local plan policies.

3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

There are no significant implications for this priority. Any planning application coming forward will need to demonstrate how it provides for protecting vulnerable people in accordance with local plan policies.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

There are no further resource implications to detail at this stage.

4.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

There are no further resource implications to detail at this stage

4.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no further resource implications to detail at this stage.

4.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications

No further resource implications to detail at this stage.

4.5 Localism and Local Member Involvement

No further resource implications to detail at this stage.

4.6 Public Health Implications

No further resource implications to detail at this stage.

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes or No Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
Has the impact on Statutory, Legal and Risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes or No Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan
Are there any Equality and Diversity implications?	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: Eleanor Bell
Are there any Localism and Local Member involvement issues?	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
<i>Land North of Cherry Hinton Supplementary Planning Document – Consultation Version</i>	<i>Room 304, Shire Hall, Cambridge</i>

**Cambridgeshire County Council Representation
to
Land North of Cherry Hinton Supplementary Planning Document Consultation.**

(Each representation is prefixed with 'support', 'object' or 'comment' to clarify the status of each comment).

EDUCATION

SUPPORT: Education officers generally support the principles set out for education provision and the locations of the schools. However, there does remain a need to retain appropriate flexibility around the building location for the primary school. Both in terms of the site itself, and the surrounding area.

COMMENT: The gas main should not run under any part of the school sites, and any agreed school site will need to meet the site specification requirements set out by the County Council.

COMMENT: The 2.3 hectare primary school site is sufficient to accommodate a 2 form of entry (420 place) school, and sufficient to meet the needs of the proposed development on this site. Officers have encouraged the inclusion of additional safeguarded land to future proof the primary school site for expansion, should the adjacent land come forward for development in the future.

SUPPORT: The principle of secondary school playing fields in the green belt is acceptable to the Education Place Planning team, although it is recognised that there will need to be a balance between providing appropriate boundary treatments, and maintaining the character of the green area.

COMMENT: The local planning authority should satisfy themselves that the greenbelt tests will be met to not prejudice the deliverability of a secondary school.

COMMENT: For completeness, the map of surrounding schools, on page 18 of the SPD, appears to omit Abbey Meadows Primary School, which is within the 1600m isochrone and St Philip's Church of England Primary School, just outside of the 1600m isochrone.

COMMENT: It seems unnecessary, in paragraph 5.94, to state that the secondary school will be a minimum of 6FE to ensure it is educationally and financially viable. Simply state the secondary school will be a minimum of 6 forms of entry (900 places) to serve the SPD site and surrounding areas.

COMMENT: The primary school will include provision for early years. Officers would encourage any development of this nature to also consider provision for a commercially operated nursery. This could be ensuring the appropriate use class designation is included in any planning applications.

MINERALS AND WASTE

OBJECT: The SPD omits to include the planning policy of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mineral and Waste Core Strategy (2011), and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mineral and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012); both of which are part of the adopted development plan for the area.

COMMENT: The adopted Core Strategy seeks to make adequate provision for waste management to meet Cambridgeshire's needs over the period to 2026, and makes allocations for this purpose. The Cherry Hinton site which is the subject of this SPD forms part of a larger Area of Search for the potential location of waste management facilities allocated by Policy SSP W1E of the Site Specific Proposals Plan; and this allocation is safeguarded through Policy SSP W8H which designates a Waste Consultation Area over and around the Area of Search.

COMMENT: Policy SSP W1E allocates the Area of Search at Cambridge East for a range of waste management uses which potentially includes recycling facilities, a Household Recycling Centre, Temporary Inert Waste Recycling, Materials Recovery Facility, and suitable new waste management uses.

COMMENT: Policy CS30 of the Core Strategy provides the overarching policy for Waste Consultation Areas and this states that development will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that this will not prejudice existing or future planned waste management operations.

COMMENT: These policies will need to be included in the policy section of the SPD and addressed in due course. It should also be recognised that the wider Area of Search for the potential location of waste management facilities has been subject to development elsewhere, and has therefore been reduced in size.

FLOODS and WATER

COMMENT: Page 20, Paragraph 3.21 is incomplete '*...onsite attenuation provided to mitigate risk to the wider catchment. Maximise and incorporate existing*'.

TRANSPORT

OBJECT: Page 52 – 5.18 – The SPD should highlight that the requirements of the final spine road design will be determined by CCC and Local Authorities prior to submission of a Planning Application. The wording in the consultation version is that this will be decided through the planning application process, but the County Council require this to be decided prior to a planning application is submitted, therefore wording should be altered to prior to submission of a planning application.

COMMENT: Page 46 - Movement – the 'vehicular access points' on figure 39 are not very clear, these need to be made clearer.

COMMENT: Page 47 – 5.13 should refer to Coldham's Lane/ Barnwell Road not Drive.

COMMENT: Page 51 – 5.16 –The spine road design speed should be agreed with Highways Development Control – 20mph seems most appropriate This should actually refer to Highways

Development Management or the Highway Authority or County Highways rather than Highways Development Control.

COMMENT: Page 53 – Figure 45 is small and not clear to read.

COMMENT: Page 59 –car parking provision should be compared to needs assessment e.g. car ownership levels. This has not been addressed.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The SPD has been compared to the New Housing Developments and the Built Environment Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) for Cambridgeshire¹.

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.

The SPD has therefore been reviewed against these themes to ensure the SPD has identified possible areas which can impact human health and wellbeing and therefore should be mitigated through design and master planning.

For ease of reference the comments on the SPD have been grouped under the nine themes contained in the JSNA as mentioned above.

COMMENT: A. Generic evidence supporting the built environment's impact on health.

It is welcomed that the SPD recognises that "where necessary, appropriate mitigation of environmental and health impacts will be required within any proposal to ensure future residents are provided with a satisfactory living environment" (Page 2 – 1.3 of the SPD). And that the SPD acknowledges both the emerging Cambridge Local Plan, and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan in that in section "2.9 Proposals for residential development will be supported if... "acceptable mitigation of environmental and health impacts (including noise) from the airport can be provided..." In addition the 5.71 of the Open space and recreation section within the SPD states that the development should "also encourage healthy lifestyles and the use of sustainable travel modes, such as cycling."

¹ <http://cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/joint-strategic-needs-assessment/current-jsna-reports/new-housing-developments-and-built-environment>

COMMENT: B. Green space.

There are concerns that the provision of green space may not be sufficient, although the SPD references the policies within each local plan, the labels for pocket parks on the indicative map on page 63 do not match the description on the indicative map on page 43 where they are classed as green corridors, these are not the same and should be clarified.

In addition the dry swales should not be included within the allocation for green space as these may not be available for recreation depending on the condition of the swale e.g. in exceptional flood circumstances.

COMMENT: C. Developing sustainable communities.

The provision of electric charging points within the development is welcomed, however, the provision needs to be more specific and it is suggested the SPD reflects the need for EV charging points in different settings e.g. Residential, Commercial, Carparks etc. also the SPD should reflect the different types of EV charging points (standard and rapid).

It would be beneficial if the SPD had an aspiration that all dwellings are provided with EV charging points.

The acknowledgement that air quality needs to be considered at the design stage (Page 56) is welcomed and the SPD should also consider domestic use of energy as well as energy production i.e. combustion sources within domestic dwellings

The statements regarding s106 monies for 'primary health care facilities' on page 75, needs to be wider. The category of infrastructure should be 'health care facilities' rather than 'primary health care facilities' in order to allow different sectors of the NHS to decide what type of provision would best suit that location i.e. primary and community care provision. In addition the location of any expansion, or new facility may not be within Cherry Hinton so it might be better to reword the requirement to allow a flexible location.

COMMENT: D. Community design (to prevent injuries, crime, and to accommodate people with disabilities).

The SPD does reference the need for "a wide choice, type and mix of housing will be provided to meet the needs of different groups in the community, including families with children, older people and people with disabilities." However this seems only to apply to housing. The needs of disabled or older people and other marginalised groups should be taken into account in all aspects of the masterplan including, but not limited to, the design of green space, transport connectivity etc.

There is no aspiration within the SPD to tackle crime through innovative design.

The aspiration for encouraging developers to incorporate a traffic calmed environment is welcomed. Particularly the reference to using street design, intersecting cross routes to create a natural reduction in speeds, and setting the spine road speed limit to 20mph. The SPD could consider making the entire development a 20mph zone.

COMMENT: E. Connectivity and land use mix.

The incorporation of cycle links, and the access to public transport is welcomed but the s106 requirements (page 75) could be widened to increase the uptake of cycling and walking within, and from the development. For example, any emerging travel plan should include personal travel plans, cycle purchase vouchers etc. In addition the connectivity considerations need to relate to the provision of adequate cycle parking facilities in both commercial buildings and domestic dwellings.

COMMENT: F. Communities that support healthy ageing.

Although the SPD references the need for “a wide choice, type and mix of housing will be provided to meet the needs of different groups in the community, including families with children, older people and people with disabilities.” It does not address the needs of older people specifically.

The SPD should make it explicit that the needs of older people, particularly those with dementia should be taken into account as part of the overall design and master planning.

COMMENT: G. House design and space.

The requirement that the development should include a mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures to meet projected future household needs within Cambridge including integrated housing, and dwellings designed to provide adaptability and flexibility is welcomed.

The SPD could go further and recommend the proportions of dwellings that are built to the Government’s ‘Approved Document M’ standards to ensure that people are able to access and use buildings and their facilities.

COMMENT: H. Access to unhealthy/“Fast Food”.

The SPD could reflect the need to address obesogenic environments that encourage people to eat unhealthily and not do enough exercise by encouraging healthy lifestyle choices through innovative design.

COMMENT: I. Health inequality and the built environment.

The SPD needs to address the need for local employment opportunities further.

ARCHAEOLOGY

COMMENT: The site has been subject to a programme of archaeological evaluation, the results of which indicate that significant archaeological remains survive in the area. Any planning application will require a programme of archaeological excavation, secured by condition, as appropriate methodology for mitigating the development impact.

ENDS