

WELLCOME GENOME CAMPUS OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION

To: Economy and Environment Committee

Meeting Date: 11 July 2019

From: Steve Cox, Executive Director (Place and Economy)

Electoral division(s): Duxford

Forward Plan ref: N/A **Key decision:** No

Purpose: The purpose of this report is to update the Committee on progress and changes to the Council's position in relation to;

- (i) Primary education mitigation
- (ii) Transport assessment consideration

In respect to the outline planning application for mixed use development at the Wellcome Genome Campus.

Recommendation: The Committee is requested to approve the Council's revised education response as set out in section 2 to this report. This amendment to the previous recommendation is to seek land and a financial contribution for up to 2 forms of entry for primary education.

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

1. BACKGROUND

Economy and Environment Committee 14 March 2019

- 1.1 The Economy and Environment Committee received a report at its meeting of 14 March 2019 at which it approved the County Council's response to the Genome Campus planning application.
- 1.2 The relevant report (Item 9) and committee minutes (minute 225) can be accessed through this [link](#).
- 1.3 In respect to education matters the key issues considered by the Committee were:
 - The Council recognised that the general multipliers would not produce the most likely forecasts for this development and therefore it had been agreed to draw a comparison with the Eddington site at North West Cambridge.
 - Regarding early years provision as there were limited spaces at existing providers, the Council supported the proposal to provide early years facilities on the site.
 - The pupil yield was unlikely to be sufficient to justify the provision of an on-site primary school but the impact of the development on existing schools would require mitigation as detailed in the report.
 - The County Council supported the view that there was no need for a new secondary school on site. However, proportionate contributions towards a one form of entry expansion to Sawston Village College was required to mitigate the impact of this development.
- 1.4 The education service has received amended data from the research team and re-assessed the requirements for primary school mitigation having considered the potential pupil forecast arising from the development. Since an agreed dwelling and tenure mix has yet to be agreed with the applicant this re-evaluation of the options for mitigating the impact is necessary to ensure that all scenarios can be accommodated.
- 1.5 Regarding transport, the Committee approved a holding objection on the grounds there were a number of issues identified primarily concerning the development mix, trip generation, internalisation of trips, accident data and mode share as well as a number of outstanding issues concerning the site strategy, off-site improvements and parameter plans which required to be addressed.

2. MAIN ISSUES

Primary Education

- 2.1 An outline planning application has been submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council for further development of the Genome Campus, Hinxton which includes the construction of up to 1,500 dwellings. Normally the starting point for assessing the primary education provision required on the site would be to use the top end of the County Council's general multiplier (40 children aged 4-10 per 100 dwellings). However, there are unique aspects to this development that require an alternative approach hence the Research Team has provided advice on an alternative method of forecasting.

- 2.2 The planning application refers to a very specific set of circumstances regarding tenure and housing mix, designed to meet the on-going needs of workers on the Genome Campus. This also includes (at application stage) no plans for affordable housing on the site.
- Housing mix – studio/one bedroom properties at a higher ratio than other developments.
 - Tenure – leased/rented from the site owners (or Management Company) or privately owned but restrictions on re-sale.
- 2.3 The Eddington site in north-west Cambridge has been identified as the closest comparable development in terms of pupil numbers. At the early stage of that development (particularly the housing for University ‘key workers’), there were relatively low numbers of children compared to what would have been expected given the Council’s general multiplier. This provides a justification in the case of the Genome Campus for not using the 40 children aged 4-10 per 100 dwellings.
- 2.4 For reference, if the standard multiplier (30-40 primary aged children per 100 dwellings) were applied, we would expect between 450-600 primary school pupils aged 4-10 (approximately 2 to 3 forms of entry (FE)).
- 2.5 There is an inherent uncertainty in producing a single alternative forecast due to the wide range of possibilities for the housing mix on the site which will not be determined until later reserved matters stages. Therefore to ensure that adequate mitigation is planned for at an early stage a number of scenarios have been considered:
- Scenario one: Assumes that the maximum possible studio and one bed properties are built (and no four bed). This will yield 143 primary aged children (20 children per year group or 0.7FE). This is a similar figure to the lower range quoted by the developer.
 - Scenario two: Assumes a mid-range number of dwellings are completed for each type. This will yield approximately 280 primary age children (40 per year group or 1.3FE). Again a figure similar to the top end of the range quoted by the developer
 - Scenario three: Assumes the maximum number of 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings are built (within the ranges quoted). This yields, 413 children (60 per year group or 2FE). This is a new scenario not previously considered by the developer.
- 2.6 The range quoted by the developer reflects the low to middle of the possible outcomes (Scenario 1 and 2) and there is a possible scenario that produces higher numbers (Scenario 3). Planning assumptions therefore should focus on managing 1.3FE with a contingency to support a further 0.7FE if required.
- 2.7 In terms of mitigation in order to meet the demand for places arising from this combination of scenarios the Council is no longer seeking off-site contributions to increased capacity at Duxford. With this option the maximum additional capacity that could be created is 0.8FE which would only allow the Council to mitigate Scenario 1. It is now proposed to secure up to 2FE of capacity on a site provided within the Genome Campus. This would require the section 106 agreement to secure the provision of 2.3ha together with financial contributions.

Transport

- 2.8 Following submission of the County Council's transport response to the planning application (a 'holding objection' given matters outstanding on the transport evidence) The County Council Transport Assessment and Highways teams have been involved in ongoing discussions with the Wellcome Trust and its agents 'Vectos'.
- 2.9 Discussions have concerned the Transport Assessment, its associated impact assessment and proposed mitigation. Whilst good progress has been made in addressing some of the issues, there are matters outstanding, and work on the impact assessment is ongoing.
- The applicant's future year 'Paramics' impact model is under review
 - The applicant has submitted its junction proposals for safety audit review
 - CCC has commenced its review of signal models (Linsig) of the proposed signalised junction proposals
 - Without prejudice to the ongoing impact assessment, draft Heads of Terms have been prepared
- 2.10 It should be noted that the application is in a sensitive area from a transport perspective, with the A505 and M11 already facing capacity problems. Given the existing issues and growth pressures, the Combined Authority is about to commission a Strategic A505 Study to consider this area, its transport and growth context, and potential solutions. The study will take around 1 year to complete.
- 2.11 Furthermore, in December 2018 the Greater Cambridge Partnership published the Whittlesford Stage 2 Report, which contains a shortlist of potential transport infrastructure projects within the study area.
- 2.12 There are other major development proposals in the area (i) the Hinxton Agri-Tech site: 112,000sqm employment, presently the subject of a planning appeal, which the Local Planning Authority is defending on spatial planning grounds and (ii) the North Uttlesford Garden Village: a draft allocation in the proposed Uttlesford Local Plan for up to 5,000 dwellings at Great Chesterford.

Transport Notes on the application

- 2.13 **Access Not Included:** It is important to note that the application is for all matters reserved and therefore access is not included in the assessment. The developer has proposed access off the A1301 however the ultimate access detail will need to be approved prior to construction, enforced by condition.
- 2.14 **Crossing the A1301:** The proposed development is on the opposite side of the A1301 to the Genome Campus. This will require pedestrians to cross the road to enable campus interaction. The developer has suggested an at-grade signalised crossing solution combined with some traffic calming measures and speed reductions. These have been subject to a stage 1 Road Safety Audit, which did not identify any significant hazards. However, in order to bring such a crossing forward the additional works and traffic calming along the A1301 would need to be secured by Traffic Regulation Order prior to any Reserved Matters Decision.

- 2.15 **Disparity with Hinxton Appeal Package:** It should be noted that the Wellcome Trust's proposal to address impacts at the A505 McDonald's Roundabout differs from the solution proposed by Hinxton Agri-Tech. The Wellcome Trust propose a signalised solution. In the event that both developments are consented the County will take a view as to which solution is preferred (Hinxton, Wellcome or A505 Study recommendation) and take an equivalent financial contribution as required.
- 2.16 **A Flexible Approach:** Numerous aspects of the Heads of Terms will require flexibility so that mitigation could shift from the direct delivery of defined works (that successfully deal with the development's impacts) to a financial contribution to other strategic works that may go above and beyond this (i.e. the Whittlesford Hub or outcome of the CA Strategic Study).
- 2.17 **Sustainable Movements:** The Genome Campus already boasts a very successful Travel Plan, and the further enhancement of this, combined with a strong focus on internalisation will be key to minimising unsustainable private car use.

Heads of Terms

- 2.18 The transport holding objection remains until the full technical assessment has included and impacts are fully understood, notwithstanding, initial Heads of Terms have been offered by the developer.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 A good quality of life for everyone

The application provides a range of measures to promote healthy lives, including sport, play and leisure uses.

3.2 Thriving places for people to live

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

3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children

The development should provide appropriate mitigation to ensure that the needs of children are met in terms of providing early years, primary and secondary education.

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 developer and the SCDC.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category at this stage.

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

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

Source Documents	Location
South Cambridgeshire District Council planning application reference S/2075/18/OL	South Cambridgeshire District Council planning portal: S/43229/18/OL