

Planning Committee Minutes

Date: Thursday 29 July 2021

Time: 10am – 14:38pm.

Venue: University of Cambridge Sports Centre

Present: Councillors Batchelor (Chair), Bradnam, Corney, Gardener, Gowing, Kindersley, Rae (Vice Chair), Smith

1. Notification of Chair and Vice Chair

It was resolved to note the appointment of Councillor Henry Batchelor as Chair and Councillor Catherine Rae as Vice Chair of the Planning Committee for the municipal year 2021/22.

2. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies were received from Councillors Connor, Hathorn and Sanderson. Councillor Gowing and Councillor Bradnam substituted.

In relation to declarations of interest, Cllr Mandy Smith explained that her husband was a farmer, and whilst the applicant in Agenda item 5 was not known to her, she wanted to register this information.

Cllr Sebastian Kindersley explained that in relation to Agenda item 5 the applicant had business interests in the Gamlingay area and therefore had been in business meetings that he would have attended. However, there was no known conflict of interest to mean that he cannot be involved in the decision of the item. Furthermore, he explained that in relation to Agenda item 6 both Mr Watkins and Mr Fletcher were known to him, as both had previously been planning officers.

Cllr Bradnam explained that in relation to Agenda item 6 she had attended a Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC) briefing historically on this proposal but was coming to the matter afresh.

During item 6, Councillor Kindersley gave a declaration of interest having worked with one of the public speakers, Dr Alan James, on the development of the East-West rail. He stated this would not affect his judgement.

3. Minutes – 15 April 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 April 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Application for the construction of irrigation reservoirs by the extraction, processing and export of sand and gravel; widening vehicular access onto the A1123 (Hillrow Causeway) at Doles Drove; mineral processing plant, weighbridge and three 6 metre x 3 metre temporary office buildings.

At: Willow Hall Farm, Hillrow Causeway, Haddenham, Ely, CB6 3PA

Applicant: Mr W Dennis, Dennis (Haddenham) Ltd

Application Number: E/3003/18/CM

The Committee received a report on a planning application which sought permission for the construction of three irrigation reservoirs, holding 432,000m³ water, by the extraction, processing and export of 691,000 tonnes of sand and gravel. The development required the widening of vehicular access onto the A1123 (Hillrow Causeway) at Doles Drove; and the construction of a mineral processing plant, weighbridge and three 6x3 metre temporary office buildings.

Production would take five to six years and working times (excluding pre-loaded HGV movements) would be 7am-6pm Monday-Friday and 7am-1pm Saturday. An average of 90 and maximum of 100 HGV movements per day would be generated during the construction of the reservoirs.

The application was made to the County Council rather than Huntingdonshire District Council because it involved mineral extraction. In accordance with local plan policy, the developer was required to demonstrate an agricultural case for the irrigation reservoirs.

Prior to the officer presentation it was clarified that the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published on 20 July 2021 had been taken into account in the officer report, which was also the case for Agenda item 6.

Clarification was also provided by the officer that the day before the committee meeting, Peterborough City Council's Full Council approved the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Local Plan, which meant it was formally adopted by both Councils. As such the Core Strategy and Site-Specific Proposals development plan documents had fallen away, so these references in the officer report should now be ignored. Therefore, if planning permission was granted, officers would ensure that the planning condition reasons would be amended accordingly.

Having provided the above oral updates, the officer proceeded to show plans and photographs of the proposed development site and its surroundings, highlighting how the proposal had been reduced in size, from four to three reservoirs, because of land having been withdrawn from the scheme. Details of the phasing were also explained.

The officer clarified that while 8 and 20 Farm was referred to in the applicant's noise assessment as Third Bridge Holiday Home, the inaccurate naming had not impacted the outcome of the evaluation.

The County Council had employed independent consultants to assess the agricultural need case, air quality and noise.

The officer listed causes of objections to the proposal, including: the effect of dewatering on groundwater levels in third party land; and traffic concerns including highway safety, congestion, noise and air pollution, road damage, and damage to properties.

The officer reported that the applicant had entered into a legal agreement with the Haddenham Level Drainage Commissioners [the internal drainage board (IDB)] had been drawn up and the application had been amended so that the mineral would be worked “wet” and that dewatering would be limited to the reservoir construction periods from October to March. As a result, The Environmental Agency and Natural England had withdrawn their earlier objections, but the IDB and the neighbouring landowner, although objection was maintained by A. G. Wright & Sons Farm Ltd, strongly opposed dewatering during January, February and March so maintained their objections to the application.

The officer also showed alternative routes that the applicant had evaluated in response to traffic objections. However, individual Members showed concern that the alternative routes would still cause congestion as they also went through villages. The transport officer maintained that the route was suitable: the application would generate 8-10 HGV movements per hour while 30 HGV movements an hour was the threshold for ‘severe impact’ on a junction.

In response to Members’ comments, officers stated that there were not any objections from highway colleagues on this scheme; that the information on page 75 and the requirements of condition 7 were not sufficient to satisfy the IDB and neighbouring landowner as the dewatering for two of the three reservoirs was proposed between January and March; and that it was the responsibility of the operator – Mick George Ltd. to ensure compliance with the routing agreement.

The Chair received six requests to speak and invited William Dennis, the applicant, and John Gough (Planning Director – Mick George Ltd), to speak.

Mr Gough addressed the Committee and explained Mick George Ltd advised William Dennis on the engineering and operational aspects of the project. Mr Dennis was therefore in attendance today should Members have any questions relating to the farming business or need for the agricultural reservoir.

Mr Gough noted that, as a result of climate change, the reservoirs would address water and soil resources in a sustainable way and were needed to enable the farm to meet central government objectives for UK Food Security. There had therefore been little to no objection to the principle of the reservoirs.

He commented that the concerns raised by local residents regarded the construction phase of the development. This phase was temporary and could be addressed by conditions placed on the proposal by the Planning Committee; lorry routing would be monitored by HGV GPS trackers and MGL used environmentally friendly HGVs.

In favour of the proposal, the speaker emphasised the sustainability of the scheme (with crop water for local produce) and the long-term biodiversity gains, which would address climate change issues with support from both the NPPF and also the development plan. They encouraged Members to note the largely positive contents of the officer report and emphasised the support provided by statutory consultees.

In response to Member's questions, the speaker:

- Established that there was no reason why construction would extend past the five-year period requested and that the longer HGV route originally considered would not cause the construction time to increase, but would have an impact on carbon emissions (as it was about 3 times longer than that being proposed) and therefore an impact on climate change net zero climate change aspirations which was contrary to the Council's objectives.
- Clarified that they were only seeking an extended dewatering period for two of the three reservoirs i.e., that the initial reservoir (Reservoir A) would be dewatered between October to December; and that the IDB's request to stop dewatering prior to March would significantly impact the construction timescale, leading to a potential delay of one year if they were unable to dewater ahead of the shorter time window. In coming to this view Mr Gough emphasised that the Environment Agency had looked at this matter very carefully and as the relevant body are comfortable with the extended dewatering periods to ensure that the reservoirs are properly constructed.

The Chair invited Mr Michael Church Chairman of the Haddenham Level Drainage Commissioners to speak against the proposal.

Mr Church noted that, after works began for gravel extraction, small dykes had dried up and that he had concerns over the report's limited expectation that water levels would 'probably' recover should dewatering continue until March. This, he argued, was not a strong enough guarantee, especially considering the effects of global warming on summer rainfall.

He emphasised the differences between dewatering in the Haddenham Fen compared to the Needingworth quarry [exemplified in 4.87 of the report]. Needingworth quarry works had caused ground water levels to fall with a draw-down 'halo' extending up to 500-600m beyond the quarry face, and up to 1,500m downstream. However, unlike the Needingworth quarry land, which had been purchased by a gravel company and used by farmers at their own risk, Mr Church argued that the small fields surrounding the Haddenham Fen were owned by farmers and therefore crop growing was more intensive, requiring more water. In his experience, this meant the surrounding crops could be affected during the construction period.

He also stated that the recharge trenches requested by the IDB and supplied by the development, would not be provided for a sufficient length of time.

He concluded that Haddenham Level Drainage Board Commission considered that the storage of the water would be a benefit once built. However, it was the construction phase that was their main concern and as such they would maintain their objection

unless dewatering was scheduled to stop by December 31 each year. He suggested the applicant alternatively dig in watered land.

In response to Members' questions for clarity, Mr Church:

- Confirmed that if dewatering was stopped by December 31, the IDB would be satisfied.
- Stated that the applicant had offered to pump the water out the reservoir and into the void, but that the IDB did not understand how this would sufficiently recharge the ground water.

The Chair invited Councillor Allan Till from Earith Parish Council to speak against the proposal.

Mr Till explained the current impact of traffic on Earith: old houses near the road with shallow foundations were cracking as a result of passing heavy vehicles, and noise levels by the road exceeded World Health Organisation guidelines. He acknowledged that pavements are narrow and not built to support these types of movements. He showed concern that using the A1123 as a travel route for this development would result in an HGV movement every 5-6 minutes, which would exacerbate existing problems. Further, in an environment where work from home had increased, the impact this would have on homeowners' lives was also greater.

The speaker noted that in 1989 a planning application had been rejected on the basis that it would require 90 HGV movements a day through Earith. He compared this to the current situation, stating that traffic had increased since then (public speaker, Wendy Oldfield later noted that traffic in 1989 was a third of current levels).

Mr Till also stated that the proposal regarded mineral extraction but had not been viewed by Mineral Waste Planning and should be rejected on local transport grounds.

The Chair invited Dr Alan James, Chairman of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and Member of the East Cambs HCV Group, to speak against the proposal.

Dr James stated that the CPRE had environmental concerns regarding the development: Haddenham was the only fen between St Ives and Stretham not yet exposed to gravel digging; dewatering in Northstowe had caused damage to the aquifer and nearby trees. He also established that the mineral extraction proposed was not allocated in the new County Mineral and Waste Plan.

The speaker was concerned about the impact of HGV movements on villages and roads. He stated that: the A1123 was already in disrepair, with recent upgrades to the road costing £250,000; the recommended planning conditions allowed vehicles to arrive for loading from 5:30am to get loaded; these vehicle conditions were not followed on Northstowe or Haddenham construction sites; and there was no safe limit for PM2.5s (atmospheric particulate matter with a diameter under 2.5 micrometers) in the 2010 Air Quality Regulations or Air Quality Directives of the EU.

He also stated that the Haddenham Drainage Board Byelaw 3 made it illegal for the County not to reject an application if it has been rejected by the Drainage Board. The legal officer later clarified that fundamentally the Committee is to deal with the planning aspects of this application. Both the Environment Agency and the Internal Drainage Board were statutory consultees in this matter but that it was for the committee, applying their planning judgement and applying weight to those consultation responses, to make the decision on this planning application. If planning permission was granted, the Environment Agency would not necessarily grant a dewatering licence nor would the IDB necessarily would approve the operations under their byelaws.

The Chair invited Mr Nick Wright of the Haddenham Level Drainage Board and owner of A. G. Wright and Sons Farms Ltd. to speak against the application.

Mr Wright explained that he was not objecting to the principle of the reservoirs, but that the applicant needed an abstraction licence. Furthermore, he stated that paragraph 2.7 of the officer report was incorrect - there was insufficient time for groundwater recovery. He also stated that the hydrological impact assessment recorded in paragraph 4.29 of the officer report lacked convincing evidence.

The speaker stated that in a meeting between the applicant and the Haddenham Level Drainage Board on 3 December 2020, the applicant had proposed a wet excavation scheme which would require dewatering in October and November only. Mr Wright showed favour for returning to this original arrangement.

He implored the Committee to protect neighbouring farms from the multimillion-pound mineral extraction scheme by putting dewatering conditions in place and ensuring the applicant followed Environment Agency recommendations to secure a monitoring and mitigation schedule between neighbours.

In response to Members' questions, Mr Wright clarified the Haddenham Level Drainage Board would be prepared to accept the proposal if conditions were placed on the dewatering of the site.

The Chair invited Dr Craig Fannin to speak against the proposal on behalf of A. G. Wright and Sons Farm Ltd.

Dr Fannin explained groundwater levels in the area rose October-December, plateaued in January, then begin to deflate. He used a graphic to demonstrate how this had occurred over 2020 and 2021. In 2020, depleting began 4-6 March. In 2021, depleting began 8 February. Through this evidence, Dr Fannin concluded that dewatering into February and March would not allow the groundwater system to recharge.

The Chair invited Wendy Oldfield to speak against the proposal on behalf of the East Cambridgeshire HCV Group.

Mrs Oldfield noted that a Tarmac mineral application had been refused in 1989 on the basis of traffic impact and that this was endorsed by the Huntingdonshire Local Plan in 1995, that observed that Earith and Bluntisham could not withstand the large volume of HGVs passing through. With 21 occupied listed buildings in a conservation area on Earith's high street, this observation was corroborated by case studies from the

Transport and Road Research Laboratory on the effect of passage induced vibration on heritage buildings. Mrs Oldfield argued that, as a result, the routing plan failed to meet Policy 21 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan (July 2021), which stated that the Council understands the importance of recognising the significance of historic buildings and their settings.

The speaker also argued that the routing plan did not meet various parts of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), such as: Section 8, Promoting health and safe communities – she stated Earith's high street was 4.9 metres wide which caused passing HGVs to mount the footpath; and Section 9, Considering sustainable transport from the earliest stages of planning, or Amenity Considerations (Policy 18 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan (July 2021)) - Noise and vibration levels resulting in disturbance - the HCV Group's environmental survey showed worrying levels of all types of pollution including noise.

The speaker argued that overall there was a lack of evidence to determine diversity net-gain.

She also noted that the application site was not listed in the Mineral Waste Plan, and that mineral reserves at Hanson's Block Fen and Mepal could cover the next 10-20 years.

In response to the Members' questions, the officer clarified to Members that the issues raised regarding the narrowness of Earith's roads had been considered.

In response to Members' questions, Ms Oldfield clarified that the 2018 Earith Parish Council Vehicle Assessment listed in Section 4.13 of the report was measured manually through a video camera. She stated that the statistics given were correct, and that levels had been higher in 2019, prior to Covid-19.

Written comments were received from three Local Members and read out by the Democratic Services Deputy Manager.

Councillor Dan Schumann, as Local Member for Haddenham, expressed his support for the views of Haddenham Parish Council.

Councillor Neil Gough, as Local Member for Cottenham and Willingham, expressed desire for the Committee to take into account the protection offered to residents living in Willingham in the Traffic Management Scheme set out in the conditions of the report. He asked that officers also took sample records of vehicular movements to ensure compliance with the regulations and that Northstowe deliveries follow the A14, rather than the B1050.

The officer responded that the Northstowe development has its own routing agreement which explicitly excluded Earith and Willingham.

Councillor Steve Criswell, as Local Member for Somersham and Earith, expressed his continued objection in line with paragraphs 4.157, 1.42, 1.49, 4.113 of the report. He wrote that the cumulative effect of routing plans through Earith exacerbated existing

traffic problems on the A1123, recorded by the HCV Working Group and HGV Diamond Working Group.

In response to Members' questions:

The officer concluded that the application had undergone assessment for three years owing to changes in the scheme and the applicant responding to objections. Monitoring information had been gathered to understand and justify the dewatering process. The officers had concluded that taking into account the advice of the Environment Agency, subject to climate change anomalies, there was no genuine reason why the dewatering timescale would need to be restricted further.

The Environment Agency [EA] clarified that it held no objection to this application, but that abstraction of water would require additional permissions. The chief concern of the EA was securing the abstraction reach south of the road. The applicant had agreed to mitigate this by dewatering outside of the spray irrigation season and, should trigger levels not be met, ceasing abstraction until further mitigations were in place.

The Environment Agency also clarified paragraph 4.29 of the report: the public may raise concerns and a topographical survey/offsite boreholes could be requested when the applicant sought an abstraction licence from the National Permitting Service. The applicant stated that boreholes had been made on A. G. Wright's land in November, and findings submitted to the Council.

The legal officer explained that the Committee required evidence to place a condition on an application and there was not sufficient evidence to defend placing a condition on further restricting dewatering to cease at the end of December. The Committee could place conditions on quarterly groundwater level monitoring; however, this may duplicate or contradict Environment Agency conditions made later. Dr Fannin advised that real-time ground level monitoring January-March would be more suitable. Officers clarified that weekly monitoring would be measured by the operator. If desired, this information could be shared with the Internal Drainage Board, as well as the Environment Agency. Confirmation was given that additional boreholes had already been placed on Mr Wright's land (13, 14 and 15) by the applicant and had been in place since last November.

Officers explained that the conditions would allow lorries to leave the site at 6am, but that prior to this, workers would be arriving in their own vehicles and not in empty HGVs.

Officers noted that it was unknown why Willingham believed 50% of the traffic would run through the village.

During the debate Members:

- Raised concern that there was no limit on the number of lorries leaving the site at 6am.

- Expressed concerns regarding traffic on the A1123, which does not lead to the A14. However, another member noted that this concern was not significant enough grounds for rejection.
- Expressed regret that they were unable to place more severe restrictions on the dewatering of the site or the monitoring of it. The officer stated they would offer to involve the Internal Drainage Board in groundwater monitoring. **Action.**
- Noted that the applicant had addressed most objections, and that the Committee should only refuse planning permission if they considered the potential impact to outweigh the benefits of the development and fail to comply with planning policy.
- Expressed the need for the Environment Agency to produce a method in which groundwater level reduction can be communicated to all relevant parties particularly the IDB.
- Suggested creating liaison groups with local parishes to allow for public consultation regarding the expected biodiversity gain during the restoration period.

It was proposed by Councillor Bradnam and seconded by Councillor Kindersley to amend Condition 20 to prevent the departure of loaded lorries before 7am This would read [amendment strike through]:

20. Hours of operation

No development including the entry and exit of HGVs shall take place within the site outside the hours of:

07:00 – 19:00 on Mondays to Fridays except bank or public holidays; and 07:00 – 13:00 on Saturdays.

~~Except that pre-loaded HGVs may leave the site between 06:00 and 07:00 on Mondays to Fridays except bank or public holidays.~~

No development authorised by this permission shall take place on Sundays or on bank or public holidays.

Reason: To minimise disturbance to residents and users of the area in accordance with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan Core Strategy DPD (July 2011) policy CS34, East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (April 2015) policy ENV9 and emerging Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (July 2021) Policy 18

The officer stated that greater restriction would likely result in a higher number of lorries during the remaining working hours.

The amendment was passed unanimously.

It was proposed by Councillor Kindersley, seconded by Councillor Bradnam and passed by a majority to accept the recommendations with the amendment.

[Voting pattern: 4 in favour, 3 against, one abstention]

[Councillor Mandy Smith was not present for the following item.]

6. Application for a proposed Travel Hub, to include car parking, cycle, coach, and horse parking, travel hub building, photovoltaic panels, substation, lighting; significant infrastructure improvements to include road widening of the A10 along Cambridge Road, Hauxton Road and M11 Junction 11 north bound slip road, and a new dedicated busway to include strengthening of existing agricultural bridge; provision for a new Shared Use Path, including new bridge across the M11; with associated drainage, landscaping (including reconfiguration of bunds), biodiversity enhancement areas and infrastructure. At: Land to the north/north-west of Hauxton Road (A10), to the north-west and north of Junction 11 of the M11 and to the west of Cambridge Road (A10) CB22 5HT (within the parish of Hauxton and partly within the parish of South Trumpington).

Applicant: Cambridgeshire County Council

Application Number: CCC/20/040/FU

The Committee received a report on a planning application which sought permission for the creation of a travel hub, including 250 car parking spaces [108 EV charging spaces and 108 disabled spaces], bicycle parking [150 chargeable lockers and outside parking], 6 coach parking spaces with electric charging points, and horse parking, a single storey travel hub building, photovoltaic panels [covering a third of the parking area], a substation, lighting; significant infrastructure improvements included road widening of the A10 along Cambridge Road, Hauxton Road and M11 Junction 11 north bound slip road, a new dedicated busway, strengthening of the existing agricultural bridge; provision for a new, lit shared use path [5 metres wide], which included new bridge across the M11 [5.7 metres wide with 4 metre high railing to protect equestrian users]; with associated drainage, landscaping (including reconfiguration of bunds), biodiversity enhancement areas and infrastructure.

The officer presented a PowerPoint which included agenda plans 1-4. They noted that there were no statutory objections, but that the application was brought to the Committee as it was a departure from the adopted development plan.

The officer drew attention to sections 6 and 7 of the report, Support and Objections: where it was explained that objections were received from Hauxton and Harston Parish Councils, Trumpington Resident Associations, CPRE, Past Present and Future, Wildlife Trust, Smarter Cambridge Transport and six individual representations. Support was given from twelve individual representations, bridleway groups, and the British Horse Society.

The officer presented aerial views, diagrams and photographs of the site, and the context of the proposals in the surrounding area, including the application area and land

in the control of the applicant. This also included the bordering Trumpington Meadows Country Park. As seen in paragraphs 9.68-9.71 of the report, the proposed development site was predominantly grade two agricultural land, with the most southern point at grade three. The new non-motorised user bridge, existing bridge and new transport route were highlighted. As were the drainage swale, covered waiting areas [3 metres high], storage, greenery, solar panels / charging points and ponds.

A diagram and 3D image of the proposed single storey transport hub (13.9mx8.06mx4m) was presented to Members. It included a kitchenette, storeroom, waiting room, and gendered, disabled and changing toilets.

Paragraph 5.97 of the report, Biological Enhancements, included grassland, maintained hedgerow, native tree planting and fencing. This included an explanation of the biodiversity net gain assessment.

Paragraphs 9.72 - 9.89 of the report noted the impact of Covid-19 on travel patterns.

A slide highlighting the constraints was also used during the officer presentation, which highlighted the location of the local rivers and the Cambridge Green Belt and how this sat with the Trumpington Meadows housing development and Country Park & Nature Reserve.

The officer concluded that it was recommended by the officers that Members accept the recommendation based on the planning balance set out in the report, that took account of Covid-19 on travel behaviours, the applicant's justification of need found in Section 9 of the report and the lack of statutory objections.

The presenting officer was joined by a transport planner, ecology officer and landscaping consultant to answer Members' questions.

In response to questions, officers' clarified:

- That solar panels were only considered for one aspect of the site in agreement with pre-application advice to minimise glare and obstruction of the green belt and to retain the openness in line with national guidance. However, the infrastructure would be in place underground to allow future development that could result in greater solar panel implementation subject to the necessary planning permissions being granted.
- That a condition was in place for the provision of greater cycle parking details at a later date.
- That, despite the history of the site, a full, intrusive examination of the site had occurred and the environmental health officer (EHO) advised that they do not anticipate any contamination. However, there was a condition placed on the proposal that, should any unanticipated contamination occur, they were duty bound to report it to the EHO. This was later clarified by the applicant.

The Chair invited, Mr David Fletcher to speak in favour of the application on behalf of the applicant.

Mr Fletcher explained that the application was made by Cambridgeshire County Council on behalf of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) as part of the Transport Plan to reduce traffic north east of Trumpington on the A11, A10 Junction 11, M11 Junction 10 and encourage a modal shift in this area. The parking demand was forecast as a likely 30:70 split between the A10 and M11. It would provide alternative parking for the city centre, lowering demand for the Trumpington Park and Ride which, prior to Covid-19, was often at full capacity. He was joined by colleagues from wider specialisms, including transport colleagues, should Members have questions on any of these points.

He stated that the hub would also act as parking provision for the Biomedical Campus which had 17,250 employees in 2019, with an expected increase of 30% by 2030, and 800,000 patients and visitors in 2018, with an expected increase to 1.4 million by 2031.

The speaker noted that the Travel Hub would provide environmental parking, with a biodiversity net gain, and a lit pedestrian/cycle/bridal route into Cambridge City which reflected the modal shift away from motor car travel and linked to the Melbourn Greenway.

Mr Fletcher concluded that the application was supported by Camcycle and the biomedical campus. There were no statutory consultee objections to the proposal which had more representations supporting than objecting the proposal.

In response to Members' questions, Mr Fletcher (supported by technical colleagues):

- Reported that there had not been a survey of biomedical campus employees to understand whether their own transport methods would reflect the modal change of transport. However, detailed surveys found individuals were uncomfortable using the M11 path and that throughfare of the lit path could be as high as 500 cyclists per day (there were currently 100-150 cyclists entering Cambridge per day through alternative routes). They also found that the proposal reflected transport demand shown in the Cambridgeshire Sub-regional Transport Model which showed an increasing demand for bus transport.
- Established that the applicant would apply for a traffic regulation order on traffic light timing at Junction 11 to increase junction efficiency.
- Established that the Transport Model used would have identified any possible rerouting of cars from the M11 into smaller villages. The impact of this would be minimised by the location of the Transport Hub in the M11/A11 corridor.
- That every EV charging points would be slow and fast charging.
- That the land was generally level, but that storage had not been placed in the east, where the land was lowest.
- That there would be no planting near disability parking to increase ease of access.

- That the footprint of the travel hub had been kept small to allow for the green belt. PV panels would not allow for a planting, hence only a third of car parking would be covered.

Members' raised concerns:

- That the modal shift in transport use predominantly applied to short-distance travel. This was mis-aligned with the needs of M11 users, the majority of whom travelled further.
- That the A10 and A603 between the park and ride in Madingley and Trumpington was stationary at peak times. The development of the transport hub would increase this.
- About the re-routing of cars on the M11 through smaller villages.
- Expressed that cyclists already had a cycle route into Cambridge along the A10, limiting the justification for the development of a new route.

The Chair invited Dr Alan James, Chairman of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE), to speak against the proposal. He strongly objected to the environmental impact of the development.

Dr James expressed the belief that that application's justification for development was insufficient to allow for development on Cambridgeshire's green belt in accordance with NPPF Paragraphs 147-149. He argued that the development would increase footfall, pollution and noise pollution in the Trumpington Meadow Reserve; would erode the open landscape of the area; would put Fenland farmland at risk; and encourage development on the other side of the road. He also raised concerns that run off from the site would contaminate the river.

He suggested alternative options which included:

- Deferring the application until there was further knowledge about the long-term change in working patterns resulting from Covid-19, and the Cambridge Integrated Transport Plan was produced.
- Instead building upon pre-existing car parks in Addenbrookes and the Biomedical Campus.
- Should the development continue, covering the parking with solar cloth for which there is no glare.

Written comments were received from the Local Member, Councillor Brian Milnes and read out by the Democratic Services Deputy Manager.

Councillor Milnes expressed his general support for the application but raised concerns regarding the limited number of solar panels and the likelihood that necessary regulations to alleviate traffic would not occur.

In response to Members' questions, officers clarified:

- That, unlike environmental groups, the Biodiversity Officer continued to favour the application because there was a biodiversity net gain for local habitats, and the local flood authority had found filtration systems that would prevent water contamination and aid site drainage.
- That the Environment Agency had stated a separate application for the outfall was also likely to be required.
- Meetings with the Wildlife Trust had occurred and a letter of comfort had been produced to secure fencing and therefore reduce footfall on the Trumpington Meadow Reserve in this quiet area of the park with ground-nesting birds. Footfall in the Country Park would also be monitored for 25 years and measures were proposed on the landscaping and management of the site, whilst not predetermining who might do that on behalf of the applicant.
- That the Wildlife Trust had been opposed to the location, but not necessarily to the development itself and therefore had worked with the applicant to ensure that suitable mitigation could be found.

During the debate, Members noted:

- That construction costs had not been taken into account in the presentations or the planning balance (as it was acknowledged that this was not a material planning reason) but it should be a point considered by the Committee as part of the wider Council implications of the scheme.
- The written letter of Mr Jim Chisholm against the development is acknowledged. This letter raised the fact park and rides encourage people to drive to the bus, rather than take the bus directly. This would result in a negative impact on the environment. It suggested the money spent on this project, could be used to increase bus provision.
- That there were many ongoing but incohesive public transportation developments occurring in the area such as the East-West Rail, Cambridge South Station, CSET (Cambridge South East Transport) and bus investments. Information was requested on how the Travel Hub would link into this plan.
- That the development would undermine the purpose of the green belt and the Trumpington Meadow Reserve. Furthermore, the appearance of the development resembled a car park, rather than a travel hub and had not properly taken into account the Council's Climate Change Emergency or provided sufficient evidence of how modal shift would be achieved.
- Raised concern that the Milton park and ride was currently eroding the green belt and urged caution in developing on the green belt again.

It was proposed by Councillor Kindersley, seconded by Councillor Corney and passed unanimously to defer the item for further information.

Further information requested for the deferral:

- Justification and use of the travel hub (to include covid considerations, demand patterns and including calculated travel modes)
- S106 for the Trumpington Meadows development, including impact on the use of this land on the adjacent Trumpington Meadows Nature Reserve;
- Green belt impact
- Pollution concerns including drainage;
- Researching the possible expansion of solar panels and charging points;
- Travel connectivity (with regard to the wider transport travel plans for the County and future arrangements such as East / West Rail and Cambridge South Station);
- Need to establish impact on the Council's climate change agenda;
- Clarification of landscaping and height of the species to be planted.

7. Summary of Decisions Taken under Delegated Powers

A member urged the development of the zebra crossing in Section 9 of the report to meet the September deadline.

The Committee resolved unanimously to note its summary of decisions taken under delegated powers.

Chair