

WATERBEACH PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held at 7.30 pm on Tuesday 23 October 2018 at the Old Pavilion, Waterbeach.

18/112 THOSE PRESENT / APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Present: Cllrs Bull, Gilzean, Grant, Howlett, B Johnson, P Johnson, Rabbett, Seamarks, Shipp, B Williams, J Williams, J Williamson, M Williamson, Wright
Apologies: Cllr Bavester, Grant, Howlett, Shipp District Cllrs Rippeth and Smith

In Attendance: S Mason – Clerk, County Cllr Bradnam, Tim Slater (planning consultant)

18/113 OPEN FORUM

Nothing raised

18114 MEMBERS' INTERESTS

None reported

18/115 MINUTES

The minutes of the Parish Council meeting on 2 October were agreed and signed a true record of the meeting.

Proposed: Cllr Bull Seconded: Cllr Wright In favour 10 Abstentions 1 Unanimous

18/116 PLANNING APPLICATION

a. To comment on the following application:

[S/3764/18/FL](#) Revised design of approved 2 storey side extension (S/1307/17/FL)
12, Kirby Road, Waterbeach, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB25 9LX

Council had **NO OBJECTION** to the revised design.

Proposed Cllr J Williams Seconded: Cllr Rabbett In favour 5, Against 4, Abstentions 2.

County Cllr Bradnam arrived at 7.40

18/117 SCDC CONSULTATION ON THE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

a) To agree what comments to make on the [Supplementary Planning Document](#).

Standing Orders were suspended for this item to enable Tim Slater, WPC Planning consultant, to contribute to the discussion prior to his departure at 9.15pm, at which point Standing Orders were reinstated.

The Council worked through the document carefully. Owing to its length, the record of the proceedings is at [Annex A](#).

b) To approve a payment of £186 to Print Design Direct for the printing of the mailshot (this is due to be distributed on Monday).

The Council **APPROVED** the payment

Proposed Cllr Bull Seconded Cllr B Williams Unanimous

18/118 [S/0559/17/OL](#) **Outline Planning Application for up to 6,500 dwellings (including up to 600 residential institutional units), business, retail, community, leisure and sports uses; a hotel; new primary and secondary schools; green open spaces including parks, ecological areas and woodlands; principal new accesses from the A10 and other points of access; associated infrastructure, groundworks and demolition; with all matters reserved except for the first primary junction from the A10.**

Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield Site, Waterbeach, Cambridgeshire
Secretary of State for Defence and Urban&Civic Plc

Further to the District Council [consultation letter](#), SCDC had highlighted which documents had been amended and offered to provide a short briefing to Cllrs. The Clerk was asked to arrange, if possible, for this to be prior to the November meeting of the Council.

18/119 **JOINT MINERALS & WASTE LOCAL PLAN**

To agree a response to the CCC/PCC email ([link to letter and interactive map here](#)) and comment on the plan (due by 31 October).

It was **AGREED** that the Council would make the following comments:

- All references to EfW are removed from the WWMP currently managed by Amey
- Any development must not exceed 16m in height in Levitts Field due to the impact on Denny Abbey
- Any new developments must be odour free and meet air quality requirements of the proposed new town.
- No new licenses should be permitted due to the proximity to the New Town. (Note too that WPC continues to raise concerns about breaches of EA permit limits (currently 3 actions outstanding with the EA) and the poor track record of the WWMP site operator

Proposed Cllr Seamarks Seconded Cllr B Williams. In favour 10, Abstention 1

The meeting closed at 10pm

WATERBEACH PARISH COUNCIL
Council meeting 23 October

Item 18/117 – decisions and comments on the Supplementary Planning Document for Waterbeach New Town

Chronology

It would appear that the SPD was cleared for consultation even before the adoption of the Local Plan. It is therefore unclear if the appropriate policies were applied to the SPD.

- Have the Inspector's main modifications policies to make the Local Plan sound been included in the SPD?
- Have the [concerns of Scrutiny Committee](#) and [decisions by 5th Sept Cabinet](#) been applied to the SDP prior to consultation as identified in the Minutes of the latter?

If the answer is no then how can the consultation be sound? A recast and a rescheduling of the process would be necessary.

Proposed Cllr Rabbett Seconded Cllr Bull Unanimous

Ownership

The Parish Council has serious concerns regarding multiple ownership of the site. To date there is little evidence of cooperation between the two which does not augur well for the future and the SPD does not effectively deal with this. At the outset there needs to be an agreed mechanism to deal with disputes, either by way of arbitration or an agreed process and timeline for dispute resolution Without this there is no prospect of a smooth delivery process or a seamless integrate new town at the end of it. There is an unacceptable level of risk that the existing village would be left in limbo, while for SCDC, as the planning authority, the danger of being effectively held to ransom and manoeuvred into a sub-optimal solution cannot be overstated.

Proposed Cllr Rabbett Seconded Cllr Bull Unanimous

The items below are identified by their pages number in chronological order.

Page 8 - Relationship to existing village

WPC asks for the relationship to the existing village to reflect SS6 policies i.e with some separation to be provided to protect the character and identity of the village. Protecting the identity and character of Waterbeach as a Village close to the New Town is included in 4 SS5 policies: MM058, MM065, MM075, MM076 and as part of the SPD Vision. Close is defined as being close distance away or apart.

Proposed Cllr B Williams Seconded Cllr Seamarks Unanimous

Page 42 Education

WPC objects to the siting of the phase 1 primary school, and special needs school, owing to their close proximity to the A10 and the potential effect on young children's health. These buildings should be positioned further into the town.

Proposed Cllr Bull Seconded Cllr J Williams Unanimous

Page 45 Primary movement and access

WPC objects to the use of Cody Road as a vehicular access route to the Station District. Access should be in place from the A10 with both U & C and RLW Estates agreeing to this before the new station is built.

Proposed Cllr Seamarks Seconded Cllr Gilzean

Page 52 Public Spaces

WPC asks that the plans ensure that all public spaces are exempt from being partially used as Sustainable Drainage Systems.

Proposed Cllr Bull Seconded Cllr B Williams Unanimous

Page 63-69 Scale and massing

WPC is concerned about the number of dwellings the SPD seems to be supporting. The numbers should be a district requirement supported by SS6 policies and not developer driven. All references to 10,000 and 11,000 dwellings should therefore be removed since this number is not at all consistent with the adopted Local Plan. .Based on the figures in Table 2 on page 63, a figure of 9,000 will result in a blanket residential density of 40. As a comparison, the new Bovis development at Bannold Drove is understood to have a density figure of 38 and it is clear how little green open space they provide.

Proposed Cllr B Williams Seconded Cllr Bull Unanimous

The indicative high density buildings adjacent to the proposed railway station are not in keeping with the fenland landscape on the eastern side of the railway line. They should therefore be reduced in scale. And the lowest density adjacent to Denny Abbey 1-2, should also be reflected and matched where the new town joins Waterbeach.

Proposed Cllr B Williams Seconded Cllr Gilzean Unanimous

Height page 68

Proposals for 7 or 8 storey building are not supported by Local Plan policies SS6 which clearly state in SC-MM058 that it will draw on the traditions of other Fen Edge Market Towns. We are not aware that any of those have 8 story (or even 6 story) buildings. And even the Masterplan for Ely Station area in East Cambs is understood to restrict building to a maximum 4 storey in a very similar landscape to Waterbeach. Development should be limited to 4 storeys with massing around the current village restricted to 2 storeys.

Proposed Cllr Bull Seconded Cllr J Williams Unanimous

Page 86-89 Movement and Place

The following substantive motion was proposed:

Cllr J Williamson proposed that there should be access for Waterbeach residents only to a parking facility this side of the new railway station

A second motion was proposed that there should be access for Waterbeach and Horningsea residents only to a parking facility this side of the new railway station.

The second motion was voted on first.

Proposed: Cllr J Williamson Seconded Cllr M Williamson

In favour: 5 Against: 5. Abstention: 1.

The motion **FELL** as there was no majority.

The meeting therefore moved to take a vote on the substantive motion:

Proposed: Cllr J Williamson. Seconded: M Williamson

In favour 3 Against 5 Abstentions 3

The motion was **NOT CARRIED**

WPC supports the table of principles on page 89 which is based on a user hierarchy that prioritises sustainable modes of travel without ruling out car travel.

The focus on public transport routes serving the new town should not be allowed to lead to the removal of services to the existing village and there should be a connection from the village to a Park and Ride service.

Proposed: Cllr Bull Seconded: Cllr M Williamson In favour 10 Abstention 1

Key worker housing page 91

This should be removed as the term is inherently unfair since all workers are key and it will penalise some categories of workers.

Cllr Rabbett Seconded Cllr M Williamson Unanimous

Health page 96

- Air quality (also page 111): The negative impact of the Waste Management Park, where the track record of the operator is poor, will adversely impact on the new town. The impact of Amey poor management must be addressed in the SPD with measures put in place to reduce risk to the new town e.g. working smarter with the EA and requesting that fines and prosecutions to be actioned quicker.
- .Due to the high level number of complaints regarding smells from Amey Cespa East operations there needs to be a firm commitment that CCC will work and support the EA and Amey to reduce air quality issues from the Amey site. The operator needs to start following its licences not continuously breaching them (currently 3 actions outstanding with the EA), and the County Council as a partner should have an active role to play.

Proposed Cllr Seamarks Seconded Cllr Rabbett In favour 6. Against 3 Abstention 2

- Please can we be told to what extent of the proposed Waterbeach New Town land is contaminated (SS6 para 3.15a and b refers). What will it cost to make it safe, how will this be achieved and how might it affect the viability of the site?

Page 101 - Suds Design

It is essential that SUDs are safe, and if adjacent to paths where people are walking and cycling, there should be a restriction on the depth of them.

Cllr Bull Seconded Cllr B Johnson Unanimous

WPC would also like to ask for clarification on:

- Noting the problems already dogging Bannold Road, what assurances are there that the schemes which need to be designed for SUDS will work and that Waterbeach village will not suffer from flooding?

- How might the proposals affect water levels at Wicken Fen and the Cam washes?

Page 104 Productive planting and landscapes

WPC would also like to ask for clarification on

- who will take on the responsibility and care for this?
- How will it be funded?

Page 106-107 Sustainability

There is a lot of aspirational wording in this section (“Seek”, “Actively Consider” and “Explore” – which is meaningless unless there are binding commitments written into the contracts with developers that they must abide by what is written in the SPD.

WPC suggests that buildings should meet BREEAM certification standards as this is a good measure of the sustainability of a development.

Page 108 Water stress

Waterbeach is located within an area of serious water stress which raises the following questions:

- Why is there no reference to a new water main
- What guarantees are there to enable a constant water supply for the new town and Waterbeach village?
- How will Wicken Fen and the Cam Washes be safeguarded?

Page 109 - Sustainable waste

Regarding the plan for a temporary waste management facility on-site, access into this will be a concern and WPC would therefore like clarification on this point.

6.2 infrastructure page126: Water treatment and sewage works

WPC asks that the SPD specifies that treatment plants should not be placed within 1,000 meters of recreational facilities such as the River Cam or parks etc

Cllr Seamarks Seconded Cllr B Johnson Unanimous

Page 138 Approaches to Delivery

Conditions should be made for and proven to have been met before work commences on every phase of the new town. This follows the appalling lack of conditions being met on the Bannold Road **developments**, and building commencing without these in place.

Enforcement needs to be taken seriously during the building of the new town, so that all work related traffic is kept out of Waterbeach.

Waterbeach must be fully consulted prior to any potential traffic calming measures being considered.

6.3 Housing delivery rates page 139

National Rail are upgrading the existing station in 2019 and it is not fair on the existing users or the environment to move the station until there is a critical mass in place. WPC would therefore like to see an additional provision that:

The train station should not move until a minimum of 1,500 homes are delivered.

Proposed Cllr Seamarks Seconded Cllr Rabbett In favour 8 Abstentions` 3

Page 142 Viability and sustainability

It is not at all clear when and how supporting infrastructure will be delivered or funded. SCDC is already well aware of the concerns that have been already expressed about incompatibility of timing between potential development and a future upgrade the A10 (where there is still no real available on scheme design, funding or timing).

Monitoring and review. There is no evidence of collaborative working of the landowners, council and key stakeholders.” The Local Plan Inspector referenced the importance of how the plan is monitored, managed, and reviewed and these issues need to be in place at the outset. Please can we therefore ask for clarification on:

- How will SCDC achieve these tasks so that planning conditions/S106 agreements are rigorously monitored to ensure the developers meet their obligations?
- What sort of enforcement actions will be implemented, if needed?
- How will construction traffic be monitored and managed throughout the construction phase?

Page 147 -S106 Agreements

Inevitably there will be growing pressures on existing village facilities residents move into the new town. These pressures will arise before any of the usual S106 triggers (e.g 50% occupation rates) kick in. WPC would therefore like to request that SCDC makes some provision for S106 to be made available to it to cover costs of residents of the new town using the existing facilities of the Parish prior to their own being in place. WPC would also like the opportunity to participate in the drawing up of heads of term agreements.

Crime and emergency services

The meeting discussed concerns about crime. The fear of crime is a major impact on health. It was claimed that Orchard Park is now one of the UKs hotspots for some crime and that housing associations now refuse to fix broken outbuildings due to repeated incidents. With the RLW design of vehicles parking away from buildings and people walking around, crime risk reduction measures need to be incorporated into the SPD. The Council was also surprised that there is no reference in the SPD to provision for the emergency services.