

WATERBEACH PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on Wednesday 8 January 2020 at 7.30pm

THOSE PRESENT / APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Present: Cllrs Bavester, Bull, Gilzean, Grant, Howlett, P Johnson. Rabbett, Seamarks, J Williams, J Williamson, right

Apologies: Cllrs B Johnson, Shipp, B Williams, M Williamson

Also in attendance: County Cllr Bradnam, Tim Slater Planning Consultant
S Mason, Clerk

19/194 OPEN FORUM

No members of the public were present

19/195 MEMBERS' INTERESTS

None declared

19/196 Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield Site, Waterbeach – [S/0559/17/OL](#)

Discharge of Conditions as follows (plus any further ones if received in advance of the meeting):

[S/3884/19/DC](#) Discharge of condition 8(site wide construction environmental management strategy), 9(explosive ordnance mitigation and safety management plan),10(h) (archaeological written scheme of investigation) and 10(i) (land investigation and remediation scheme) pursuant to outline planning permission S/0559/17/OL

[S/4257/19/DC](#) Discharge of condition 10.a (Schedule of Uses and Quantum of development)

[S/4258/19/DC](#) Discharge of condition 10.b (Delivery Plan)

[S/4259/19/DC](#) Discharge of condition 10.c (Travel Plan)

[S/4260/19/DC](#) Discharge of condition 10.d (Site Access Strategy)

[S/4261/19/DC](#) Discharge of condition 10.e (Arboricultural Statement)

[S/4262/19/DC](#) Discharge of condition 10.j & k (Key Phase Surface Water and Foul Water Drainage Strategy)

[S/4263/19/DC](#) Discharge of condition 10.l (Sustainability Statement)

[S/4264/19/DC](#) Discharge of condition 10.m (Details of Existing and Proposed Site Levels and Land Profiling)

[S/4265/19/DC](#) Discharge of condition 10.n (Ecological Management Plan including Biodiversity Impact Assessment)

[S/4283/19/DC](#) Discharge of condition 13 (Heritage Strategy)

Tim Slater summarised the applications before the Council and explained how they had only been split into separate applications to make it easier to deal with the not inconsiderable volume of paper involved. In discussion the following responses were agreed:

Members suggested that as well as using the planning portal, the Clerk should produce a consolidated return and send it directly to the SCDC Planning Officer.

General comments

Overall there are a number of omissions and uncertainties in the condition discharge submissions.

Sequence of decision- given that the Delivery Plan is in essence a combination/ summary of the other condition discharge submissions, and contains details that have yet to be submitted/ considered, it is considered inappropriate to be asked to comment on the

Delivery Plan before the Design Code has been considered and questioned in respect to the other conditions addressed.

Matters of ongoing concern to Waterbeach Parish Council (WPC)

Health facility -The existing facility in Waterbeach is already under severe strain given recent growth and development in the village. Currently it has been put into special measures having been rated inadequate in a recent CQC inspection. The backstop for the new health centre is 250 houses – the PC urges that it should be delivered early on and certainly well in advance of the 250 occupations set out in the S106. WPC would also like to ask for clarity to confirm that construction workers will have their own discrete welfare facilities on site and will not use those of the current doctors and impose additional burdens on the practice.

Electricity - WPC is aware that there are serious concerns about available grid capacity in Cambridgeshire. How much power is the whole site going to need; how will it be provided and how will appropriate investment be assured? It understands there is some provision for localised on-site generation but what assurances are there that this will be sufficient to meet needs throughout the development's life?

This is particularly important with the move towards electric cars and domestic charge points which can place considerable load on the grid in a development of this size. Given the concerns about electricity capacity, can the developers confirm whether houses will have smart meters and be able to participate in the implementation of DSR (Demand Side Response) and ESA (Energy Smart Appliances)?

Cemetery - The cemetery extension was transferred and was registered in the ownership of Waterbeach Parish Council in May 2018 and is not under U&C control as indicated on the submission maps. It is requested that this be addressed.

Naming strategy - The town should have a name of its own at an early stage and features within it should not have a Waterbeach preface. This means that Waterbeach Gardens and Waterbeach Woods are not appropriate and the maps need to be updated. The WPC will consider some suggestions at their February meeting and suggests that the potential name should be an item of discussion at the next SCDC Community Forum on 26 February.

Condition discharge submissions reference by Condition 10 sequence number

C9 explosive ordnance strategy - WPC supports the tiered risk assessment approach identified.

Quantum of development C10a - Quantum – whilst it is acknowledged that this is largely in accordance with the permission and the S106 agreement, WPC expresses concern regarding the use of the existing indoor sport facilities for up to 1,000 dwellings. It questions if this is sufficient to ensure capacity for all village and new residents.

It is noted that in discussions with U and C there has been a commitment to bring sporting facilities and open space at the South of the site (off Denny End Road) forward as soon as possible. It is disappointing that this is not clear in the documents.

Delivery Plan C10b - It is considered to be inappropriate to be asked to comment on the Delivery Plan before the Design Code is finalised and has been circulated for review. Many parts of the delivery plan refer to elements of the Design Code and cannot be assessed out of context.

Travel plan- C10c - It is noted that the travel plan makes a number of commitments and in principle these are welcomed. However it is noted that a bus turn facility is proposed at the existing station car park. WPC is concerned that there is no obvious space for this and that it is related to a separate planning permission on land not in the ownership or control of Urban & Civic. WPC notes that no planning application has yet been made for this provision but believes it is an essential part of the promotion of public transport and ability to meet this condition. At Clayhithe Road there could be ecology and/or flood concerns as well as issues with identifying a suitable location for these plans that WPC believe need to be explored.

WPC notes that the public transport measures are intended only for the new residents and requests that they be put in place during construction to enable building workers to use public transport, especially since the developers have stressed it is their intention to use local firms and not need construction staff to live on site.

Access plan and construction access plans- C8 and 10d - The Denny End road junction is not fit for purpose. It is essential that this pinch point is remodelled to allow non construction traffic to proceed unhindered. Therefore, it is also essential to provide sufficient turning space for large HGVs (so they do not need to go the wrong side of the islands as at present) while ensuring phasing of the signals is better for northbound traffic turning right.

A left turn out of the site (Cadet Force entrance) should be prohibited to ensure construction traffic does not pass down the village.

The site access strategy states that vehicles will be checked for entry, thus it is important that there is no backing up of traffic turning into the Cadet Force entrance as that could lead to blocking Denny End Road entrance to the village. The developers have said the Cadet Force entrance will only be used for construction traffic during the building of the link road from the northern roundabout but the documents do not seem to specifically limit the use of the Cadet Force access. Moreover, the layby by the Cadet's facility also needs to be brought up to standard before construction commences

Good signage is essential to ensure construction traffic does not proceed through village or turn off at the Taste of Goa junction.

To minimise use of the Denny End entrances, WPC urges that the 2nd junction off the A10 should be constructed early in the programme so that Denny End Road is then used only by non-construction traffic (although the Cadet Force entrance should be available for emergency vehicles if required). Assuming this cannot be delivered at the very outset, the construction of the second major access point should nonetheless be prioritised.

Arbocultural Strategy -C10e - Replanting should be primarily, and preferably entirely, with native trees grown from the outset in the UK so that no infectious diseases or foreign species are imported. This is consistent with the Neighbourhood Plan and important given the Cambs Washes SSI nearby and the number of trees involved. Pests such as the Oak Processionary Moth resulted from developers importing semi mature trees in Kew.

Archaeology C10h - No objection.

Land investigation and remediation C10i - No objection

Foul and surface water- C10j and k - Sewage/foul water – WPC understood that there was sufficient spare capacity in the research park for 1600 houses but ask how this can be assured for other facilities (school, hotel, retail etc.). In recent weeks there has been an application for a significant expansion of the Research Park itself - what confidence is there that there is sufficient capacity given this more recent development (and indeed others that may follow)?

Water – WPC notes that the Environment Agency and Flood experts have not been able to provide a response and feel unable to do so until they have further details. This is significant. Anglian Water have commented that there would be issues regarding SuDS on contaminated land – which this development will be. WPC trusts all concerns raised over surface drainage and other water-related matters will be addressed by these important consultees.

SCDC should have up to date knowledge on the number of tankers already accessing the Waterbeach Recycling Centre both daily and weekly, WPC are concerned that additional tanker traffic may result from the development. Accordingly WPC has asked AW for this information and will forward any correspondence to you as part of evidence.

Sustainability C10l – WPC requests that this strategy be tied more closely to the wider UN sustainability goals and would like to see some specific worked examples to indicate how such goals will be addressed rather than the broad statements, for example 12.2.8 which has no KPIs and no reference to dates or roll out. In a presentation to the WPC by the developers the sustainability strategy was addressed but WPC would like firm commitments to delivery and KPIs against which progress can be assessed.

Ecology Managing Plan- C10n - WPC will expect the developers to comply with all relevant legislation and best practice and that the developer will work closely with the appropriate wildlife and environmental bodies to achieve significant net biodiversity gain.

Site levels C10m - A request has been made to SCDC for additional background strategy information to support the section drawings submitted; it is understood that this is being prepared and WPC will comment on the submission in due course. However, concern was expressed at the proposal to raise land levels given the visual sensitivity of the development within the fen landscape.

Design Code and Heritage – documents uploaded late, will be considered by the WPC planning committee in due course. Because the Design Code was not available to view online until 10 January (despite being registered on 16 December) the PC reserves the right to comment further on some of the discharge of conditions applications if they consider there are inconsistencies between the Design Code and these documents. As mentioned above, one clear case is the Delivery Plan which includes material from the Design Code but the PC do not have the full context of such material.

Conclusion

Members asked that that as well as using the planning portal response system, the Clerk should produce a consolidated return and send it directly to the SCDC Planning Officer.

DRAFT