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INTRODUCTION

1. This Statement of Common Ground (SCG) relates specifically to Matter SC6A of the Inspector’s questions in respect of the forthcoming hearing session on Policy SS/5 for Waterbeach New Town. It is presented on behalf of the following parties:
   - South Cambridgeshire District Council – Local Authority and authors of the Local Plan;
   - Urban and Civic – Development partners appointed by Defence Infrastructure Organisation, owners of land at the former Waterbeach Barracks and Airfield and joint promoters of the new settlement;
   - RLW Estates - Promoters of land to the east of the former Barracks and Airfield and owners / controllers of other ancillary land in the vicinity such as land within the setting of Denny Abbey, and land, owned by the Waterbeach Trust as part of the new settlement.

2. From hereafter, Urban and Civic and RLW Estates are referred to as the promoters where they have a common view.

3. A summary of the representations made by the promoters, jointly or separately, at the Proposed Submission consultation in 2013 and the Proposed Modifications consultation in 2015/16 is included at Appendix A.

4. There is considerable common ground between the parties supporting the proposed strategic allocation at Waterbeach as reflected within this statement.

5. It is intended that the presentation of this common ground provides confirmation concerning key aspects associated with the soundness and delivery of the new town, relating back to the questions posed. This statement therefore:
   - Provides an overview of the current position, reflecting the progress made during the course of the examination and to provide an update to those representations in order to assist the Inspectors in assessing the soundness of the Local Plan allocation, with particular regard to phasing and delivery.
   - Addresses each of the questions set under Matter SC6A in turn clarifying where the above parties are in agreement.
OVERVIEW OF CURRENT POSITION

6. The parties agree that the allocation of Waterbeach new town represents a sound part of the development strategy for Greater Cambridge.

7. The new town is capable of being delivered with the necessary supporting infrastructure to ensure a sustainable development, including local services and facilities, secondary and primary education and local jobs. It will provide high quality public transport connectivity to the jobs and higher order services in and around Cambridge via rail, bus, cycle and road improvements to the A10(N) corridor, in conjunction with the City Deal.

8. The development strategy approach to protect the Green Belt (other than in response to a need for jobs and homes where development could come forward without significant harm to Green Belt purposes), and to focus on a new settlement strategy based on brownfield land and focusing investment on infrastructure in key corridors, is consistent both with the NPPF and also with the direction of travel of government policy as set out in the Housing White Paper (February 2017).

9. Since submission of the Local Plan, and the representations now the subject of this hearing, a number of things have occurred which are directly relevant to implementation of Policy SS/5. These are outlined below and covered in the common ground identified in relation to each of the Inspectors’ questions.

10. Where the three parties have different positions (uncommon ground) these are also noted.

The Involvement of U&C

11. Representations were submitted on the Submission Local Plan on behalf of RLW and the Defence Infrastructure Estate (part of the MOD), jointly. In 2014 Urban and Civic were appointed as Development Partner to promote and deliver development of the land owned by Ministry of Defence (the Barracks and Airfield), reflecting their track record in bringing forward other large scale strategic projects, for example, Alconbury Weald in Huntingdonshire (also a former airfield and adjoining land, now with permission for 5,000 homes and 290,000 m² of employment uses and under construction). Whilst the promoters now intend to bring forward planning applications, both are working closely together, with the District and County Council and other stakeholders to ensure development occurs in a co-ordinated and seamless way and in accordance with the submitted local plan.
Establishing A Framework for Development

12. The parties have been working together to ensure a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach and both promoters have agreed in principle to enter into agreements to progress the proposals for the new town at Waterbeach through the SPD process and planning applications.

13. The signatories to this SCG recognise the need to have a comprehensive framework for development, to establish the context for outline planning applications across the site.

14. During 2016, the promoters of the land within the Policy SS5 area worked together to produce a spatial framework (a Development Framework Document – ‘DFD’) for development of the land proposed for allocation. This was an involved process including engagement (through workshops and consultation) with South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC), the local community, statutory consultees and other stakeholder organisations. The promoters’ purpose in preparing the DFD was to:
   - Establish context, key constraints and opportunities
   - Set out key objectives and principles to augment the Local Plan allocation policy
   - Inform the emerging Waterbeach neighbourhood plan
   - Provide a framework for future planning applications
   - Co-ordinate development across the site as a whole, including how it relates to the adjoining village and Cambridge Research Park.

15. A draft DFD was presented to the local authorities and considered by Cambridge Quality Panel in June 2016. Through the DFD process the two promoters reached broad agreement on spatial principles for development.

16. Council officers provided comments during the the DFD process on a without prejudice basis but the Council did not reach any formal view on the appropriateness of the DFD that had been emerging. However, Council officers recognised the considerable work and community engagement that had taken place in preparing the draft DFD.

17. At this point work on a final DFD stopped. SCDC, had been initially minded in principle to accept a DFD as a promoter led initiative, to be given status for decision making through member approval. However, following legal advice, the Council proposes that a supplementary planning document (SPD) be prepared instead of the AAP proposed in the submitted Plan in recognition that the content of the proposed document should in law be prepared as an SPD under the Town and Country Planning (England) Regulations 2012. The Council proposes that the SPD process will draw as appropriate upon the extensive work already undertaken in preparing the draft DFD.
18. RLW and U&C/DIO fully support preparation of SPD instead of an AAP. Each of the signatories has had legal advice confirming the policy is sound if supported by SPD rather than an AAP.

19. In February 2017, the Secretary of State for Defence and U&C submitted an Outline Planning Application (OPA) for development of the Barracks and Airfield (293 hectares of the total allocation). The Application Guide is included at Appendix B; this provides an overview of the OPA and its content. In its scope the applicants consider that the OPA responds to the requirements of Policy SS/5 as proposed to be modified, and other relevant Local Plan policies.

20. The applicants consider that the application demonstrates the effectiveness of the Plan in providing a framework for planning applications that are capable of being registered and considered, having provided the necessary technical, policy and environmental impact documentation.

21. The full application is accessible at: https://www.scambs.gov.uk/waterbeach.

22. The OPA has been registered and is being consulted upon. It is not appropriate for the parties to this statement to comment upon the merit of the proposals at this stage, but it is agreed that the submission of the OPA is a demonstration of the commitment of the MOD (DIO) and U&C to commence development at the earliest opportunity.

The Commitment to Deliver the Necessary Infrastructure

23. Mindful of Paragraph 177 of the NPPF, the matters raised by the Inspectors in their letter of 20 May 2015, and the understandable concerns of the local community about the delivery and timing of infrastructure provision, the parties consider that there are three strands to on-going work on delivery which the Examination should be aware of:

1. Guidance on Delivery through SPD

24. It is common ground that the proposed modification agreed by the Council in November 2016 to prepare a SPD for the new town rather than an AAP is necessary for the soundness of the Local Plan.

25. Initial work on the SPD has commenced. The Council’s Planning Portfolio Holder agreed in December 2016 to commence preparation of SPDs for Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield new settlements. The Council recognises that some of the local community remain opposed to the new town allocation and decided that key stages, including community engagement, should not commence until after the Local Plan hearing. It would be appropriate for the Council to agree the SPD that it intends to adopt, but for formal adoption to only happen once the Local Plan is adopted.

26. The preparation of the SPD will make use of evidence prepared by the promoters as appropriate and subject to assessment by Council experts and key stakeholders. The Council is in the process of preparing a Brief in order to instruct consultants to prepare a draft SPD and all parties are committed to the earliest possible preparation and adoption of the document.
2. Delivery on the Barracks and Airfield (on the DIO / U&C land)

27. The parties support the principle of early delivery of Waterbeach, subject to agreement in the detail of how this is achieved and ensuring that there is appropriate infrastructure in place to support each phase of delivery.

28. The following refers to the content and purpose of the OPA that U&C consider is helpful to the Inspectors’ assessment of the soundness of the allocation.

29. The OPA will be considered in parallel with preparation of the SPD. U&C suggests that this provides opportunity for a practical and iterative planning process, shaping practical delivery mechanisms, alongside potential planning obligations. The applicants consider that the OPA establishes a spatial framework for the proposed application development, that is consistent with the draft DFD referred to above. It also promotes an approach to delivery which the applicants consider will ensure:
   
   - Appropriate phasing, in tandem with scheme led mitigation and strategic transport improvements, as part of the A10 Scheme.
   
   - Comprehensive and seamless development across the SS/5 area.

30. DIO/U&C hope that these proposed measures will inform preparation of the SPD.

31. Preparation of the application has brought together a detailed evidence base, assessment and survey work, and has provided useful knowledge about the Barracks and Airfield and solutions to the challenges of delivery. This supplements the existing evidence base. Advised by Peter Brett Associates, U&C has a costed, detailed Delivery Plan for an initial quantity of development. The OPA is subject to consultation and consideration by the Council, stakeholders and infrastructure providers, including the Highway Authority. U&C make the case for early delivery of 1,600 units and all the infrastructure necessary to address associated needs and any significant environmental effects. The infrastructure the DIO/U&C consider necessary to support the proposed development is the subject of draft heads of terms included within the application package. The Delivery Plan for the OPA is summarised in the schedule at Appendix C (U&C confirm that this is based upon extensive consultation with stakeholders and utility providers during the pre-application stage and full environmental impact assessment).

32. U&C propose in the OPA that infrastructure provision beyond 1600 units will be linked, in part, to the delivery of the strategic A10 Scheme (being shaped by stakeholders through on-going work on the A10 Study).

33. In order to work with the outputs of the A10 Study, U&C propose in the OPA to adopt a ‘Monitor and Manage’ approach to define and secure further mitigation, linked to phased development beyond 1600 units. U&C are committed to contributing a significant component of the A10 Scheme cost through a planning obligation.

34. Once the A10 Study is complete this would inform development and thresholds in relation to the build out of the new town in relation to transport infrastructure improvements.
35. DIO/U&C’s consider that the proposed Monitor and Manage approach will provide a robust monitoring mechanism to ensure that there is appropriate capacity in the corridor for all phases of development and include controls on development if monitoring demonstrates that these are necessary.

36. The Monitor and Manage approach is being used in delivering Alconbury Weald in neighbouring Huntingdonshire, a scheme also being advanced by U&C, which was ahead of full knowledge of strategic investment in upgrading the A14.

37. Whilst there is no agreement between the parties or the County Council as highways authority at this time on the appropriateness of using Monitor and Manage in this instance, the SPD and planning application processes will allow proper consideration of the approach, in potentially facilitating outline consent and early delivery.

38. Importantly, planning consents will provide significant leverage in securing other funding for social and physical infrastructure from a range of sources.

3. Delivery to the east (on the RLW Land)

39. The parties also support early delivery on RLW land and recognise the merits of development proceeding here in parallel with, or shortly after, the early stages of the Barracks and Airfield development. This will provide choice in the market and promote higher rates of delivery at the new settlement in the early stages.

40. RLW are concentrating on formulating proposals to bring forward infrastructure that will support the development of the site as a whole, together with a first phase of residential development. In particular, RLW are working with Network Rail to formulate proposals to relocate Waterbeach station.

41. The relocation of the station is a requirement of Policy SS/5 and all parties agree to the basis for that requirement, namely:

   • meeting the sustainable travel requirements of the new settlement and achieving a significant shift of travel mode towards public transport
   
   • meeting Network Rail operational requirements (in terms of the capacity of the line) and the fact that its potential revenue generation will offset the cost of its provision.
   
   • resolving the unsatisfactory condition of the existing station (in terms of safety, convenience and facilities) that is impractical to address substantially in situ for the long term.
   
   • specific benefits in terms of improved accessibility and facilities.

42. The parties agree that the proposals for a relocated station will help realise and maximise the inherent benefit of access to rail services for this location.
43. The parties note that the provision of the new station is directly linked to Network Rail’s proposal to increase capacity at all stations between Kings Lynn and Cambridge (to allow longer 8-carriage services). Full details of the total costs of the new station are set out in Section 6 of the GRIP 2 report appended to the RLW Statement for this hearing.

44. It is agreed by the Parties that the station will have direct access to the A10. This avoids the current need for traffic to access the station via the village. It also provides routes to the new station that do not pass through the village, although appropriate access from the village to the station will be retained.

45. The promoters note that the relocated station will provide improved accessibility (for cars, taxis, cyclists and pedestrians) and improved safety at the existing Waterbeach Station level crossing.

46. RLW Estates are currently working on a planning application for the new Station that will be submitted as soon as possible (late 2017 / early 2018). This is likely to be linked to proposals for a first phase residential development.
RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR’S QUESTIONS

1. General Policy

Question 1.i Does the figure of 9,000 dwellings in paragraph 1 represent the maximum number of houses that would be developed on the site in accordance with this policy?

47. It is the view of the promoters that 9,000 dwellings does not represent the maximum number that would be developed on the site and both parties have evidence to suggest capacity is greater than this.

48. The Council considers that there may be potential for a higher number to be accommodated on the site having regard to the work undertaken by the promoters since the submission of the Local Plan but does not consider there to be sufficient evidence at this time to identify a sound alternative figure. As a result, the Council proposed a modification to Policy SS/5 in November 2016 to include the word ‘approximate’ before the dwelling range in order to provide flexibility and ensure that best use of this brownfield focused site is made following a design-led approach.

49. All parties are agreed that it is not feasible to specify the maximum number of dwellings on the site at this stage.

50. All parties also agree that it is inappropriate and unnecessary to set an absolute cap on development capacity – this will be determined through the SPD process, masterplanning and planning applications.

51. In the view of the promoters, the narrow range in the plan and the fact that 9,000 is specified as the upper end of that range, even with the insertion of “approximately” through the modification, represents an unsound constraint (especially as the development will not all be delivered within the plan period).

52. The Promoters consider a further degree of flexibility and change to the policy wording is required to ensure the Policy is soundly based (justified and effective), to ensure efficient development of the site, as detailed masterplanning is taken forward, and to optimise potential of the site (as required by NPPF para 58).

53. All parties recognise the need for flexibility but the promoters are concerned that the use of ‘approximately’ and then a defined range is a bit confusing.

54. The promoters consider that the policy should not place a limit on the capacity of the site but may refer to approximately 10,000 dwellings.
**Housing Delivery within the Plan period**

55. Policy SS/5 of the Local Plan (as submitted in March 2014) assumed that no more than 1,400 dwellings would be completed by 2031 and Policy SS/12 (as submitted in March 2014) required the development to be phased so that the first housing completions would be in 2026. In March 2016, the Council submitted to the Inspectors proposed modifications to the Local Plan to remove these restrictions. The promoters support the modification.

56. The proposed modifications mean that there will be no policy controls or barriers to the rate of delivery of Waterbeach New Town, subject to meeting the other policy requirements.

57. The promoters consider that between 4,700 and 5,800 dwellings are deliverable on the site within the Plan period. The difference is due to U&C estimating an earlier start on site and a more rapid increase in build rate than RLW.

58. More specifically, U&C has already commenced reuse and refurbishment of existing buildings within the Barracks, restoring activity to the site (see response to question 1.viii), and anticipate the first residential development on the site will be in 2017/18 (through the conversion of existing Barrack blocks to provide accommodation for staff working at Papworth hospital) and U&C consider that development will then rise to 400 dwellings in 2018/19 and 500 in 2019/20 as the first phase is brought forward rapidly.

59. RLW estimate that development on the site will start later in 2019/20 and the rate of completions will increase more gradually increasing to 250 units in 2020/21 and 400 units in 2021/22.

60. Overall the promoters estimate the same maximum annual build rate on the site of 500 completions in a single year and their projections from 2021/22 onwards to the end of the Plan period, are virtually the same.

61. The Council has taken a more cautious approach to the delivery of this site in its housing trajectory (December 2016 Annual Monitoring Report) than suggested by the promoters. The housing trajectory assumes that the first homes will be completed in 2021-2022 and that the site will deliver an average of 250 dwellings a year following a gradual build up in the early years, with a total of 2,300 dwellings completed by 2031. However, the AMR is clear that the proposed modifications mean that there will be no controls on the rate of delivery of Waterbeach New Town, so if development could start earlier and if more than 250 dwellings can be delivered in a year there would be no planning policy barriers to that (paragraph A43). This is clearly subject to meeting other policy requirements as set out above.
Question 1.ii Would the proposed level of employment on the site be consistent with the proposed number of dwellings?

62. The level of employment is not specified in the policy and sub paragraph 8 (as proposed to be modified) and preparation of an Economic Development Strategy is proposed to guide delivery of employment activity on site. All parties support this approach.

63. The policy does not therefore require there to be consistency between numbers of homes and jobs, and all parties agree this is not necessary.

64. All parties agree:
   - The scheme will support “the continued development of the economy of the Cambridge area”, as specified in the policy, but it is not intended to accommodate strategic employment uses but rebalance and support growth across the northern fringe, where there are already strong economic drivers and delivery of homes as failed to keep pace with need.
   - The requirement for housing in the sub-region is largely driven by economic growth. Delivery of homes has failed to keep pace with economic need, resulting in negative impacts, including unsustainable patterns of long distance commuting. The new town will help to redress that imbalance.
   - The new town is intended to include employment provision appropriate to the settlement, not become a significant new employment location in its own right.
   - The new town is being planned to support and complement economic growth in other locations (including at the adjoining Cambridge Research Park, Cambridge Science Park, Cambridge Northern Fringe and elsewhere in Greater Cambridge)
   - In particular, the Cambridge Research Park can be considered part of the future settlement (with 30,000 sq m of employment uses and consent for a further 47,000 sq m)

65. The parties are aligned in their wish to see appropriate provision of employment to ensure that the new town is not purely a dormitory and to ensure a vibrant community during the day.

66. U&C/DIO consider that the application supports this objective. It assesses need and seeks consent for a wide range of uses to accommodate businesses, and sustain and meet the day-to-day needs of the community in terms of education, health and leisure, and shopping needs. It says around 6,000 jobs on the Barracks and Airfield (including an element of homeworking) are estimated, to be deliverable.

67. Taking all of this into account, the promoters consider that an appropriate level of provision, to meet the reasonable needs of the new town, is in the order of 7,600-8,600 jobs, including homeworking.
**Question 1.iii Given the direct rail link and the new station, does the new town have the potential to become an attractive location for people who work beyond the Cambridge Sub Region e.g. in London? If so, could this factor cause local people to be priced out of the housing market in this location?**

68. No, the evidence is that the new town will not be an attractive location for people who work beyond the Cambridge sub region.

69. RLW has provided evidence on levels of commuting to London and Cambridge by rail. Both suggest much higher levels of commuting to Cambridge than to locations beyond the sub region.

70. All parties agree:

   - In light of the evidence on commuting, the question of local people being priced out of the market by those who work beyond the sub region does not arise.
   - There will, in fact, be a positive impact on house prices from a very significant increase in supply of new homes to the north of the City.
   - Any premium on house prices associated with proximity to a station will be far outweighed by the increased supply and improved access to housing, including provision for a range of properties and tenures and affordable units.
   - It is far better that connectivity is underpinned by high quality public transport infrastructure than private vehicle movements. The presence of railway access is therefore a major benefit in terms of sustainable transport.

**Question 1.iv Would the proposed new town result in an unacceptable loss of good quality agricultural land?**

71. Within the allocation site there is a total of over 200ha of best and most versatile agricultural land (mostly Grade 2 with some Grade 3a). This needs to be viewed in the context of the total land area of the allocation, which extends to 560 ha, with the majority of the site unclassified, as previously developed land.

72. All parties agree that there is a significant resource of high quality agricultural land within the District and therefore that:

   - Development needs cannot be met without the use of such land (a fact highlighted by the Sustainability Appraisal)
   - The loss through development is not significant in relation to the scale of the resource in the District.
   - The loss of agricultural land should be balanced against the extent to which this development would utilise previously developed land.
The extent to which a loss does occur, is outweighed by the considerable social and economic benefits of the development, and by the sustainability benefits of the location.

Question 1.v The policy and reasoned justification makes reference to the significant amount of new infrastructure which will be required as a consequence of the development. Bearing in mind the requirements of paragraph 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework, is there a reasonable prospect that the provision of such infrastructure, and the services and facilities referred to in the policy and justification, could be achieved in a timely fashion, particularly if the proposed modification to remove any phasing of development (PM/SC/3/H) is accepted, whilst not putting at risk the overall viability of the development?

73. The statements submitted by the Council and by RLW Estates refer to the Council’s evidence base for the Waterbeach New Town allocation. All parties broadly agree to the content of this evidence base in respect of:

- the identification of the infrastructure expected to be required for the development;
- the high-level estimates of the costs (by category) of that infrastructure; and
- the analysis of how this is to be funded by a combination of public and developer sources.

74. All parties agree that this evidence base, along with the commitment of the promoters, is sufficient to establish a more than reasonable prospect that the required infrastructure will be delivered in a timely fashion without putting the overall viability of the development at risk.

75. All parties participated in preparation of the Cambridge City Council and SCDC Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS) (2015) prepared by PBA. This was updated following the Inspector’s Letter of May 2015 with input from the promoters (RD/T/020).

76. All parties agree that the estimate of site specific infrastructure costs at approximately £150 million provided by the IDS is a reasonable and appropriate estimate and a basis for more detailed assessment of infrastructure costs in each subject area.

Transport Infrastructure – short term investment

77. U&C proposes a comprehensive package of transport mitigation and travel planning measures in the outline planning application, linked to delivery 1600 units.

78. RLW also proposes specific transport measures for the early years of the development, including the relocation of Waterbeach station.

79. There is a broad measure of agreement between the two promoters on these early interventions.
**Transport Infrastructure – long term investment**

80. All parties agree that the IDS provides an appropriate level of detail for long term transport and accessibility costs at this stage of the planning process by specifying:

- Overall Ely to Cambridge transport corridor infrastructure requirements and costs including specific measures and costs for the Waterbeach development.
- That the A10 corridor study (A10 CS) is to refine these requirements and costs.
- The principle that the A10 CS will set out comprehensive measures including highway improvements, guided bus, park and ride, improved rail services and infrastructure, as well walking, cycling and travel management initiatives.
- The principle that the A10 corridor study will also determine the balance between public transport measures and highway improvements, taking account of the fact that the overall focus of the transport strategy is predicated on a modal shift away from car use.

81. It is agreed that as planning applications are brought forward they will demonstrate, through usual assessment processes, that appropriate sustainable transport provision is made.

**Funding and Viability**

82. Part 3 of the IDS assesses how much funding is available.

83. Chapter 12 deals with non-developer infrastructure funding and assesses the main sources of “City Deal”, New Home Bonus, local transport funding, Growth Deal and other sources. This is also detailed in the Council’s statement for this hearing. These assessments are generally agreed by the Promoters.

84. Chapter 13 assesses developer funding. This assumes, and the Promoters agree, that the site enabling infrastructure will be fully funded by the developer. The IDS also provides an assumed amount per dwelling and a total amount from developer contributions (subject to further study and review).

**Phasing of Infrastructure**

85. With regard to phasing of infrastructure, the proposed plan modification does not remove phasing of the development. It removes a restriction that could prevent otherwise acceptable housing delivery coming forward before 2031.

86. All parties agree that the County Council as highway authority will co-ordinate the prioritisation and sequence of transport spending having regard to a phase by phase assessment of impacts associated with development at Waterbeach; mitigation requirements and viability review.

87. As stated in paragraph 8.3.5 of the IDS update “The specific phasing of transport infrastructure relative to the delivery of development will need to be considered though more detailed work to inform the threshold limits to growth.”
88. It is agreed by all parties that the required infrastructure is capable of being delivered in a manner which would not harm viability of the development.

**Question 1.vi Should the policy clarify how the proposed new town would relate to the setting of the River Cam adjacent to the site?**

89. All parties agree that further clarification of how the proposed new town would relate to the setting of the River Cam is not necessary. Specific references in Policy SS/5 (including that “the new town will be developed to high standards of design and layout which draw on its Fen edge location”, at item 2) are sufficient to ensure that the planning and design of the proposed development would relate to local landscape character including the setting of the river Cam and other key landscape features.

90. All parties agree that work associated with the proposed SPD and the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) provided by planning applications will address this issue insofar as this is necessary and appropriate.

**Question 1.vii Does the area of land identified on Inset H of the Policies Map provide sufficient capacity to achieve the quantum of development associated with the new town whilst ensuring that the setting and historic significance of Denny Abbey is preserved or enhanced?**

**Should the policy include a requirement for a setting study to be submitted at the planning application stage in respect of the relationship of the development to the designated heritage assets within the site?**

91. All parties are in agreement as to the importance of the heritage assets on and near the site and the need for a highly sensitive and considered response.

92. All parties agree that sufficient land exists within the area shown to accommodate the quantum of development specified (and indeed higher levels considered possible by both promoting parties) whilst safeguarding the setting of Denny Abbey.

93. However, all parties consider that the ‘Major Development Site’ on Inset Plan H excludes a significant area of land to the east of the runway and west of the runway south of Soldiers Hill from the developable area that neither Historic England nor the promoters have assessed as being necessary to protect the setting of Denny Abbey.

94. As such, all parties agree that capacity should not be determined using the area of land on Inset Plan H, but rather using a defined northern limit of proposed development.

95. RLW support the line put forward by Historic England that is in accordance with the setting study prepared by RLW and other recommendations regarding the use and function of land north of the proposed northern limit of built development, notably the ‘strategic landscape buffer’ and areas of multi-functional open space.
96. Through the preparation of the outline planning application, and in particular the Environmental Impact Assessment, DIO/U&C has reached the view that a variation to the line proposed by Historic England, reflecting historic field boundaries, is the most appropriate response to impacts (heritage and visual) and master planning considerations. RLW do not object to the line proposed by DIO/U&C. There has been no opportunity for DIO/U&C to respond to the proposed modification or share evidence with Historic England to supplement their setting study (which is a reference document to the examination (RD/SS/330). DIO/U&C do not support the boundary as shown on the submitted Inset Plan or the line now proposed by the Council as a modification, reflecting the HE position.

97. All parties note that setting studies have already been prepared to inform the allocation of the Waterbeach New Town and this work has already or will be supplemented at application stage by Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and further heritage assessments, as necessary.

**Question 1.viii Would any of the existing facilities within the site be retained e.g. sports facilities?**

98. The following information is provided by Urban and Civic and is not disputed by RLW or SCDC.

99. Planning Permissions have already been secured by U&C for reuse of a number of buildings including:

- Re-use of the existing Squash Courts, Sports Hall and Tennis Courts.

- Re-use of the building close to the existing entrance to provide a community meeting space and museum.

- Change of use of the former Watch Tower to provide office and meeting space.

100. Other areas of the site, including the lake, are also now in use for recreation activities.

101. Planning permission has been granted for extension of the village cemetery utilising an area of land within the former Barracks area.

102. Existing buildings are now in use by the village community and will be available for use by the in-coming community. The buildings will remain in situ unless they become redundant following provision of new, replacement facilities elsewhere within the new development. U&C are exploring the potential for re-use of other buildings and proposals will be taken forward through standalone planning applications until a comprehensive outline planning permission is in place for the Barracks and Airfield. Opportunities for re-use will then be pursued as Reserved Matters.

103. Planning permission is also being sought by U&C for conversion of some the existing Barracks housing into accommodation for employees of Papworth Hospital. At the time of writing, this application was yet to be determined.
Question 1.ix Would the provision of town centre uses be detrimental to the existing convenience retail offer in Waterbeach village?

104. All parties agree that, initially, existing shops and services will benefit from additional trade, making up for some of the loss experienced when the Barracks closed, before provision is made on site. In the longer term, the increased retail expenditure from new residents and employees within the new town will help sustain existing village facilities. This will also help to rekindle links between the site and the village.

105. The Promoters have broadly agreed upon an appropriate number and hierarchy of centres to meet the needs of the new development, respecting the existence of the village centre as an important local centre, which will continue to serve the needs of the existing village. The existing village is lower tier and too small in scale to meet the needs of the enlarged community. The Council considers this to be an issue for the SPD.

106. DIO/U&C’s outline planning application proposals include a new ‘Principal Centre.’ The timing of the principal centre will be a matter for agreement and will be determined through the SPD and ultimately planning consents to allow critical mass to build to support new uses without the need to draw trade from the village.

107. The permissible floorspace will be limited to that which can be sustained by the growth in spending associated with the new population and clawing back spending which is currently leaking outside the retail catchment, so the existing village catchment ‘spend’ should be unaffected.

108. All parties agree that the new town centre will be part of a higher density, urban environment and will function at a different level of the retail hierarchy (draft Policy E/21 of the Submission Draft Local Plan proposes to designate the new town centre at the Waterbeach New Town at the top of the District’s retail hierarchy).

Question 1.x Would other land not identified on Inset H of the Policies Map be required to facilitate storm and foul drainage arrangements?

109. All parties agree that the answer to this is yes, based on detailed discussions including with Anglian Water and the Environment Agency (EA), as well as the desirability of relocating the existing works to ensure the development potential of the allocation site is fully realised. No further land allocation on-site is necessary; Anglian Water has the power to acquire land and deliver infrastructure off-site, as necessary. Land within RLW ownership also provides options for the relocation of the water recycling centre. Anglian Water have provided an up-to-date position statement regarding the provision of water recycling capacity for the new town which has been added to the Local Plan reference documents library (RD/SS/350)
Question 1.xi Should the policy specifically require a surface water and foul water drainage water strategy?

110. All parties agree that a scheme of this size will be subject to full and comprehensive EIA, National and Local Planning Policy, and a full raft of validation list requirements. All relevant impacts, including the need to address surface water and foul water drainage will therefore be subject to scoping with the relevant bodies (including the Environment Agency, Anglian Water and the IDB) and comprehensive assessment.

111. All parties consider that applications will therefore include comprehensive assessment of impacts, FRA and a drainage strategy and there is no need to state this requirement explicitly within Policy SS/5.


Question 2.i Does the preparation and subsequent adoption of an AAP represent an appropriate mechanism in planning terms for the implementation of this development? If this is not a sound approach, would the Council’s further proposed modification to prepare SPD rectify that issue?

112. Following legal advice, the Council proposes that a supplementary planning document (SPD) be prepared instead of the AAP proposed in the submitted Plan in recognition that the content of the proposed document should in law be prepared as an SPD under the Town and Country Planning (England) Regulations 2012.

113. All parties agree that an AAP is not the appropriate mechanism for implementation of the development and is not sound in terms of the tests in paragraph 182 of the NPPF, and particularly the requirement that the Plan is “effective” (and deliverable over its period) and consistent with national policy.

114. RLW and DIO/U&C have also received legal advice that reference within the policy to the use of an SPD rather than an AAP would be make the policy sound.

115. All parties agree that an SPD would fulfil the required functions of a secondary planning document.

116. All parties agree that an AAP could also unduly delay the plan-making process and render the policy ineffective for that reason.

Question 2.ii Paragraph 6n: Should reference also be made to measures to mitigate the effect of the development on the wider landscape area including Landbeach and Milton settlements?

117. All parties agree that there is no need to refer to this matter in the Policy. It will be addressed through the SPD and more particularly through EIA and technical assessments that are application submission requirements.
**Question 2.iii Paragraph 6p: Would the assessment of heritage assets also include World War II structures on the site which may be worthy of retention?**

118. All parties note that this would be covered within heritage assessments under the NPPF requirement to consider impacts on non-designated heritage assets.

**Question 2.iv Paragraph 6w: Is there a reasonable prospect that the effect of the development on the ecology and biodiversity of the site could be adequately mitigated?**

119. All parties agree that there is more than reasonable prospect of this, based on assessment of ecological conditions and impacts by both Promoters.

120. All parties consider that detailed Landscape/ Biodiversity Management Plans supporting future planning applications, will ensure adequate mitigation.

**Question 2.v Paragraph 6x: Would the relocation of the railway station be detrimental to the residents of Waterbeach village in terms of the increased travel distances to a sustainable mode of transport?**

121. All parties agree that the relocation of the station will increase the access distance for some residents in the southern part of Waterbeach village, but for other residents access distances will be improved.

122. All parties agree that on balance more residents will (once the new population is established) be within a short walk of the relocated station position. The village and new town will be within a short cycle or bus ride.

123. The station, in its current position, is constrained in terms of potential for upgrade, presents safety issues and has negative impacts upon surrounding residents. The promoters consider that development can support the introduction of enhanced shuttle services to connect the village, the station (in situ and once relocated) and park and ride provision.

The parties agree that overall the benefits of a new, enhanced station, delivered as part of a comprehensive public transport/walking/cycling strategy will bring far greater advantage than disadvantage.
Question 2.vi Paragraph 6hh: Should there be a cross reference to Policy TI/8: Infrastructure and New Developments as the policy indicates that planning permission will only be granted for proposals that have made suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make a scheme acceptable in planning terms

124. All parties consider that such cross-referencing is not required. This would represent replication of NPPF policy requirements. All parties note that Local Plans need to be considered as a whole, and the onus is clearly upon the Promoters to demonstrate that suitable provision has been made to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Question 2.vii Paragraph 6ii: Would the flood risk reduction measures be sufficiently resilient to the effect of climate change over the lifetime of the new town given that it is low lying land? Would this form part of the flood risk assessment for the site?

125. Engineering consultants for both of the promoters have assessed the flood risk aspects of the scheme and are confident, from discussions with the EA and other stakeholders, that the proposed measures would be resilient to the effects of climate change.

126. All parties note that a scheme of this size is subject to full and comprehensive EIA, National and Local Planning Policy, and validation list requirements. As such all relevant impacts will be subject to initial scoping and assessment, and therefore there is no need to state this explicitly in Policy SS/5.

127. All parties note that the need to have regard to climate change is already embedded in National and Local Plan Policy and is established good practice in preparing FRAs.

Question 2.viii Paragraph 6jj: Should reference also be made to the creation of appropriate community governance arrangements to assist the development of the new community?

128. Both promoting parties are committed to the creation of a successful and vibrant new community, and indeed to achieving an appropriate and sensitive relationship with the existing community of Waterbeach village, and would therefore be comfortable with some reference to the need for appropriate governance arrangements, albeit that such measures would be provided for in any event. The Council does not consider it necessary to include such a reference in the Local Plan.
Question 2.ix Paragraph 6kk and 6ll: Given the previous use of the site for military purposes, is there a reasonable prospect that the de-contamination of the site could be achieved satisfactorily so as to enable residential occupation whilst not prejudicing the viability of the proposed development?

129. Both promoting parties have undertaken assessment of ground conditions across the whole site and are therefore well informed as to the required mitigation measures, and in turn are comfortable that these would not harm overall viability of the scheme.

130. There has been a preliminary desk top survey of the site. Extensive archaeological trenching has also been completed. No major constraints have been identified in this respect. Conditions attached to any outline permission will ensure further survey work is completed in advance of development commencing.


Question 3.i Are these modifications necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan?

131. All parties agree that the requirement within the policy for a second tier planning document should be fulfilled through an SPD and that it would be unsound for the second tier document to be an AAP. A modification to replace the reference to an AAP with an SPD would be a more effective approach and in this respect would make the policy sound.

132. Other consequential changes to the policy and the way that this is constructed are therefore also required in light of this overarching change to the approach to be taken to the secondary planning document.
Signed:

Caroline Hunt
Caroline Hunt, Planning Policy Manager, South Cambridgeshire District Council

Signed:

Julia Foster, Managing Partner, David Lock Associates on behalf of DIO/U&C

Signed:

Mike Newton, Director, Boyer Planning on behalf of RLW

This Statement of Ground is agreed as between SCDC and U&C and RLW is awaiting final client sign-off from an individual who is today on leave.
APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Summary of representations by DIO/RLW Estates to Submission Local Plan, 2013

SUPPORT for

- Policy TI/1: provision of new rail station at Chesterton.
- Policy SS/4: Council’s general strategy to Cambridge Fringe North East.
- Policy SS/5: Designation of Waterbech New Town
- Policy SJ/4: Green Belt. Support approach to no further substantial Green belt releases.

OBJECT to

- Policy SC/7: Outdoor play space, Informal Open Space and New Developments. Greater flexibility required.
- Figure 10: Residential Space standards: Standards should not represent a minimum as set out.
- Policy H/8: Housing Mix. Greater flexibility required.
- Policy CC/3: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments. Greater flexibility required
- Policy SS/5: Waterbech New Town as set out below:
  - Inset H showing AAP boundary should include land designated for Green Belt and include all land expected to be needed to deliver the new Town.
  - Remove phasing restriction of only 1,400 dwellings completed up to 2031.
  - Amend capacity form 8-9,000 dwellings to 9-10,000 dwellings.
- Policy SJ/4: Cambridge Green Belt. Land proposed for Green Belt should be determined through AAP process.
- Paragraph 3.35: Plan should commit to timeframe for AAP to allow a planning application to come forward quicker.
- Policy S/12: Phasing, Delivery and Monitoring. Remove phasing restriction.
- Policy SJ/6: The Development Strategy. Refer to Waterbech as being able to delivery of 9-10,000 dwellings and at least 3,500 in the plan period.
- Policy SJ/5: Provision of New Homes and Jobs. Housing target should be increased to 22,600.
- Policy SJ/2: Objectives of the Local Plan. Strengthen obligation to meet national policy housing obligations.
Summary of representations submitted by Urban and Civic, November 2014, to Consultation on Local Green Space

OBJECT to

- Proposed Local Green Space at the Waterbeach Barracks entrance (NH/12 - 167)

Summary of representations submitted by Urban and Civic, January 2016, to the Proposed Modifications

SUPPORT for

- Policy S6 (PM/SC/2/N); Paragraph 2.45 (PM/SC/2/Q); Policy S/12 (PM/SC/2/R); Paragraph 2.60 9PM/SC/2(S); Policy SS/5 9PM/SC/3(H) - Support removal of phasing restrictions. Policy H/8 9PM/SC/7(G) - Support objective to deliver wide choice, type and mix of housing.

OBJECT to

- Policy S/5 and related paragraphs (PM/SC/2/H). Objectively Assessed Need figure is too low and figure of 20,600 should be used.

Summary of representations submitted by RLW Estates, January 2016, to the Proposed Modifications

As above comments made by U&C with following differences:

Objection to Paragraph 2.45 (PM/SC/2/Q). Text inconsistent with removal of phasing restriction

In addition, both U&C and RLW made comments regarding changes that should have been addressed through the Proposed Modifications to allow full consideration at the Examination. Regarding dwellings capacity, northern boundary and removal of need for AAP.
APPENDIX B – U&C OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION GUIDE
The former Barracks and Airfield provide an exceptional opportunity to grow a new, vibrant community at Waterbeach, utilising publicly owned, previously developed land.

Urban&Civic has been appointed by the Ministry of Defence to bring forward the development and deliver a return to the Treasury. The development is needed to help meet the Government’s commitment to one million new homes by 2020 and to support the highly successful economy of the Cambridge sub-region. Significant investment in infrastructure is a key ingredient in harnessing this economic potential and will benefit the quality of life for residents across the Northern Fringe.

Urban&Civic has been working with local partners and the community on the evolution of the Outline Application. This Guide explains the Application and provides further direction, in terms of next steps and where to find key information.

Waterbeach Barracks & Airfield APPLICATION GUIDE
Application Guide

This application guide describes the Outline Planning Application which has been submitted for the redevelopment of the former Barracks and Airfield, adjoining Waterbeach village, which lies within South Cambridgeshire District, five kilometres to the north of the edge of the City of Cambridge.

The Application Site

The Application Site is owned by the Government through the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) which is the part of the Ministry of Defence responsible for the military estate. The Outline Planning Application has been submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council by Urban&Civic plc (U&C) and the Secretary of State for Defence on behalf of the DIO. U&C is a master developer, appointed by DIO to secure the necessary consents and redevelop the site.

The Application Site comprises approximately 293 hectares. Most of the site is regarded as ‘brownfield’ having been in use as an operational, military Barracks and Airfield. There are buildings and structures, (including the runways) associated with the former military use still on site, although only a few are in active uses. The built elements are located within a generous landscape setting which includes grassland, woodland and a man-made lake.

The Application Site forms part of a larger area allocated for development as a new settlement in Policy SS5 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, being prepared by the District Council. Within the application documents this area is referred to as the ‘Strategic Site’. The Local Plan is at an advanced stage of preparation. This Outline Planning Application accords with the emerging Local Plan. In addition, the District Council will shortly commence preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document to support implementation of the emerging Local Plan policy and guide decisions on planning applications.
Outline Application Proposals

Redevelopment of the site has been under consideration for a number of years, most notably through the Local Plan process, which began in 2011. The Outline Planning Application has been in preparation for two years.

Preparation

The proposals have been informed by engagement with the local community, partners, neighbouring landowners and technical stakeholders.

The Proposed Development

The Outline Planning Application seeks permission for the principle of mixed use development and defines key fixes and limitations upon that future development. Permission, if granted, will provide the framework for detailed proposals to be brought forward through further planning applications, under the Outline, which are called Reserved Matters Applications.

The full extent of the development for which outline planning permission is sought is:

- Up to 6,500 dwellings including up to 600 units of residential institutional use (a care home or similar).
- Up to 16,500 sqm of retail uses of which no single outlet will be larger than 4,000 sqm.
- Up to 15,000 sqm of employment uses comprising offices, research and development and light industrial only.
- Three Primary Schools incorporating pre-school provision.
- Secondary School for up to eight forms of entry.
- Up to 9,000 sqm in total of community uses to include: multi-purpose community centres, health care, nurseries, library use, places of worship, museum and other community purposes.
- Up to 4,000 sqm for hotel accommodation.
- Up to 7,000 sqm for health and fitness, gym and other cultural and recreational uses.
- Open spaces and other landscaped areas (including parks, play areas, playing fields, multi-use games areas, weather protected structures, skateboard park, public art, all weather pitches and associated floodlighting, woodlands, wildlife habitat areas, managed grassland, allotments, community orchards, Denny Abbey buffer area, formal/informal open space, ancillary maintenance sheds and pavilions and associated lighting).
- Access roads including two access points to the A10, construction/bus only access to Denny End Road and ‘locally managed access only’ to Denny End Road with associated street lighting and street furniture.
- Pedestrian, cycle, vehicle and bus routes, including plazas, dedicated busway and bus stops with associated street lighting and street furniture.
- Park and Ride facilities.
- Vehicular and cycle parking including electric vehicle charging points.
- Two energy centres.
- Community waste management facilities.
- Provision and/or upgrade/diversion of services.
- Drainage works including foul drainage infrastructure, Sustainable Drainage Systems and ground and surface water attenuation features.
- Demolition of existing buildings and structures.
The Outline Planning Application Structure

The Application Documents include both formal and informal elements to satisfy statutory requirements and provide decision makers and interested parties with information about what is deliverable within the framework of the Outline Planning Application.

The Application Documents

The documents included in the Outline Planning Application are listed and described briefly below. Formal Elements are shown in the Box A and the Informal Elements are shown in Box B.

The formal elements prescribe the limits and fixes which would apply to any future development. It is against these parameters that the Outline Planning Application will be assessed. These parameters will constrain and shape future development delivered under the Outline Planning Permission, should it be granted.

The supporting elements explain and justify the Outline Application with reference to relevant contextual information; assess the impact and merit of the proposals; and present strategies and illustrative material to guide design and delivery.

Want to Know More?

The planning application is large and complex. The best place to start is the Planning Statement which explains the proposals, addresses their merit and provides direction in terms of the other information provided. The Design and Access Statement provides a good introduction to the potential of the site and its planned transformation. The Environmental Statement addresses the impact of the proposed development and the effectiveness of measures to mitigate those impacts. There is a None Technical Summary of this document.

You can also make contact with the Applicant and/or Council:

**Paul Mumford**
New Communities Team Leader
01954 713237
newcommunities@scambs.gov.uk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BOX A: FORMAL INFORMATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEVELOPMENT SPECIFICATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan &amp; Existing Features Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BOX B: SUPPORTING INFORMATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Delivery Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Community Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; Recreation Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Happens Next?
The Outline Planning Application has been prepared following extensive consultation activities in respect of the Strategic Site and the DIO land. You may have already expressed your views. Following submission to South Cambridgeshire District Council, the Council will now ask for comments specifically on the Outline Planning Application for the Barracks and Airfield.

Consultation
The Outline Planning Application (Reference S/0559/17/OL) will be considered by the District Council and consultees. We encourage you to have your say at www.scambs.gov.uk/waterbeach.

Determination
The District Council are charged with making the formal decision as to whether to grant planning permission. If they do, the Council will impose conditions and enter into a legal agreement with the DIO which will create the framework for the new development and ensure that commitments made at this stage in the process are fulfilled.

Further Consents
An Outline Planning Permission does not mean development can start. Detailed design will follow. For large complex sites such as this, a three tiered approval process is helpful in introducing the right level of detail and certainty for manageable phases of development, at the right time.

Tier 1 Outline Planning Approval - includes conditions, legal obligations and deals with site wide issues and requirements.

Tier 2 Key Phase Approval - defines a phase (land uses, quantum of development and viability) and provides the next level of detail on matters including: design, transport measures, delivery and affordable housing provision.

Tier 3 Reserved Matters - provides detailed proposals for layout, buildings, landscape, movement and infrastructure.

The Key Phase and Reserved Matters Proposals will need to be in accordance with the Outline Planning Application Framework. Other relevant guidance, including Supplementary Planning Documents prepared by the District Council will also inform these stages in the process.
Delivering Co-Ordinated & Comprehensive Development

This Outline Planning Application promotes development of a scale which is substantial in its own right, but it is likely to be only part of the overall development for the Strategic Site identified in the emerging Local Plan.

Very significant investment in new infrastructure, facilities and services will be needed alongside new homes and commercial development. As each phase of development comes forward, following the tiered approach described opposite, the impact will be monitored and capacity will be created – on the transport networks, in schools, in health provision, for recreation and learning, for enterprise and for shopping – to meet needs as they arise and make sure facilities and services are in accessible locations. Safeguards will be put in place, via the Outline Planning Consent and Key Phase Approval to ensure that capacity keeps pace with the development.

The Applicants have been working with the adjoining landowners and are also proposing a number of measures, explained in the Planning and Delivery Statement - including conditions, development management tools (such as design codes) and legal obligations - to deliver co-ordinated and high quality development across the Strategic Site.

---

**STEP 3: DELIVERY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY PHASE 1</th>
<th>KEY PHASE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONSENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DELIVER</strong></td>
<td><strong>DELIVER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>MONITOR</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FRAMEWORK FOR DEVELOPMENT**

**PLANNING OBLIGATION:** Provision & Contribution to Infrastructure

**T1** **T2**

**KEY PHASE & RESERVED MATTERS APPROVALS**

**ESTABLISH INFRASTRUCTURE USAGE & FUTURE REQUIREMENTS**

**KEY PHASE 1 DEVELOPMENT**

**KEY PHASE 1 INFRASTRUCTURE WORKS & CONTRIBUTION**

**KEY PHASE 2 DEVELOPMENT**

**KEY PHASE 2 INFRASTRUCTURE WORKS & CONTRIBUTION**
## DELIVERY PLAN SUMMARY: BARRACKS AND AIRFIELD ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>Year 1 (2018-19)</th>
<th>Year 2 (2019-20)</th>
<th>Year 3 (2020-21)</th>
<th>Year 4 (2021-22)</th>
<th>Years 5 (2022-2027)</th>
<th>Years 5-10 (2027-2032)</th>
<th>Years 10-15 (2032-2037)</th>
<th>Years 15-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICITY</td>
<td>Landbeach Primary sub-station offers capacity – local connection and sub-stations as required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>Existing capacity – local connections</td>
<td>Network Reinforcement</td>
<td>Local connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTABLE WATER</td>
<td>Existing capacity – local connections</td>
<td>New Main - C. Hintons Res</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUL/SURFACE WATER</td>
<td>Existing capacity – local connections</td>
<td>Interim reinforcement: utilising capacity in Cambridge Research Park (Cambridge WRC) and early construction of new discharge point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELECOMS</td>
<td>Openreach and Virgin Media available – local connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>1st site access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL PED/CYCLE CONNECTIONS WBEACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYCLE LINKS - L'BEACH, MILTON, C'BIDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYCLE ROUTE – A10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTENSION OF P&amp;R BUS SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW BUS SERVICE - CRP TO STATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMP P&amp;R AND CYCLE HUB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYCLE CONNECTION - COTTENHAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRETHAM ROUNDABOUT SIGNALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC CALMING – NEARBY VILLAGES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10 SCHEME - BUS-WAY, P&amp;R, ROAD CAPACITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timing and Sequence to be determined by A10 Study Development Phasing aligned with A10 Scheme Delivery – Monitor and Manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON INTERCHANGE, STATION RELOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd SITE ACCESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY SCHOOL (&amp; EARLY YEARS)</td>
<td>Phase 1 – North of lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sites serviced and marketed and available for progressive expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL CENTRE</td>
<td>Core provision including town square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>First phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL CENTRES</td>
<td>Phase 1 – North of lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>Interim expansion of existing provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY BUILDINGS</td>
<td>Existing Barracks provision in place; otherwise as required (phase by phase delivery plans) to include library and faith space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING TRAJECTORY (BARRACKS AND AIRFIELD ONLY)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DWELLINGS CUMULATIVE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>