

**Meeting with Claremont Planning re. land promotion on Broad Lane
13th January 2021**

Present: Cllrs Jones, Morris, Young, Katherine Else (Claremont Planning), Andrew Dutton (Landhold Capital) and the Clerk

Outline - KE started by saying that one of the key areas they've looked at is the high risk of flooding and this could be a reason the application wouldn't go forward. The current maps show the Jocelyn site in Flood Zone 3 even though other sites in the vicinity aren't. They have liaised with the EA and demonstrated that the online mapping is incorrect. Currently going through a process now to advise the EA and will provide info to show the mapping is incorrect and that certain areas of the site aren't in Flood Zone 3 and automatically excluded.

In the AECOM report there are a number of issues identified for this site. The flooding and the requirement to upgrade Broad Lane. They have looked at the capacity of Broad Lane and the ability to upgrade it, specifically to provide pedestrian footpaths. They believe that is possible. In terms of services, they aren't restrictions and can be accommodated within a residential development i.e the power lines would be put underground etc. In terms of the environmental credentials of the site, it has largely been used for grazing. They believe it does have some ecological value in terms of hedgerow etc. and that they could demonstrate an ecological enhancement and include an area on the edge of the site that residents that can enjoy.

The priority area of the plan is coloured buff. The space above it could be open space. The idea would be to maximise the housing in the buff area and provide open space around it. Want to create a setting to the village that will work well in that area. Still need to look at onsite drainage and ecology reviews.

Want to get an idea from CPC of what they were looking for to justify the site. The AECOM report refers to the agricultural quality of the land but likely to be 3B. If it was higher value the land would have been used for arable a long time ago. Claremont can investigate to confirm that if it would help in the assessment of the site. Willing to do a phase 1 eco assessment of the site if it would help.

Housing need – as far as CPC is concerned this isn't any need due to the other big sites in the village which are still being built. Following on from the AECOM analysis this demonstrated that Cottenham has exceeded the level for both market and affordable homes. The NP only argues there is a need for 'locally affordable' homes. The complication for the parish, is that there is a different calculation which shows there is a need for affordable homes in the District which could be 30 miles away from Cottenham.

KE asked if there was a need for self-build plots. CPC not aware of any need but SCDC would be the best place to ask. It may be that Claremont could look at making a number of plots available for locally affordable/self build.

FM mentioned the CLT which aspires to build the 91 locally affordable homes so this could be factored in. KE said they will take into account any land requirements in terms of the CLT as part of the wider land holdings that they are promoting.

Traffic – Claremont believe the traffic capacity can be demonstrated to be acceptable.

FM mentioned the bridleway that runs alongside the north edge and through Les King Wood that cuts across to Broad Lane. Another nearer one is the thin strip around the southern edge of the field which was a drain. Still a reserved drain that runs around that edge of the TM estate and up to the ditch that Jocelyn has the riparian ownership for. CPC have a barrier strip around the edge and there is a gateway onto the Tenison Manor estate. Joining those together isn't anything that CPC have thought about. Site would need to go further in conceptual development before able to get a proper comment from residents.

AD asked if there be a comprehensive scheme in the area of bridleways, links, wooded areas etc. linking to Rampton Road for the northern area of the village? FM said that it could provide better connectivity/safer route to CPS.

Clerk raised issue of increased traffic joining traffic coming from TM already. Any development of the site would look at wider access to link back and avoid putting pressure on Broad Lane. May be s106 towards travel plan provisions and that the site is fit for cycling/walking. KE said they are getting a travel plan produced. May need to look at the changing dynamic of life/work at the moment.

Scale and time - In terms of scale the only party they are working with is Jocelyn. No masterplan as yet and Claremont are putting all the feedback in. That is because of the work done re. flood issues so that site should be remapped. Always look at a wider area to meet connectivity, eco, open space etc. All that work is still going on. The 300 homes for this site is as per the LP submission. AD said that SCDC uses 30 units per hectare as a calculation. Would never have that many per hectare. His job is find out what is commercially possible. Not looking at 2-3 years time, looking longer term. Dependent on ability to engage with the Local Plan and how quickly that moves forward. The next LP may steer away from Cottenham but don't know at this stage. Have looked at the possibility of linking up with This Land so see if possible to create a link road. Would be complicated but not commercially viable. Are still looking to see if there is any benefit.

KE confirmed that the Jocelyn site is the priority for promotion. In terms of the land requirements, that would be informed by the number of units and amount of open space they'd need to provide. If they provided the CLT homes alongside market homes then the buff area may be increased. The indicative number of homes on that plot is around 50 units.

CPC queried if there is any aspiration to develop the land south of the drain. AD has been engaging with the landowner so there is a possibility. Would want to resolve that area as well if the Jocelyn site was developed.

Acceptability - Two things may be acceptable; real affordable homes and then doing something substantial re. flood protection in that area which would have wider benefits for

the village. AD can look at flood mitigation and sewage further which may benefit that side of the village. IY said need to do more than theoretical work because a lot of Jocelyn's site was underwater at Christmas.

Flood – FM said that the site does flood despite the information Claremont have, with the most recent incident at Christmas. The drainage is complicated. Ran through the details. CPC are pretty certain the sewage and surface water mingle but don't know how. Claremont may need to look at details of the improvement of the sewage system. KE asked if the improvements would be considered positively by CPC. Yes.

AD asked if we have anyone on the PC who has engaged with agencies re. the flood. FM ran through the flood risk group that was set up. We also have the benefit of the Chair of the local IDB on the PC. AD was concerned about the sewage mixing with surface water. The problem is the residual pumping station. Sewage from the north of the village comes down the High St, down Broad Lane into a combined drain etc. FM ran through the drainage system in that area and remedial works are required. There is also a maintenance issue. Any development would need to take this into account and provide a solution.

Community Land Trust - AD wanted to explore the CLT further. To what extent are we looking to cluster those together? FM said that Cambs ACRE had done a study to show the housing need. The CLT has used that elsewhere in Cottenham on a site which has since fallen through. AD has done a lot of work on exception sites and will explore but it's difficult commercially to take these forward. KE said that where Claremont has had success in this area is where they're supported by a market scheme alongside the exception/affordable site. FM said there is a rule of thumb that you can get away with around 20% market value on an exception site.

In terms of the southern area of the site, south of the drain, Claremont will engage with the CLT to see if that site is suitable so there could be a pedestrian link to Tenison Manor. Would look to work with CPC on that.

Neighbourhood Plan - Clerk asked about the vista from Rampton Road to the church and whether that would be obscured. FM confirmed there would be risks along the top of the site blocking the view.

Next steps - Claremont will now take stock and summarise and review the drainage arrangements. That will probably inform an early concept plan for the site once they have solutions to those aspects of the development. AD said they are on the way to a tech solution to altering the EA flood maps. Need to look at how they can look at improving the surface water. AD is doing some design work to pick up the visual vista protection etc. They will do that before they come back with a further update.