

PLANNING COMMITTEE DATE: 29th May 2024

Agenda No: 7

REFERENCE NO: F/YR23/0206/F

SITE ADDRESS: Land north of Stoneleigh, 22A Eaton Estate, Wimblington.

PROPOSAL: Erect 45 dwellings involving demolition of existing dwelling and Outbuildings.

UPDATE

Wimblington Parish Council

Note the Wimblington Parish Council notes the reporting under 4.9 that *the Parish requested an extension to 15th May which was agreed. Further comments are awaited.*

However further objections were submitted on the 15th which may be missed by members.

Officers reply. The Parish Council did object and it is reported in full under para 4.15 of the report. This comment refers to the Ninja trail having been completed in Wimblington. As such the open space contribution cannot be directed as it is not necessary and fails the CIL Regs test. However, the Parish refer to the upgrade of play equipment in the Clarion play area in the Eaton estate. This however is not in the Parish Council's ownership or control. Nevertheless, it is suggested by officers that the play equipment contribution could be included (the original figure before being proportioned to meet the £2,000 per dwelling was £6,456, this complies with Local Plan appendix B), and should be held for a period of two years to contribute towards an upgrade to the Clarion play area. If however, no scheme comes forward for such an upgrade, that contribution reverts to the sum to be used to fund a project which increases clinical capacity at one of the GP Practices in the vicinity of the development, the original request (prior to being proportioned to meet the £2,000 per dwelling position) was for £37,075.47. Therefore, the transfer of contribution from play equipment to NHS would still be CIL compliant.

Applicant's reply to Councillor Taylors objections.

Any site in Fenland if not developed could produce food. However, he believes no food has been produced on the site for many years. He believes caravans were occupied on the site in 1999.

As regards the flooding issues raised the proposal will be outputting less water into the drainage ditches than the current site produces.

The applicant's consultant states the following:

The proposed drainage scheme, as demonstrated in the drainage strategy, is to mimic the site's natural greenfield catchment as best as possible. In the instance of this site, it is bounded by land drainage to the north, west and east, and during rainfall events produces a modest discharge.

For this site, and in accordance with the Lead Local Flood Authorities guidance (the LLFA now support this application), the site is restricted to the QBAR greenfield event (this is roughly between

the 1 in 1 and 1 in 2 year event). This means that even the undeveloped site in its current state would discharge at 1.8l/s. The proposed site restricts all storms up to and including the 1 in 100 year + 40% climate change event to 1.7l/s, which is slightly below the QBAR event for the undeveloped site. Furthermore, the greenfield site, for storms greater than the QBAR event, exceeds 1.8l/s, for example the 100 year event, without climate change (present day) has a natural catchment flow rate of 6.5l/s. As a result of the development, the higher intensity storms such as the 1 in 100 year event, will enter the system as a reduced rate of 1.7l/s, a 4.8l/s reduction, or 26% of the original flows.

Volumes are also an item to consider, and again this has been approached in the report. The natural greenfield runoff from the site is 354m³ for the 1 in 100-year, 6-hour storm duration. As a result of the scheme, the same event will have a discharge volume of 53.9m³. This demonstrates that the speed at which natural water enters the system is vastly reduces.

One of the concerns of the response took aim at an overloaded system. In reality, the scheme reduces the peak flows of all higher storm events and the speed at which the water enters the system, and this lessens the burden on the system. The development will actually help to relieve some of the stress of the capacity system, and certainly not make it worse.

Lastly, the drainage strategy is in accordance with LLFA's policy, and DEFRA's non-technical standards.

Officers' conclusion

At the time of writing this update no further objections have been received. The matters on which the application was deferred on 6th March have been addressed both by the applicant in submitting an amended scheme for 45 dwellings, the replacement of two-storey houses with bungalows removing concerns of loss of privacy, together with a revised drainage strategy in discussions with the IDB and accepted by the LLFA. The proposed drainage reduces the impact on the existing network rather than increases the risk.

There is no objection on highway grounds. Matters of overdevelopment, density and impact on the character of the area have been addressed in full in the report. Previously mentioned matters of adoption and management of open space and drainage areas are clarified. Officers consider the matters raised in deferral of the application have all been addressed and there are no reasons on these grounds to refuse the application.

Recommendation: No change to the recommendation which is to Approve subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement as recommended in the update report and in Section 9 of Agenda item 5.