



**Murdoch House
Station Road
Cambridge
CB1 2RS
United Kingdom**

**Tel: 44 (0)1223 576360
Fax: 44 (0)1223 576359**

7 November 2006

David Rush Esq
South Cambridgeshire District Council
South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambs
CB3 6EA

Dear David

Cambridge Sports Lakes – Response to 13 September letter

Pursuant to the 13 September letter from Planning Services of the South Cambridgeshire District Council confirming the deferred consideration of our planning application, we are writing to respond to the items contained therein. The accompanying tables respond to the matters requiring attention as referred to by the letter. Please note that we have listed the status of those unresolved matters together with the action that the Trust will undertake.

As you are aware, we invited the local District Councillors from Waterbeach, Milton, Horningsea and Landbeach to meet with us and a team of four hydrologists from WSP regarding the drainage issues on 24 October. Councillors Peter Johnson, Hazel Smith, Richard Summerfield attended the meeting together with Melissa Reynolds and Pat Matthews. Tony Waddams of the Environment Agency was invited but was unable to attend. I believe that all present benefited from a constructive exchange on the matter to hand. From the ensuing discussion, David Adamson (CSL) proposed that an effective means to provide concerned Councillors with further input into the resolution of drainage/flood issues could occur following a conditional planning approval. This could be achieved by making drainage a reserved matter (as proposed by conditions 4b and 24c of the agreed conditions in the previous application) to be brought back to the Committee at a later date. Such conditions and others were also suggested by the Environment Agency's approval of the details submitted to date. After consultation with one of our Trustees who is a planning QC, we are assured that such an action would ensure that the Committee could have additional input into the proposed details of the drainage/flood protection regime being proposed.

Consequently, the Trust suggests that this proposal would be a practical alternative to your requirement for a Stage 2 FRA before planning permission is granted. We believe that such a procedure would provide a way forward that would satisfy both the wish for important design detail to come back to the Council and the requirement of the Applicant to synchronise expensive detailed design with fund-raising which is contingent on a Conditioned Permission as recommended in the Officers' Report and in accordance with Planning Guidance and legal precedent.

On the issues of transportation, ecology, and landscaping, the Trust has agreed to undertake some additional work as specified in the table. We acknowledge the issues raised by the consultees and respond to them individually in Attachment A to this letter. Please note that we indicate where appropriate when the items have been addressed and in what manner. We believe that our response helps address concerns, and that future matters can be dealt with through conditions as per the officers' report on the application, certain aspects coming back to Committee as Reserved Matters.

We hope that this additional information will enable our application to be placed on the Committee's December or January 2007 agenda. We firmly believe that the safeguards exist through reserved matters, conditions and other statutory means to provide assurance to ensure that all the necessary work will be stringently followed by the Trust to allow this scheme to move forward, maintaining its momentum.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael L. Garroway". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long, sweeping tail on the final letter.

Michael L Garroway
Director of Resource Development

Attachment A

1. Ecology.

Section 52/SCDC Ecology Officer	CSLT Response
1. Provide indicative figures for expected hedgerow planting, standard trees, scrub, grassland, open water and new ditches	Once all of the hydraulics is completed, details designs can be made so that CSLT landscape and management proposals will be able to consider how BAP species will be protected. See "Update on Ecological Assessment and Response to Planning" dated June 2006.
2. Provide water vole distribution data. Re-surveys will be taken prior to construction and habitat creation measures are likely to occur 2 years in advance of construction, with a commitment to advance creation of the new habitats at least 1 year prior to the destruction of the present watercourses.	We can confirm that the water voles are present in three watercourses (dykes) on the site. We estimate that the maximum population size is probably between 30-40 breeding animals across the entire site. See e-mail from Mark Johnston to Rob Mungovan dated 16 August 2006.
3. Provide a wintering bird survey.	Surveys could commence in early spring and include detection of late wintering birds. See "Update on Ecological Assessment and Response to Planning" page 6, dated June 2006. Full wintering bird surveys could be completed before construction commences as part of a planning condition.

Section 52/SCDC Ecology Officer	CSLT Response
<p>4. Further mitigation could be proposed for Nightingale and Grass Hopper Warblers. Also, the triathlon track could be moved a little away from the boundary to provide more space for screen planting. More clarification is requested on the proposed scrub planting near to the Car Dyke SAM. The landscape plans should be checked to see if habitat creation measures could include grassland areas.</p>	<p>Agreed that additional scrub planting along the Car Dyke will not be necessary, and could potentially impact on the now relatively species-rich grassland along the dyke. We understand that there is no nightingale population at the site but that at nearby Car Dyke it is small, and we could therefore mitigate as appropriate, subject to any construction or engineering constraints. See e-mail from Mark Johnston to Rob Mungovan, dated 16 August 2006 and Update to Ecological Assessment pages 10-11, dated June 2006.</p>
<p>5. Reptiles – the proposed approach is acceptable.</p>	
<p>6. Amphibian – the proposed approach is acceptable.</p>	
<p>7. It is accepted that a programme of on-going monitoring will be required. However, it is also important to formally agree to post-project monitoring for a 10-year period in order to report on the biodiversity successes of the scheme.</p>	<p>CSL has suggested that this be developed as an Ecological Plan. 10-year timeframe would need to be discussed. See Review of Comments by EN and SCDC page 1, dated 31 March 2006 and Update on Ecological Assessment and Response to Planning section 3.6, page 13, dated June 2006.</p>

Section 52/SCDC Ecology Officer	CSLT Response
8. The provision of various nest boxes and bat boxes is welcomed.	An Ecological Plan could be produced for the site that addresses impacts of phased development. The contractor could work with the ecologist, with a protocol for presence of protected species. See "Consultees Comments with Applicant Responses" document page 13-14, dated 15 August 2006.
9. The provision of otter holts has not been taken forward, and should be.	An Ecological Plan could be produced for the site that addresses impacts of phased development. The contractor could work under the ecologist, with a protocol for presence of protected species. See "Consultees Comments with Applicant Responses" pages 13-14, dated 15 August 2006.
10. The retention of large standing deadwood should be undertaken to compensate for the loss of large standing deadwood.	Tree survey conducted in May 2006. Also, some generic ideas on retention and enhancement were included in the Chapter 6 Mitigation Strategy. See Review of Comments by EN and SCDC page 3, dated 31 March 2006.
11. A commitment must be secured to achieve monitoring of the site's biodiversity for 10 years following the project's completion. (Similar to Item 7).	The landscape and management proposals must consider how BAP species will be protected, wherever possible identifying mean to enhance existing habitats, etc.

	<p>An Ecological Plan could be produced for the site that addresses the impact of phased development.</p> <p>A 10-year timeframe would need to be discussed.</p> <p>See Review of Comments by EN and SCDC page 1, dated 31 March 2006.</p> <p>Also Consultees Comments and Applicant Responses, page 13, dated 15 August 2006 and mitigation and compensation outline in Update on Ecological Assessment and Response to Planning, dated June 2006.</p>
<p>12. The creation of new grasslands is welcomed.</p>	<p>CSL agrees with guideline that provision should be made for creating areas of species grassland. See "Consultee Comments and Applicant Responses" document page 33, dated 15 August 2006.</p>
<p>13. SCDC would like to see more suitable habitat for skylarks. Perhaps off-site habitat works could address this, such as on the CCC land near the Waterbeach Station car park.</p>	<p>While some habitats currently suitable for skylarks will be lost due to the construction of the proposed development, mitigation will include the clearance of skylark habitats outside of the breeding season, and during periods when skylark activity/abundance on the site is at its lowest. Also, habitat loss will be compensated through the creation of open grassland meadow areas south of the Storage Lake.</p> <p>See Update on Ecological Assessment</p>

Section 56/Wildlife Trust	CSLT Response
1. The WT would like to know what construction profile is planned for the ditches, and what materials will be used.	No sand and gravel will be removed from the site, and no transport of materials is anticipated. See "Consultees Comments and Applicant Responses" document pages 2-4, dated 15 August 2006. Also.
2. Provide translocation methods for water voles. There needs to be a plan for monitoring the results of any vole translocation.	Further and more detailed surveys of water voles will be undertaken prior to start of construction and a detail translocation plan instigated. See Update on Ecological Assessment and Response to Planning page 11, dated June 2006.
3. The Focal Specimen cluster of trees are not considered appropriate for the site. We suggest these should instead be native local species, such as Oak, Ash and Willow species.	A detailed landscape design will be developed following detail design phase. A tree survey was furnished by Mott MacDonald's ecologist (Aug 06) See "Consultee Comments with Applicant Responses" document page 33, dated 15 August 2006.

<p>4. Whilst the WT appreciates the need for hardier (non-native) grass species, the WT believes it is important that some provision should be made for creating areas of wildflower species-rich grassland. In addition, rides in the newly created woodland could instead be created using an appropriate woodland seed mix that would encourage a more varied and interesting mix of flora.</p>	<p>CSL agrees that provision should be made for creating areas of wildflower species rich grassland. See "Consultees Comments with Applicant Responses" document page 33, dated 15 August 2006 and mitigation and compensation section in the Update on Ecological Assessment and Response to Planning, dated June 2006.</p>
--	--

Section 56/Wildlife Trust	CSL Response
<p>5. The WT believes the link with Milton Country Park is a key component of the scheme, and would like to see some concrete suggestions about how this link will be created.</p>	<p>Link agreed upon in consultation with SCDC Recreation Officer and Milton County Park Chief Ranger.</p>
<p>6. The WT believes there is a good opportunity to greatly improve the quality of the environmental contribution of the scheme by creating a link between the planned development and fields to the north-east of the development site.</p>	<p>CSL is ready to collaborate with other landowners, where appropriate.</p>

Section 62/ English Nature	CSL Response
<p>1. It has not been demonstrated that there will be no construction and/or operational impacts upon the biodiversity of the River Cam, or that any potential effects would be avoided or satisfactorily mitigated.</p>	<p>A detailed environmental management plan for the CSL will be formulated to ensure that there is no significant negative environmental impact on the River Cam. See Update on Ecological Assessment and Response to Planning page 10, dated June 2006 and "Consultees Comments with Applicant Responses" document pages 11-16, dated 15 August 2006</p>
<p>2. EN has concerns regarding the hydrological impacts of the proposals, including affects of water being discharged from the lakes into the river system, in terms of water quality and flows.</p>	<p>CLST has proposed a condition that design drawings will arise as a result of hydraulic studies and following Stage 2 FRA. See "Consultees Comments with Applicant Responses" document pages 15-16, dated 15 August 2006.</p>
<p>3. The potential to provide nature conservation enhancements should be clearly distinguished from measures to mitigate and/or compensate for harm to nature conservation interests.</p>	<p>An outline of the mitigation measures states that: All scrub and tree clearance will be kept to a minimum. To minimise any potential impact to amphibians, construction should ideally be undertaken between August and January. The construction work will follow the Environment Agency guideline on construction working near or adjacent to water bodies The translocation of macrophyte communities,</p>

	<p>amphibians, reptiles and water voles may be necessary. Culverts and bridges will be designed to allow safe passage of otters. Phased construction activities and construction of exclusion fencing could occur as appropriate. Compensation and Enhancement plans also outlined.</p> <p>See Update on Ecological Assessment and Response to Planning pages 13-15, dated June 2006 and "Consultees Comments with Applicant Responses" document page 29 dated 15 August 2006.</p>
--	--

2. Transportation.

Cambs. County Council Transport	CSLT Response	Comment
<p>An assessment of the impacts of an event that utilises the 750-space car park on highway safety, junction:</p>	<p>See Traffic Impact Assessment (MDP Final dated 1 August 2006) Also see Babbie Report (B0269500/01) dated August 2006, pages 11, 15-18. Also see e-mail from MLG to David Rush dated 31 August 2006, titled "Re: brief message for the Planning Committee". Met with Park and Ride and Craig Druary on 10 October 2006 and submitted large-event modal study on 23 October 2006.</p>	<p>Awaiting for Safety Audit review of Babbie study. (Nov 06)</p> <p>Park and Ride to send letter of agreement in principle with the special event off site parking scheme (Nov 06)</p>
<p>A detailed junction design for site access:</p>	<p>Junction design prepared in August 2005, received a Safety Report in September 2005, followed by a Swept Path Analysis dated May 2006 by John Allen Consulting</p>	
<p>Concern about overflow parking occurring in Waterbeach and how this potential problem would be avoided:</p>	<p>In order to ensure a smooth and orderly flow of traffic to programmes and events at the CSL site, it is proposed that a Travel Plan is provided for the whole scheme. The Travel Plan will provide guidance on appropriate measures which can be applied to minimise the use of the private car park and maximise accessibility for non-car owners to all events occurring at the development. The Travel Plan will form the basis for an annual transport management scheme that will be prepared in advance of each year's operation in</p>	

	<p>the autumn for programmes taking place at the site during the course of the following year. See CSL Framework Travel Plan, as outlined in the attachment to letter from Mike Palmer at Savills to Craig Drury, dated 11 August 2006.</p>	
<p>A scheme needs to be prepared to ensure that no construction or operational traffic uses roads other than the A10/Car Dyke Road to avoid congestion and nuisance on village roads in Milton and Waterbeach:</p>	<p>A Travel Plan Framework has been submitted for comment and a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Road Safety Assessment for the A10/Car Dyke Road Junction has been prepared by the consulting firm Jacobs Babbie. Recommend safety measures for the junction were also provided. CSL agrees to limit access for construction traffic to main entrance on Car Dyke Road and to instruct contractors to avoid village centres. See e-mail from MLG to David Rush dated 31 August 2006, titled "Re: brief message for the Planning Committee."</p>	

3. Landscape.

SCDC Landscape Officer's Report	CSLT Response	Comment
<p>a) The general landscape character of the area is large, flat and open. The CSL scheme would significantly change the character (of the landscape) over a large area.</p>	<p>a) The degree of change (of the landscape) is recognised as substantial and necessary in order to create this facility.</p>	
<p>b) 3. Clearer detail of car parking areas is required in order to avoid large expanses of tarmac in such a rural location. Cross sections and layout plans appear to give differing treatment.</p>	<p>b) 3. The plans and sections do not differ in our view, as they both show the concept of trees along the edges of and in some places within car park areas, to break down the visual impact.</p>	
<p>b) 4. Cars appear to be being parked on some of the highest areas and presumably will require lighting in areas where they are proposing shrubs due to difficult of planting establishment. Queries why the car parks could not be lower down and therefore better screened?</p>	<p>b) 4. Car parking has to relate to the activities or buildings which will need them. (These were a given item on the architect's layout, which we were in no position to alter.)</p>	
<p>b) 5. The management of planting and watering needs to be specified.</p>	<p>b) 5. As covered in our original statement and confirmed in the officer's report, management guidance on planting and ecology will be provided later at the stage of detailed planting plans.</p>	

SCDC Landscape Officer's Report	CSLT Response	Comment
<p>b) 6. Size of tree stock is not referred to and densities etc. will depend on this. Some areas may require under storey planting.</p>	<p>b) 6. At the concept plan stage such detail may be premature. (Nevertheless, if necessary, notes could be added to the drawings concerning plant sizes, which will be mainly normal woodland planting, plus standards in places close to buildings and car parks.</p>	
<p>b) 7. Concern is raised that evergreens proposed will dominate the skyline.</p>	<p>b) 7. Evergreens, mixed with deciduous trees, are a functional requirement to provide wind attenuation while reducing leaf fall into the water areas. They will be seen on the skyline, but not dominate.</p>	
<p>b) 8. It will be appropriate to establish some planting in ditches.</p>	<p>b) 8. Agreed, to be detailed by ecologist.</p>	
<p>b) 9. Hedges should have trees within them clearly marked from day one so that they are not cut in the early years, as it would be preferable to have standards rather than stooled trees.</p>	<p>b) 9. Agreed, to be covered in management manual.</p>	

SCDC Landscape Officer's Report	CSLT Response	Comment
b) 10. Queries how much of the vegetation on Car Dyke is to be lost to the visibility splays – looking at drawings, this will be significant.	b) 10. Some tree loss is inevitable, depending on the local highway authority's requirements. (We have not seen a detailed plan of vision splays – the final plans will have to take these into consideration).	
b) 11. Queries that all the trees adjacent to the training lake can be kept as indicated.	b) 11. This is the intention. (As discussed, the training lake will need to be reduced by a lane to ensure retention and reduce impact on these trees' roots.)	
b) 12. There definitely should be a link to Milton Country Park, and is the footpath link at the side of the golf course still being proposed?	b) 12. These links can be provided. (Once these are agreed they could be shown in our concept plan.)	
b) 13. Questions the practicality of retaining the hedgerow along the access road.	b) 13. This is the intention to ensure road layout/levels ensure hedgerow retention. (Once again, this depends on highway engineering drawings, which we do not have.)	
b) 14. There is a need for the car park areas to be broken up.	b) 14. This will be done, as far as possible, within space constraints. Principle is agreed.	
b) 15. There do not appear to be any details about the cycle track and BMX track, in particular levels. Are spectator areas to be banked, etc.?	b) 15. (This is not within our brief; perhaps others could answer).	

SCDC Landscape Officer's Report	CSLT Response	Comment
b). 16. Queries what is to be parkland or woodland, and how much of each.	b) 16. The overall concept is of water areas within parkland, but all main planted areas are woodland.	
b) 17. In previous discussions there have been inferences that the planting could be significantly reduced if budgetary restrained required this. We need full and clarified details of the landscaping ideally prior to permission being granted rather than as a condition.	b) 17. The intention is that if the concept plan is agreed, the detailed planting plans would be submitted, prior to work commencing, and be carried out in phases in accordance with those agreed detailed plans.	
b) 18. There are conflicting statements about the types of planting between the differing sections.	b) 18. We do not feel there is any conflict, and if there is, it will be resolved, after discussion, in the later detailed planting plans.	
c) If it is to be constructed in two phases and the spoil has to remain on site, how will much of, if any, of the planting can be implemented in the early stages? It is unclear with the proposed phasing as to how much of the planting can be carried out early or at the end of Phase One, as it is likely that spoil from Phase Two will still need to be spread on site.	c) All planting will be carried out as soon as possible, but "advance" planting would only be possible on land not affected by groundworks. Nevertheless, planting will always be carried out as soon as possible after areas are completed, to assist stabilisation, in the appropriate planning season.	

SCDC Landscape Officer's Report	CSLT Response	Comment
<p>d) The appropriateness of some of the species proposed is questioned. For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Woodland is an issue in terms of initial loss and as the type of tree planting proposed in some areas is not ideal from landscape or eco aspects. Some replacement could be less than positive. 2. Dense conifers are inappropriate. 3. Gorse and Broom are not local species. They tend to be found more in heathland. 	<p>d) 1. The management manual will stipulate the normal woodland maintenance regime to be followed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. As previously mentioned, a substantial number of conifers are a technical/practical requirement, arising from wind-tunnel tests. 3. Gorse and Broom are only to be used on drier slopes, where these would be appropriate. 	
<p>e) The photo montage points selected do not realistically show the impact and other sites should be included.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. View 1 does not include view of churches 2. View 2 does not mention longer views or the loss of wider panoramic vistas. This indicates a total change – not necessarily better. 3. View 3 is taken from a point where the intervening tree belt was average. Several sections are very poor in terms of giving wider views. Also, there does not appear to be any recognition of the poor state of many of these trees, many of which have been pollarded or fallen in the last year. 4. Whilst summer views are of value, winter ones should be provided. 5. The applicants have not considered views from several key points, e.g. Fen Road, the 	<p>e) 1. View 1: No churches appear in the wide angle of vision of this panorama, as in existing view.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. View 2: Planting as proposed would lose the longer view, but from inside the long view would be possible, but of the main rowing lake. 3. View 3: Trees outside the applicant's site ownership have to be shown as existing, although they may deteriorate over years. Nevertheless, the proposed scheme introduces an extra tree cover to the whole site. 4. As mentioned in the original statement, the difference between summer and winter views would be slight. (Only if pressed, do we agree to produce winter views, as they would cost extra fees.) 5. We did consider other viewpoints, but do not consider they would 	

<p>footpath cycle way further up towards Waterbeach, the caravan park, the Slap Up pub (as was).</p>	<p>assist materially in assessing the visual impact from public viewpoints, in the wider context. (Again, there would be financial implications, if more are definitely requested by the planners, now.)</p>	
--	--	--

<p>SCDC Landscape Officer's Report</p>	<p>CSLT Response</p>	<p>Comment</p>
<p>f) Concern about the height and massing of the mounding proposed. The site may currently have good drainage, but even with new drains being created, how are they intending to retain the structure of the sub soils with all the earth movement and compaction that will occur? Will the increase in mounding to 10m high for substantial areas have an impact on the underground water levels and immediate vegetation off site? How big are and where are the settling basins? Some areas of the slopes appear quite steep – practicality of establishment and what means of stabilization are being considered?</p>	<p>f) This is a matter for the drainage consultant to answer, as we accepted the contours as given, as the balance of cut and fill is a pre-requirement of the whole project.</p>	
<p>g) Top soil must NOT be piled high as possible, but stored in accordance with Good BS practice to ensure retention of structure.</p>	<p>g) The specification will, as normal, include the clause that top soil must be store in accordance with relevant BS.</p>	
<p>h) The loss of all existing features on the site, and the potential impact to adjoining ones: 1. Habitats – vegetation that is to be lost, whilst this is of varying quality, they provide linkages and are the only</p>	<p>h) Items 1-3 are for the ecologist to answer. 4. There may be some restrictions. (We would need to see the exact areas of archaeological retention proposed in order to be able to answer this query in</p>	

<p>features currently on the site.</p> <p>2. How can they state that grasslands impact is neutral if the majority of not all is being lost?</p> <p>3. Queries how are they going to ensure that it is the local species that are returned – will seed collection, cuttings and temporary transplanting be required?</p> <p>4. Will archaeology restrict planting and if so, which details are required now?</p>	<p>detail.)</p>	
<p>51. The Trees and Landscape Officer is concerned that there is a lack of detail with regard to the extent of trees and hedgerows which will be removed. A detailed tree survey is required for further comment to be made.</p>	<p>51. We understand the ecologist is dealing or has already dealt with this question.</p>	