

Proposed Rowing Lake S/0917/93/F

1. In the opinion of Milton Parish Council (M.P.C.) this application is contrary to Policy P20/4 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan:
"The development of the site is contrary to Policy P20/4 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan and Policy GB3/1 of the Cambridge Green Belt Local Plan in that, whilst outdoor sports are acceptable in a Green Belt location, Policy GB3/2 only permits development in the open countryside of the Green Belt where it will not adversely affect the rural and open nature of the area."
We believe that the boat houses especially and the two houses are therefore unacceptable.
2. We refer to Policy GB3/11:
"Development for the purposes of mineral extraction will not normally be permitted within the Cambridge Green Belt."
3. We refer to Policy GB4/1:
"Development for sport and recreation which requires substantial buildings and car parks, or which would frequently attract large numbers of people will not normally be permitted in the Green Belt."
4. M.P.C. objects to any increased traffic in Fen Road, Milton. Access, vehicular or pedestrian, should not be allowed from Fen Road except for rowing coaches using smart cards.
5. M.P.C. objects to the increase in number and size of buildings.
6. M.P.C. is in favour of maximum public free of charge access to the park.
7. Clarification of the size and number of proposed events needed if the park is to be closed for 165 days per year.
8. M.P.C. supports English Heritage regarding archaeological interests (their letter of 23 August to D.B. Hussell refers) and would like all concerns raised by English Heritage clarified.
9. Although supporting English Heritage in principle regarding the size of the mounds M.P.C. would not want spoil to be removed from the site.
10. Heavy plant access to be off A10 not through village.
11. Constant water level to be maintained to prevent change to surrounding environment and land drainage schemes.
(Not satisfied with survey of drainage scheme carried out. Environmental report should be done by independent body NOT under instructions of Rowing Trust).
Expert independent authorities should be making surveys. Full explanation of the drainage and how it will work should be provided. M.P.C. has yet to receive the requested details from the N.R.A. or any other body of how the drainage will work.
There is particular concern of the effect on the water table and surrounding environment during excavation. Clarification is needed about the storm drain put in at the

time of the development North of Butt Lane, Milton.
This drain which flows directly to the river is not shown
on the plans and it appears will have to do a 90° turn.
Will costs and maintenance of this diverted drain be met
by the developers?

12. Height of banks - careful consideration to be given to height of bund so as not to be obtrusive.
13. Width of canal, cycleways and bunds appears to amount to more than 58m. - the distance available from the railway to Fen Drift.
(Plan 4A2 - uses more land than plan shows see also E13 cross section).
14. Access to be provided at Car Dyke at an early stage of Phase 1.
15. Noise levels should be monitored. Motor craft should be restricted to safety boats at events.
16. Public access. If the proposed card scheme is instigated, cards ~~which~~ ought to be differently coded at the Milton and Waterbeach gates ^{and} should be free (or small administration costs only) ~~to Milton residents, should have preference.~~ *to Milton village*
17. Fishing. There should be no licence for the South end.
18. M.P.C. fully supports the Waterbeach concerns about the dangers at what would become a much busier junction at the Slap Up (A10); also about the access through Waterbeach village.
19. No detail is known about sewage disposal from the buildings. This would need to be subject to a further application.
20. There are concerns about social functions taking place with a licenced bar and further extended use.
21. No working on the site should be permitted before 8am and after 6pm or on Sundays during construction.
22. Land from Baitsbite Lock to the end of the drift North of Fen Road should be left untouched.
23. M.P.C. supports the views in the letter of 28 June 1993 from the occupier of the crossing keeper's cottage, Tim Leedham.

1. Aims

The Rowing Trust has been set up with the aim of its becoming a registered charity to create and run the lake and country park for various sports.

- a. Will the development be delayed until charitable status is obtained?
- b. Is there a link with the Manchester 2000 bid for the Olympic Games?
- c. Is there a genuine partnership with representatives of other sports, and can the Trust show the benefit of the scheme to the general local population?

2. Relations with Council officers

- a. Could the Council officers please comment on how the proposed lake and country park fit in with and conflict with the County and District Structure Plans for this area and the local Green Belt plan (P20/4, GB2, GB2.2, GB3/1, GB3/2, GB3/11, GB4/1 and SP(D)12/14). In particular, also justify the visual intrusion of these high mounds in the surrounding Edge-of-Fen landscape.
- b. Has there been any agreement with the County Council to sell the land to accommodate the lake either a) in the previous position, or b) in the present proposed position?
- c. Is the County being asked to sell at less than the 'Amenity' value? How would this be justified?
- d. Will the County retain any obligation or control over the land after the sale?
- e. To whom will the land belong if the Rowing Trust becomes defunct a) during construction, or b) after completion of the lake and park?
- f. What extra information or changes have been received by the District Council Planners from the Rowing Trust since the application was submitted and circulated for comments?

3. Engineering and Landscaping

- a. Why was there no detailed information about levels, capacity and depth of drains in the Environmental Statement?
- b. Is the perimeter drain going to be a continuous 'ring main' around the Rowing Lake site, joining with the existing outflows into the Cam and taking flow from the several drains from the west of the site?
- c. The Rowing Trust has mentioned a design head in the perimeter drain of 0.5m but has not specified under what rainfall conditions this is to be expected. What effect does the extra flow distance (about 2km) have on the drain design, particularly in relation to the head needed under worst-case storm conditions?
- d. Who would bear the responsibility of flood damage due to inadequate land drainage in Milton and Waterbeach during or after construction of the rowing lake? Will there be insurance cover for any such eventuality?
- e.
 - i. Any standing water in the perimeter drain under dry conditions will be at lower Cam river level, effectively bringing this level towards the eastern edge of the fields between the A10 and the lake site. The hydraulic gradient over these fields will thus be greater than when lower Cam level extended only as far as the drainage channels under the railway. What effect will this have on the water table in these fields under dry conditions?
 - ii. Is there a similar effect on the water table in the immediate area of Car Dyke? (ref. English Heritage letter 23/8/93 from P R Walker)
- f. Will the County Council have their own consultant to look into the implications for the remaining farming land?
- g. How would any change in water levels affect the Milton Country Park?

- h. In evaluating the scheme, has the NRA taken account of local knowledge of the flow in the existing drainage systems, including the new storm drain from Penfold Farm and pumped drainage in Waterbeach? The plans submitted with the application do not appear to show recent improvements.
 - i. Why has the NRA not contacted Mr T. Leedham (occupant of the Railway Gatehouse, Fen Road), whose dwelling straddles a drainage channel? He is concerned that his cellar straddles the railway drain. If the new drainage arrangements cause water-logging of his cellar, what provision has the Trust made for restitution? Is there liability insurance for Consequential Damage? Why is the right-of-way access to his property not shown on the Trust's plans?
 - j. Is it fair to assume that no spoil will be removed from the site?
 - k. How extensive a deviation will the Planning Department allow from the contouring on any accepted planning application? Because of the scale of the project, this will never be exactly as drawn. Is the mounding shown for the spoil heaps an over-estimate, or if extra soil needs to be deposited on the site, (because of bulking-up or unforeseen archaeological discoveries, etc.), where will it be put and will new planning permission be needed?
 - l. Do the calculations of 1.6 million cubic metres include all the spoil from the launching lake, Award drains, cut, and canal, as well as the main body of the lake?
- 4. Archaeology**
- a. Depending on what is uncovered as the work proceeds, the archaeological cataloguing and rescue work could become very expensive. Who will pay for the archaeological investigations, excavation and preservation demanded by statute? Will the financial bond referred to in the planning application be expected to cover this?
 - b. Who decides how much needs to be done?
 - c. Will the Trust consider repositioning the lake further from Car Dyke especially in the light of the objections by English Heritage that the banking and the Award Drain are too close to this ancient monument?
 - d. How will the County Council and the Rowing Trust resolve the conflict between the Stewardship Agreement with the Countryside Commission, which allows free access to the public to Car Dyke at all times, and the Trust's aim to charge the public for access on event days and to have access restricted to holders of smart cards for the rest of the year?
- 5. Access**
- a. Why will there be no free public access?
 - b. The estimated traffic volume when there is no event on has been given as 50 cars per day. Is this estimate for traffic associated with rowing only, and if so, can any estimate be made of the expected traffic associated with the other sports that are envisaged on the site? If the lake does develop into a more extensive leisure facility, what could the traffic flow be in 5 years' time? Does the Trust yet have a Business Plan, showing anticipated usage of the site by both rowers and others? If the lake becomes the best in the country, as indicated by the Trust, will this not attract many more events?
 - c. Will camping on the site be allowed during events?
 - d. Could we be sure there would be no nuisance parking in the surrounding villages?
 - e. Would pedestrian access from Fen Road, Milton cause nuisance parking?
 - f. How would the junction at the Slap-Up and other village roads in both villages measure up to the increased traffic?

Milton Parish Council

Minutes of the Public Meeting held on 13th September 1993 in the Community Centre at 8pm to discuss the proposed Rowing Lake.

Present: Members of the Parish Council, representatives from:
the County Council Property and Transportation Departments,
S.C.D.C. Planning Department, The Rowing Trust,
Mott MacDonald, N.R.A., Cambridge Rowing Association and
over 200 ~~residents.~~
people.

Apologies for absence: D.T. Wildman, R.J. Farrington and C.F. Nunn

Minute 317/93

1. J.E. Coston welcomed everyone and introduced the chairman D.J. Lee who explained the format of the meeting.
2. M. Muir-Smith for the Rowing Trust (C.R.T.) gave the rationale behind the proposal.
3. Prepared questions (copy enclosed) were submitted to the panel. Supplementary questions were taken from the floor.

The proceedings concluded with an "open forum."

J.E.C. thanked everyone for attending including the panel and also D.J.L. for chairing the meeting.

Meeting ended at 10.10pm.

Appendix 'A'

Answers to the questions (including supplementary questions):

1. Aims

CRT had approached the Charity Commission to become a registered charity. The formation of the Trust to take place after granting of planning permission.

- a) No
 - b) No
 - c) Other sports already involved.
- 150 acres of grass and woodland would benefit local population (answer M. Muir-Smith - CRT).

The C.R.A. pointed out that the River Cam was unsuitable for regattas and by modern competitive standards was inadequate. Rowers needed a lake within easy reach of Cam and Cambridge.

2. Response from County & District Councils

- a) The first Rowing Lake proposal did not conflict with Policy P20/4 & GB3/1 according to S.C.D.C. and Secretary of State for Environment. GB2/1 - refers to boundaries - no dispute.
GB3/2 - development in open countryside of Green Belt - a sensitive and difficult matter. Character of land would change but whether adverse or positive enhancement to be decided by S.C.D.C. and Department of Environment.
GB3/1 - mineral extraction - relevance?
GB4/1 - refers to type of sport and recreation allowed in Green Belt - this policy is aimed at stadia.
SP(D)12/14 - awaiting County Archaeologist's results. C.R.T. must show mounds are not visual intrusion.
D.R. pointed out that there were many other policies to be looked at.

- 2.b) No (D. Nuttycombe).
- c) County Council must obtain best price for land. County Council would listen to others willing to buy. Each field has now been valued by Savills individually (the land value was less than previously thought).
- d) There would be covenants on the land.
- f) Any further information, when received, will be sent to relevant authorities.
- 3.a) C.R.T. not required to give such information at this stage.
- b) No.
- d) C.R.T. would be responsible for damage. There will be insurance cover.
- g) No change.
- h) No.
- i) N.R.A.'s duty is to protect third parties and to maintain drainage system status quo. B. Rail are protecting interests of their own property.
C.R.T. are drawing up large scale drawing to show how the property would be affected.
- j) Yes. Top soil to be placed on perimeter to form noise barrier (Up to 5½ metres high overplanted with trees). Insufficient room at Milton end for barrier but tree planting to take place.

Scale of Plan

The cut 35m wide (1½ x width of Cam)
Lake 135m wide
Perimeter Drain 9m wide at the top

- 4.a) C.R.T. to pay initial evaluation. The main archaeological implications to be worked out with various bodies.
- c) Architect saw no problem.
- d) No conflict existed (CRT).

If Rowing Lake is not built there would be no need to dig for archaeological remains. County Council's intention would be to preserve the site for the future by leaving the land as it is.

- 5.a) There would be running costs to maintain the park. Differential charges for the two villages by use of smart card could be discussed.
- b) Traffic impact statement submitted by C.R.T. was acceptable to County Council Transportation Department.
- d) Nuisance parking in Fen Road could be a problem but not at Waterbeach.
- f) The Slap Up junction was considered adequate by the C.C. Transportation.

Open Forum

Traffic. County Council would request S.C.D.C. to ensure Fen Road is not used by construction traffic but only A10/Car Dyke Road (Agreed by D. Rush S.C.D.C.). Further concern expressed about the inadequacies of the Slap Up junction.

Special Event Days. The number of events could not be guaranteed but at other similar sites the number of (inter)national events was low.

Construction. Hours of working would be probably 6 days a week for two years during daylight hours (not normally after 7pm).

Baits Bite. Free access to Baitsbite Lock would be unchanged.

Boat Houses. Approx. 50 Cambridge clubs would be able to keep 2 boats each in the boat houses. Further extended use of the boat houses which is not compatible with rowing would be unacceptable to S.C.D.C.

Future Development. There would be no commercial development (C.R.T.).

Appendix 'B'

Representatives attending:

C.R.T. M. Muir-Smith (Consultant), R. Alexander (Architect)

Mott MacDonald C. Rickard

County Council (Property) D. Nuttycombe
(Archaeology/Property) C. Brown

County Council (Transportation) G. Bruce

N.R.A. A. Rich

S.C.D.C. Planning J. Pym, D. Rush