Cambridgeshire County Council response

Land off Rampton Road (Planning Application Reference Number: S/2413/17)

1. Introduction

1.1 This response has been prepared in order to provide justification for the level of developer contributions that Cambridgeshire County Council requires in respect of the proposed development up to 200 dwellings at Land off Rampton Road (planning reference S/2413/17)

2. Education Justification

Approach to Assessing Education Contributions:

2.1 Cambridgeshire County Council has a statutory duty to provide education facilities for the residents of Cambridgeshire. Section 13 of the Education Act 1996 (as amended) provides that an authority is under a duty to ensure “that efficient primary education and secondary education are available to meet the needs of the population of their area”.

2.2 The NPPF attaches great importance to ensuring sufficient choice of school places is available and states (paragraph 72):

“Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should:
• give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools; and
• work with schools promoter to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted.”

2.3 Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as substituted by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991, sets in place the statutory basis for obtaining funding from developers, through Planning Obligations. Section 106(1)(d) specifically allows for the making of payments to Local Authorities on a specified date or dates or periodically.

2.4 Therefore the overriding principle which governs Cambridgeshire County Council’s approach is that development proposals which generate a net increase to the number of dwellings within any given area would in most cases result in an increase in children, and as such would necessitate the need for school places to be provided for the children requiring them.

2.5 In order to determine whether an education contribution is required the County Council calculates the number of pupils arising from the development and then
compares this to the current capacity of the catchment school. This is a well-established process based on robust figures and information.

2.6 In terms of calculating the number of pupils arising from developments, the County Council's Research Service has developed an evidence base which has been produced using information on child yield from all types of development that have occurred across Cambridgeshire and in surrounding Local Authorities. From this information general multipliers have been derived that can be applied to proposed development in order to forecast the expected child yield. These are as follows:

- Early Years = 30 children per 100 dwellings
- Primary Education = 35 children per 100 dwellings
- Secondary Education = 25 children per 100 dwellings

2.7 Further details on these multipliers are contained within the County Council report entitled *Pupil Forecasts – Adoption of Revised Multipliers for Forecasting Education Provision for New Developments*, which was approved by the Children and Young People Committee on 8 September 2015 (Appendix 1).

2.8 In addition S106 contributions towards early years provision are only sought for those children entitled to free provision. The total number of early years children is therefore halved so that contributions are just sought for those 2, 3 and the proportion of 4 year olds not already in school, and who qualify under the Government’s eligibility criteria for funded places.

2.9 This development is one of a number of schemes in the immediate area. This results in significant cumulative development which needs to be taken into consideration. The other developments are:

- Land at Oakington Road (planning reference S/1606/16/OL) – 126 dwellings
- 36 Oakington Road (planning reference S/1952/15) – 50 dwellings
- Land north east of Rampton Road (planning reference S/2876/16/OL) 154 dwellings

2.10 Once the number of children has been calculated information on the current school capacity is then used to determine if there is sufficient space to accommodate the children arising from the development. This information is reviewed and updated twice a year using details from the school’s Census Returns and the NHS Child Health Register to ensure it remains up-to-date.

2.11 For primary and secondary schools consideration is given to the school capacity over the next five years, from when the application is submitted. In determining early years places consideration can only be given to the next two years, due to the age of the children.

2.12 When considering whether there are surplus school places the County Council only considers the catchment area of school(s) in which the proposed development lies.
The reason for this is that if journeys to school exceed the statutory walking distances, or do not have an available route, the County Council would be required to provide transport, with additional ongoing revenue costs. In addition, not planning on this basis could give rise to issues of accessibility, additional congestion from car trips and road safety (crossing roads and cycling etc).

2.13 If there is a lack of capacity to meet the needs arising from the development then the County Council will seek a financial contribution from the developers in order to provide for the additional places.

2.14 The approach above clearly demonstrates that the principle and process of seeking education contributions is both sound and acceptable.

2.15 Seeking education contributions as set out above also conforms to the three CIL tests:
1. Through the process of analysing the capacity of the catchment area contributions are only sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms (e.g. where sufficient spare capacity does not exist).
2. Contributions are spent on the school(s)/early years facilities whose catchment area the development is in, and are therefore directly related to the development.
3. The level of contribution is based on detailed work and costs and are considered to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

*Early Years Provision:*

2.16 Local Authorities have a statutory duty to ensure sufficient early years and childcare places. Some children, from the term following their 2\(^{nd}\) birthday and all children from the term following their 3\(^{rd}\) birthday, are entitled to 15 hours a week free early years education up to the point they are entitled to start statutory education. S106 funds are sought to support the development of these places. Places may be provided by day nurseries, pre-schools, maintained nursery classes or accredited child-minders.

2.17 Like schools there are regulations with regard to; the number of children that can be accommodated within a set floor space, group size of children, staffing ratios, number of toilets etc. Therefore when additional children require places these things need to be taken into account. It could be as simple as an additional toilet being fitted, a wall being knocked down to make better use of space or an entire extension.

2.18 Based on the County Councils general multipliers this development is expected to generate a net increase of 60 early years aged children (200 dwellings x 0.30 multiplier). A S106 contribution is sought for 30 places for the reason explained in paragraph 2.8 above. The catchment area is Cottenham.

2.19 There is a pre-school playgroup in the village that is the main provider of early years provision in the area.

*Table 1: Potential capacity of childcare providers in Cottenham*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting Name</th>
<th>Provision Type</th>
<th>Care Type</th>
<th>Ofsted</th>
<th>Actual Places</th>
<th>Registered Places</th>
<th>3/4 year old places</th>
<th>2 year old places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladybird Pre-school EPG : Cottenham</td>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>Sessional</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy G Mutter</td>
<td>Childminder</td>
<td>Full Day Care</td>
<td>School Run/New</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemarie Dixon Little People</td>
<td>Childminder</td>
<td>Full Day Care</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.20 There is insufficient early years capacity in the Cottenham area to accommodate the places being generated by this development. A contribution will therefore be required in order to mitigate the impact of the early years aged children arising from this development.

**Table 2: Number of children 0-4 living in Cottenham catchment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at 31/08/15</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NHS Child Health Information System*

2.21 This suggests around 100 children aged 2-4 are eligible for funded places. The additional developments coming forward are expected to add approximately 65 funded children and therefore will exceed the available places which are already almost at capacity.

2.22 Given that there is not enough capacity for the new developments it is therefore reasonable to seek an early years contribution from this development to mitigate the impact that is arising. The lack of capacity means that the contribution is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

2.23 The County Council can confirm that the number of contributions which have currently been pooled together to pay for this project has not reached 5.

2.24 The trigger for the early years payment, which is considered reasonable, is as followed:
- 50% on commencement
- 50% prior to occupation of the 100th dwelling

2.25 The County Council consider that these triggers are reasonable as money would need to be spent early on design and planning. The County Council has limited cashflow to forward fund this work and the contributions will cover these costs.
**Primary Education Provision:**

2.26 Based on the County Council’s general multipliers this development would be expected to yield 70 primary-aged pupils (200 dwellings x 0.35 multiplier).

2.27 This development lies within the catchment area of Cottenahm Primary School. The primary school is at capacity and operates with 3FE. The school has no spare capacity to accommodate the additional demand forecast to result from the proposed development.

2.28 When considering the capacity of a primary school the County Council needs to pay particular consideration to the capacity in the reception class. The reason for this is that in our experience new developments tend to add children to the younger year groups in primary schools. Infant Class Size legislation limits classes to 30 pupils and therefore any pressures in this class will subsequently continue through the school for the next 7 years.

2.29 Table 3 below shows the forecast for Cottenham Primary School.

*Table 3: Recent and forecast Number of Children living in the Cottenham Primary School catchment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Academic Years within the Primary School</th>
<th>Total Capacity</th>
<th>PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Catchment forecasts Jan 2016 base forecast

2.30 The County Council has already secured primary education contributions from another development in the area and has concluded negotiations on a further development (see Table 4 below).

*Table 4: Developments for which primary education contributions are secured or negotiations are concluded*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>DWELLINGS</th>
<th>EXECTED NUMBER OF PRIMARY AGED CHILDREN</th>
<th>PRIMARY EDUCATION CONTRIBUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 Oakington Road</td>
<td>50 dwellings</td>
<td>18 children</td>
<td>£148,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.31 The County Council can confirm that it has not currently reached 5 pooled contributions for this project.

2.32 The trigger for the primary education payment, which is considered reasonable, is as followed:
- 50% on commencement
- 50% prior to occupation of the 100th dwelling

2.33 The County Council consider that these triggers are reasonable as money would need to be spent early on design and planning. The County Council has limited cashflow to forward fund this work and the contributions will cover these costs.

**Identified Mitigation**

2.34 Over a number of years the Council has provided additional teaching capacity in response to growing demand in the village. These expansions left the school with significant pressures on it auxiliary spaces, notably the size of the hall and limited informal teaching spaces. As a response, the Council has recently completed a significant refurbishment of the school to provide appropriate accommodation for a three form of entry primary school. As part of this work, detailed assessments of the sites capacity were undertaken. It is, therefore, known that the current site offers no opportunity for expansion beyond the school’s current 3FE.

2.35 At the time of the Council’s initial response to the emerging proposals it was unclear how the additional capacity would be secured. Specifically, if there was a need for this to be a separate 1FE primary school, or an expansion of the existing school. Subsequent discussions with the school have identified a desire for further expansion, if required. This combined with the previously expressed views of the local community, suggests that a new school would not be the appropriate solution.

2.36 In order to retain an effective class structure, the Council is of the view that accommodation for an additional full form of entry would need to be provided. It is accepted by the Council that there is a need to ensure there is proportionality in the contributions sought across all developments coming forward in the area.

2.37 In line with this emerging position, officers have undertaken a review of the school’s existing accommodation to identify the scale of additional capacity which would be required. The fact that the additional accommodation would need to be delivered as a standalone building may mean that some accommodation may need to be duplicated.

2.38 In addition, some additional areas may need to be delivered as the Council seek to ensure there is potential for expansion should further development sites emerge.

2.39 A review of the accommodation required for Cottenham to operate as a 4FE primary, rather than the provision of a full 1FE new build for future proofing has identified a reduced area being required. **Appendix 2** provides a summary of the identified accommodation. This shows that at 633.50 m², there is a reduction of 807.50 m² from the 1,441 m² identified for a separate 1FE school. Additional area, equating to 286 m²
would be required if the additional early years provision identified were provided at the school, although it is acknowledged that this would not be attributable to these developments.

2.40 It has been noted that there may be potential for expansion of existing provision in the village, through supporting the redevelopment of community facilities being delivered by the Parish Council. The costs associated with delivering this would need to be determined in conjunction with the Parish Council as part of wider review of their proposals. However, there is currently no clarity that this will be achievable, and the County Council needs to retain a fall back option within the S106.

Determining Proportionality

2.41 It is accepted that there needs to be proportionality regarding the contributions sought from the proposed housing developments. It is not appropriate to apportion existing surplus capacity to one developer in an area where multiple applications are under consideration.

2.42 The overall contribution are split proportionately between all proposed sites. Based on the information set out above, this would equate to:

Table 5: Early Years and Primary Education contributions from Cottenham Developments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development site</th>
<th>Early Years</th>
<th>Primary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land off Rampton Road (S/1818/15/OL)</td>
<td>£286,200</td>
<td>£715,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Oakington Road (S/1606/16/OL)</td>
<td>£194,400</td>
<td>£486,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land north east of Rampton Road (S/2876/16)</td>
<td>£220,800</td>
<td>£772,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Oakington Road (S/1952/15) already secured</td>
<td>£59,400</td>
<td>£148,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£760,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,122,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary School extension cost

2.43 The additional school provision identified by the County Council has a cost of £6.2 million for the provision of accommodation for a further 1 FE equates to £23,664 per place.

2.44 The Council’s identified costs, provided as Appendix 2, have been adjusted to
3Q19 using the All-in TPI in the BCIS Quarterly Review. This represents the anticipated mid-point of construction based on anticipated timescales for delivering additional provision in Cottenham.

2.45 The gross and average outturn pupil cost rates in the 2014 report are not fully inclusive of all project costs, with a number of below the line costs being excluded. These exclusions, which are standard for any BCIS cost analyses of all in gross costs include:

- Statutory Fees
- Surveys
- Loose Furniture, Fittings and Equipment
- ICT provision
- Client programme management costs.

2.46 The national report takes any substructure costs over £120/m² as abnormal. However, the majority of schemes delivered in Cambridgeshire have substructure costs well in excess of £120/m² due to the geological nature of ground conditions. This has resulted in a large number of buildings delivered on school sites requiring non-traditional foundations.

2.47 The cost estimate identified by the County Council makes allowance for each of these elements and, therefore, represent an accurate estimate of project costs.

2.48 The analysis set out above provides a justification for the contributions being sought. The cost estimate for delivery of a 1FE expansion at the primary school is £4,150,000 @ 3Q19. This reflects the assumed mid-point of the construction programme and is used to inform the development of the Council’s five-year capital programme. If the S106 contributions are index linked to the BCIS TPI, then, based on current information, the cost estimate for 1Q16 indicates that the cost of providing the identified accommodation would be £3,500,000.

Summary – Contributions required

2.49 As set out in table 5, a contribution of £286,200 for early years education and a contribution of £715,500 for primary education are required.

2.50 These costs have been apportioned between all developments coming forward in the area and have taken into account the current capacity at the primary school. These also include addressing any existing deficiencies in the school accommodation. In order for the contributions to meet the CIL tests and be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind the County Council has therefore only applied those costs which are required to expand the school from a 1.5FE to 2FE.

Secondary Education Provision:
2.51 Based on the County Council’s general multipliers this development is expected to generate a net increase of 50 secondary school places (200 dwellings x 0.25 multiplier). The catchment school is Cottenham Village College.

2.52 Cottenham Village College currently has a PAN of 180 which gives capacity for 900 students aged 11-15. There are currently 760 students on roll (School Admissions, June 2016). The pupil roll is forecast to increase slightly from 764 in 2015/16 to 775 in 2020/21 (see table 4).

Table 6: School based forecast for the number of children on roll at Cottenham Village College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary (10yr old)</th>
<th>11 Yr Olds</th>
<th>12 Yr Olds</th>
<th>13 Yr Olds</th>
<th>14 Yr Olds</th>
<th>15 Yr Olds</th>
<th>11 - 15 Yr Olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Secondary school pupil forecasts, Jan 2016)

2.53 In August 2015 there were 797 children aged 11-15 living in the catchment compared to the 744 on roll (Secondary Matrix, 2015). This suggests some pupils are leaving the catchment in order to access education provision elsewhere. The catchment population aged 11-15 is forecast to increase to around 898 by 2020/21 (see table 5).

Table 7: Catchment forecast for Cottenham Village College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sec 11</th>
<th>Sec 12</th>
<th>Sec 13</th>
<th>Sec 14</th>
<th>Sec 15</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Places remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Catchment Forecasts, Jan 2015).
According to the latest forecasts there is sufficient capacity until at least 2025/26 and therefore Cottenham Village College should be able to accommodate the additional children living in the new developments. Therefore no contributions are sought for secondary education provision.

3. Libraries and Lifelong Learning Provision

3.1 Cambridgeshire County Council has a mandatory statutory duty under the Public Libraries and Museums Act to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service to everyone living, working or studying in Cambridgeshire.

3.2 The importance of libraries to the quality of life, well-being, social, economic and cultural development of communities is recognised both nationally and locally. Therefore, it is important to include access to a range of library facilities to meet the needs of the residents of this new development for information, learning and reading resources in connection with work, personal development, personal interests and leisure.

3.3 These services and facilities include:
- adult and children’s books
- Information books and leaflets
- local studies and tourist information

3.4 These services in libraries – including mobile libraries - are supplemented by online access to books and high quality information resources available to library members from their home, workplace or school/college.

3.5 The facilities and services provided by libraries play a vital role in the following areas:
- developing children’s reading skills and enjoyment of reading and providing the resources for improving them throughout their pre-school and school years.
- encouraging and supporting the development of adult and children’s literacy through the delivery of the Reading Agency’s Universal Reading Offer
- supporting the economic development of the local area by providing books, information resources and courses for people in work to develop their skills and knowledge, or for people to improve their literacy, numeracy, IT or other basic skills to help them enter or return to the job market.
- supporting local tourism, sense of place and population movement by providing information and leaflets about local places and services, and local history and heritage.

3.6 In assessing the contribution to be sought from developers towards library provision, a consistent methodology is applied in Cambridgeshire, based on the following two principles.

3.7 Firstly, the requirement for a contribution is determined according to:
• the County Council’s Service Levels Policy for the provision of a range of levels of library service to ensure that communities of similar sizes across the County receive equivalent access. Since this policy is used on an ongoing basis to determine the level of stock and resources available in line with the existing population it follows, therefore, that a significant increase in population will require an increase in the level of resources made available.

• an assessment of how the additional demand can be addressed, taking into account:
  ➢ the size and position of the planned development
  ➢ the distance to / catchment area of any existing static library provision or the location of any existing mobile library stop(s)
  ➢ the physical capacity of the existing library provision in the area to deliver a service to additional users.

3.8 Secondly, where appropriate the level of developer contributions for new library service provision will be based on national guidance which sets out the costs per head of population increase to cover building, fitting out, stocking and equipping libraries. The guidance is contained in the document: Public Libraries, Archives and New Development: A Standard Charge Approach, May 2010, developed by the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council on behalf of the Department of Culture, Media and Sport, the central government department with overall statutory responsibility for public libraries. This standard charge approach has formed the basis of the agreements already in place for the major new developments in Cambridgeshire. The standard charges are based on the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) Building Cost Index and the National Statistical Office Retail Price Index for books and periodicals and will be adjusted in line with those indices over time.

3.9 Based on these principles, the actual level of the contribution sought for each development will depend on its size and location in relation to the size / physical capacity of existing library accommodation. However, in all cases it will include a one-off contribution to book and library stock and the shelving, equipment and infrastructure to accommodate and support those additional resources.

3.10 In order to assess whether the contribution is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms the County Council calculates the number of new residents arising from the new development and assesses this against the current capacity in the area.

3.11 In instances where a development mix has not been provided or approved the County Council’s applies a standard average household size multiplier in order to determine the impact of the development. At the time of the negotiation of this development the average household size multiplier was based on a rate of 2.5 people per dwelling. Justification for the rate of 2.5 people per dwelling is covered in paragraph 2.2 of the County Council guidance – Household size multipliers for new developments (October 2009) (Appendix 4). 200 new dwellings at a rate of 2.5 people per dwelling equates to 500 new residents.
3.12 Statutory provision for the library service in Cottenham is currently via Cotteham Library.

3.13 Applying the number of new residents arising from this site the County Council’s assessment is that there is not sufficient existing capacity and the number of new residents will put considerable pressure on the library and lifelong learning service in the village. The County Council therefore considers that it is reasonable to seek a contribution towards library and lifelong learning provision and mitigate the impact of the development.

3.14 The contribution will be on the basis of £60.02 per head of population increase. This represents the proportionate cost of the internal area at Cottenham library modification to create more library space and provide more shelving and resources.

3.15 Therefore the total contribution that is required towards library and lifelong learning mitigation is £30,010 (£60.02 x 500 new residents).

3.16 The County Council can confirm that it has not currently reached 5 pooled contributions for this project.

3.17 The trigger for payment would be 100% prior to occupation of the 100th dwelling, which is considered to be reasonable.

3.18 Seeking libraries and lifelong learning contributions as set out above conforms to the three CIL tests:
   1. Through the process of analysing the capacity of the catchment area contributions are only sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms (e.g. where sufficient spare capacity does not exist).
   2. Contributions are spent on the libraries and lifelong learning provision whose catchment area the development is in, and are therefore directly related to the development.
   3. Through the use of a formula-based approach the costs set out are considered to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

4.0 Transport

4.1 This section of the note takes each proposed transport-related planning obligation in turn and sets out how they meet the CIL and planning conditions tests.

4.2 In terms of planning background, the National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 4) provides the over-arching planning context for transport requirements associated with development. In particular the NPPF requires that:

- Transport Assessments demonstrate that the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up and that safe and suitable access to a site can be achieved for all people (para 32).
• developments should be located and designed where practical to...give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and have access to high quality public transport facilities’ and ‘create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians’ (para 35)

• A key tool to facilitate this will be a Travel Plan. All developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a Travel Plan. (para 36)

4.3 These three requirements provide key national planning policy context as to why a number of sustainable transport measures have been agreed with the applicant for this development, and are proposed to be secured via planning obligation.

4.4 This note now takes each proposed transport obligation in turn and explains their compliance with the three CIL tests or whether it should be dealt as planning condition as per paragraph 206 of the NPPF.

**Improvements to pedestrian and cycle facilities on Rampton Road between the development site and South of Oakington Road.**

4.5 The improvement to pedestrian and cycle facilities along Rampton Road between the site access and South of Oakington Road are agreed in principle with the appellant and are to be secured through condition. The localised improvements to pedestrian and cycle facilities are necessary to improve the pedestrian and cycle connectivity from the development site to the primary school and Cottenham village, to facilitate the additional trips created by the development to these facilities, whilst making shorter distance trips by pedestrian and cyclist more attractive.

4.6 The improvement to pedestrian and cycle facilities is compliant with the tests as the improvements are on the desire line for pedestrians and cyclist to travel to the primary school, bus stop and other facilities within the village.

4.7 The improvement to pedestrian and cycle facilities is compliant with the tests as the principle purpose of the link is to facilitate pedestrian and cyclist connectivity to and from the development with the rest of Cottenham.

**Toucan Crossing and maintenance**

4.8 The provision of a toucan crossing on Rampton Road between the site and Oakington Road is necessary in order to provide a safe crossing point for the additional pedestrian and cyclist movements generated by the development travelling to the local primary school and other facilities within Cottenham. The toucan crossing is also expected to provide added benefit to existing residents who may experience difficulty in crossing Rampton Road due to increased traffic movements resulting from the development.
4.9 The toucan crossing is to be located on the desire line for pedestrians and cyclist to travel to the primary school and other facilities within the village. The appellant will directly implement the toucan crossing.

4.10 It has been agreed with the appellant that the toucan crossing should be secured via planning condition. For this toucan to remain of use and to continue to satisfy the three tests, it needs to be maintained or it will fall into disrepair. This obligation is required to ensure this is the case. The level of contribution, at £38,661.70, has been provided by the traffic signals team that will maintain the crossing and has been calculated based on standard unit rates and assumptions.

**Rampton Road/ Oakington Road junction improvement**

4.11 This junction is shown to be over capacity during the 2020 base year during the AM and PM peak periods. The proposed development results in a worsening of conditions with an additional 25 vehicles and 36 vehicles queuing on the worst affected arm during the AM and PM peak respectively. The modelling of the proposed improvement scheme is shown to mitigate the development impact through provision of additional capacity at the junction, therefore reduce delay and queuing to below 2020 base levels. The improvements also facilitate pedestrian and cycle movements traveling alongside the carriageway or crossing each of the junction arms.

4.12 The distribution of traffic to and from the development will result in the majority of car trips passing through the Rampton Road/ Oakington Road junction and therefore is necessary to the development.

**Widening the footway on east side of B1049 within 30mph zone between the junctions of B1049 with Dunstal Field and Appletree Close to enable shared use walking and cycling**

4.13 This improvement is to be delivered directly by the developer through S278. The improvement will better enable residents of the development and those of Cottenham to access the B1049 cycleway towards Cambridge and destinations in between from within the 30mph, improving its attractiveness to cyclists, particularly less confident cyclists or those travelling with children. The improvement is considered to be in line with paragraphs 32 and 35 of NPPF above, and will help reduce the traffic impact associated with the development at the Histon Road/ High Street junction and those junctions through Cottenham, by making the route more attractive to cyclists and encouraging more residents (those of the development and existing) to cycle. The improvement is on the direct desire line for cyclists between the site, Histon and Cambridge. The improvement is needed to mitigate the impact of the development at the Histon Road/ High street junction and to encourage those from the development to cycle some journeys in place of the private car.

**Installation of a bus shelter at the Lambs Lane bus stop**

4.14 The provision of a shelter is key to providing travellers with adequate waiting facilities to enhance the attractiveness of local bus services. The improvement is necessary to
provide adequate facilities to accommodate the additional bus users resulting from the proposed development and to make bus travel more attractive to residents as an alternative to the private car. Therefore the bus shelter provision is compliant with Paragraph 32 and 35 of NPPF.

4.15 The provision of a shelter is only being sought for the bus stop identified as the closest stop to the development and the one that residents from the development will use.

**Maintenance of bus shelter**

4.16 It has been agreed with the appellant that bus shelter should be provided via planning condition and that provision of the shelters meets the CIL tests. For the shelter to remain of use and to continue to satisfy the three tests, it needs to be maintained or it will fall into disrepair. This obligation is required to ensure this is the case. The level of contribution, at £7,000, has been calculated based on standard unit rates and assumptions so is therefore **reasonable in scale and kind**.

**Installation and maintenance of RTPI at the Lambs Lane bus stop**

4.17 Real time passenger information is a key element of a quality public transport offer and provides travellers with real time data on when the next bus is due. Research shows that this can provide significant passenger benefits and can enhance the attractiveness of bus travel. Provision (and maintenance to ensure its longevity) is therefore required to make the development compliant with paragraphs 32 and 35 of the NPPF and is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

4.18 The provision (and maintenance) of RTPI is only being sought for the two bus stops closest to the proposed development and so is **directly related** to the development. Given the obligation is only sought for the stops most attractive to future residents of the site this is considered **reasonable in scale and kind**.

**Installation of cycle stands at three locations in Cottenham**

4.19 The installation of cycle stands in Cottenham Village Centre and at the train station are necessary to facilitate additional cycle demand generated by the development travelling to key facilities in the village. The cycle stand provision is to ensure sufficient cycle parking capacity is available to encourage and enable shorter distance journeys to be undertaken by cycle rather than by private car, therefore the provision is compliant with Paragraphs 32 and 35 of the NPPF

4.20 The installation of cycle stands in Cottenham Village Centre are for residents from the proposed development who will travel to key facilities in the Village.

4.21 The cycle stand provision for cycle parking at 3 locations in the village are to facilitate cycle trips from the proposed development.

**Local highway improvement scheme at The Green junction in Histon**
4.22 This improvement is for a contribution of £9,620 towards the provision of a dedicated right turn lane and widening of the carriageway at The Green Junction in Histon on the southbound arm. The junction already experiences delay and queuing which the development will contribute additional vehicles towards, adding to the delay and queuing which the scheme will help to mitigate. Therefore the scheme is **needed in planning terms** and is considered to be **directly related** to the development. The contribution sought is proportionate to the number of additional movements the development will contribute to the queue and therefore is **reasonable in scale and kind**.

**Local highway improvement scheme at the Oakington Junction signals (Water Lane/ Cambridge Road)**

4.23 The development is expected to result in additional motorised vehicles travelling westbound on Water Lane during the AM peak, which will prevent or reduce the green time available for vehicles turning right onto Cambridge Road from Dry Drayton Road. The applicant has agreed to contribute towards a dedicated right turn filter at the signals to facilitate the Dry Drayton to Cambridge Road movement, which is considered to be **necessary in planning terms**. The scheme is **directly related to the development** as it is needed as a direct consequence of additional traffic created by the development. The provision of this improvement is considered to be **reasonable in scale and kind** as contribution identified (£6,000) is the cost of installing and implementing the equipment.

**Travel Plan**

4.24 A Travel Plan including £30,000 of measures for the Travel Plan Coordinator to implement is necessary as asserted in NPPF paragraph 36 that Travel Plans are a ‘key tool’ to maximise the use of sustainable modes and should be provided for all developments that generate significant amounts of movements.

4.25 The Travel Plan will be tailored for the specific uses and needs of the development in light of the opportunities available for sustainable modes in Cottenham.

**Note:**

Importantly, as a further ‘second order’ benefit, provision of additional sustainable transport infrastructure or services that directly benefits this development may also allow other Cottenham residents to make sustainable transport choices. If this reduces car use by existing residents, this also means that the net traffic impact of the development proposal overall is reduced.

5.0 **Indexation and Security**
The County Council would also require that indexation is applied to all of the County Council contributions and appropriate security is secured to ensure the crucial infrastructure is provided.

APPENDIX 1: Pupil Forecasts – Adoption of Revised Multipliers for Forecasting Education Provision for New Developments

Agenda Item No: 7

PUPIL FORECASTS- ADOPTION OF REVISED MULTIPLIERS FOR FORECASTING EDUCATION PROVISION FOR NEW DEVELOPMENTS

To: Children and Young People Committee
Meeting Date: 8 September 2015
From: Adrian Loades, Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults Services
Electoral division(s): All
Forward Plan ref: N/a

Key decision: No

Purpose:
To: (a) advise Members of the outcome of a review undertaken by the Council’s Research & Performance Team Group of the multipliers used as the basis for pupil forecasts and 0-19 education place planning; (b) set out the impact of applying new multipliers to new developments; (c) seek approval for the adoption of the revised general multipliers for children in the 0-3 age range with immediate effect; and (d) seek approval for the adoption of the changes to the detailed multipliers for social rented and market housing as detailed in paragraph 2.19.
Recommendation: Members are asked to:

a) Comment on the matters raised in the report and note the changes to the identified requirements for early years places likely to result from applying the new multipliers; and

b) Approve the adoption of:

(i) the revised general multipliers for children in the 0-3 age range with immediate effect in order to better inform the planning of early years education places; and

(ii) the changes to the detailed multipliers for social rented and market housing with immediate effect.

1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 In order to plan appropriately for new housing developments, the County Council provides forecasts of pupil numbers to inform planning for early education and school places. The multipliers which underpin the forecasts, were last revised, and approved by Cabinet, in 2009. The forecasts form the basis for either negotiation with developers as part of a S106 Agreement or to support the Council’s case for its infrastructure requirements to be funded via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). In larger developments the number of school places required may necessitate provision of new schools and sufficient land to accommodate buildings and outdoor space. These requirements feed into the planning process. Given the importance of the multipliers in the planning of the provision of new communities, it is important that they are considered by elected members and this, in turn, lends weight to the Council’s case whenever it is challenged by developers.

1.2 Forecasting the number of children that will live in a new development is a complex and inexact process. The Council’s Research Group has developed a methodology over many years, based on:

- analyses of census data
- local surveys of new developments such as Cambourne, and Love’s Farm, St Neots; and
- local experience.

Together, these sources indicate the average number of children that might be expected in individual properties, depending on the number of bedrooms and tenure. While some key variables e.g. dwelling size and tenure mix can be factored into forecasts, there remain many intangibles to do with location and design that affect the types of people and households attracted to an individual development. As new developments settle and mature, so do their populations, meaning that infrastructure needs to evolve over time.

1.3 The multipliers used to forecast the numbers of children for a given number of new homes were last revised in 2009 resulting in the general multipliers for primary aged children being increased, from 20-30 to 25-35 per 100 dwellings and for secondary aged children from 15-20 to 18-25, with the subsequent
effects on school place requirements. The 2011 Census, the monitoring of recent new developments and surveys of new estates in Cambridgeshire and the experience of the last six years suggested that these general multipliers needed to be reviewed again. This paper sets out the reasons for, and outcome of this latest revision.

1.4 Given the current and projected level of growth in the County as part of the Service Level Agreement between Children, Families and Adults and the Research Group, a review of the multipliers will take place every 5 years.

2.0 GENERAL AND DETAILED MULTIPLIERS

2.1 The multipliers are broken into two categories. Where the housing mix is unknown a general multiplier is applied. Where a detailed mix is known a detailed multiplier is used.

2.2 General multipliers

When discussions with a developer begin, the intended housing mix may be unknown, unfixed or known in broad terms only. In these situations it is necessary to apply a “general multiplier” range that indicates the lowest and highest number of children that might reasonably be expected to live in the development.

2.3 The Council’s general multiplier ranges per 100 dwellings are currently:

- 18-25 pre-school aged children (0 - 3 years)
- 25-35 primary age children (4-10 years)
- 18-25 secondary age pupils (11-16 years)

2.4 One percent of children from new larger developments i.e. upwards of 500 dwellings are forecast to require special school placement.

2.5 For planning purposes, the Research Group advises against the use of a single mid-point figure. Instead greater use of the full range is advised, particularly during early discussions. At all points it is important to be clear that any particular child forecast is based on a set of assumptions regarding the nature of the proposed development. If these assumptions change so too will the child forecasts. Whilst a multiplier range is proposed for calculating child yield, for the purpose of calculating developer contributions where a detailed housing mix is not yet known, the top end of the range must always be used to guarantee that the Council can cover its statutory obligations with regard to the provision of early years and school places.

2.6 The review of multipliers used four developments:

- Cambourne- started in the late 1990s and still underway
- Hinchingbrooke Park, Huntingdon- started in the late 1990s and recently completed.
- Love’s Farm, St Neots - started in 2009 and still underway
- Orchard Park, Cambridge fringe - started in 2006 and close to completion
2.7 In addition, the Research Group undertook further validation which included surveys about the tenure and household structure and age of people living in new housing in a variety of sites across Cambridgeshire and Suffolk.

2.8 The four developments outlined in Section 2.6, were chosen due to the availability of data that enabled accurate identification either because they were parishes or were distinct areas that could be built up from census output area data. These developments are the most substantial within Cambridgeshire within this review period 2009-2015 and offered the greatest learning opportunities.

2.9 The data indicates a higher range, of 23-33 children aged 0-3 per 100 dwellings, than the 18-25 currently used. This new range equates to around 6-8 per year group per 100 dwellings.

2.10 For children aged 4-10, the data indicates the current range of 25-35 children aged 4-10 per 100 dwellings remains appropriate. For children of secondary age, the data for two developments, Love’s Farm and Orchard Farm developments, is below the general multiplier range of 8-15 pupils per 100 dwellings. These are the two newest developments so the number of secondary-aged pupils is still increasing as the larger, younger cohorts age through. Officers have concluded, therefore, that the current multiplier of 18-25 children aged 11-16 per 100 dwellings remains appropriate.

2.11 The 2011 Census results suggest that the guidelines of 25-35 primary aged pupils and 17-25 secondary aged per 100 dwellings are still reasonable.

2.12 **Outcome**

In light of the evidence and validation process, it is proposed to:

- increase the general multiplier for the pre-school population to 20-30 children aged 0-3 per 100 dwellings
- leave the general multipliers for the primary and secondary population unchanged

2.13 **Detailed multipliers**

The general multipliers above are applied where details of housing mix are not known, or at the early stages of a development and likely to change. Where a detailed intended housing mix of a new development is known in full, it is possible to forecast the number of children that might be expected in individual properties based on the number of bedrooms and whether they are market or social rented properties. For example, 100 three-bedroom market properties would be expected to house around 30 primary aged children compared to around 80 primary-aged children from 100 three bedroom social rented properties. The full set of child yield multipliers agreed by Cabinet in 2009 is set out in the table below. These were based on a specially commissioned table from the 2001 Census which gave the age of ‘wholly moving household’\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) A ‘wholly moving household is one where all members of the household have moved from the same address in the last year
residents according to tenure and property size. This provided more information than was previously available from the standard Census outputs.

**Table 1: 2009 detailed child yield multipliers for Cambridgeshire**
(number of children per 100 dwellings of a given size)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of bedrooms</th>
<th>Market &amp; intermediate housing</th>
<th>Social rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.14 **Market & intermediate Housing**

Two tables were commissioned from the 2011 Census for ‘wholly moving households’ and additional validation work carried out. This indicated lower figures overall for 3-4+ market housing than were found in the 2001 Census, suggesting that the multipliers for such properties be revised downward. However, 2011 Census data indicates a higher number of children in 1-2 bedroom dwellings than in the precious multipliers, so these should be increased.

2.15 **Social Rented Housing**

The 2011 Census data and CORE² indicated less consistent changes across the age-ranges for social rented properties. While they indicate no change should be made to the multipliers for 3 bedroom dwellings, they suggest that current multipliers for 1-2 bedroom properties need to be revised upwards. Data suggests that multipliers for 4+ bedroom social rented dwellings should be increased for 0-3 year olds, but revised downwards for 4-10 and 11-15 year olds.

2.17 The table below sets out the proposed new child yield multipliers. Numbers in bold indicate a change to the current multipliers in use since 2009.

**Table 2: Proposed detailed child yield multipliers for Cambridgeshire (number of children per 100 dwellings of given size)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of bedrooms</th>
<th>Market &amp; intermediate housing</th>
<th>Social rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² CORE, Continuous Recording, is a national information source, funded by the Tenant Services Authority and the Department for Communities & Local Government (DCLG)
2.19 **Outcome**
In light of the evidence and validation process, it is proposed to make the following changes for market and intermediate housing:
- increase in expected numbers in 1-2 bedroom dwellings for 0-3 and 4-10 year olds
- decrease in expected numbers in 3-4+ bedroom dwellings for 4-10 and 11-15 year olds
and the following changes for social rented housing:
- increase in expected numbers of both 0-3 year olds and 4-10 year olds in 1-2 bedroom dwellings
- increase in expected numbers of 0-3 year olds in 4+ bedroom dwellings but decrease in 4-10 year olds and 11-15 year olds

3 **IMPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT SITES**

3.1 Where planning consent has been granted e.g. Phases 1 and 2 of Northstowe, Alconbury Weald, Southern Fringe, North West Cambridge (the University) it is too late for the proposed multipliers to feed into the plans for these developments. However, the use of the proposed multipliers will enable the Council to anticipate ongoing implications that will need to be managed in terms of place planning.

3.2 For example for the second phase of Northstowe, the proposed detailed multipliers forecast a further 150 0-3 year olds. Similarly for the Southern Fringe an increase of approximately 200 0-3 year olds is forecast. Both of these will have implications for the amount of early years education and childcare which will be required. The Council’s statutory duty is to facilitate the market to secure sufficient childcare places including ensuring free early years provision for all 3 and 4 yr olds (and the 40% most vulnerable 2 year olds) of 15 hours per week, 38 weeks per year. The 3 and 4 year old entitlement will increase to 30 hours beginning in some pilot areas in September 2016 and nationally in 2017.

3.3 Where negotiations are at an early stage, or yet to begin, on the significant developments identified through the local plan process such as Darwin Green 2 (Cambridge City northwest fringe) Wing (Cambridge City east), Cambourne West, Ermine Street (Huntingdon) and Wyton, the revised multipliers, will be used.

4.0 **ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

4.1 **Developing the local economy for the benefit of all**

_The new school supports growth._

4.2 **Helping people live healthy and independent lives**

There are no significant implications for this priority.

---

3 Intermediate housing means homes for sale and rent at a cost above social rent but below market levels. It includes shared equity (including shared ownership and equity loans) and low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent. [https://www.gov.uk/definitions-of-general-housing-terms](https://www.gov.uk/definitions-of-general-housing-terms)
4.3 **Supporting and protecting vulnerable people**
There are no significant implications for this priority.

5.0 **SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 **Resource Implications**
Opening a new school is expensive. In addition to the capital investment, the Council is responsible for all pre-opening start-up costs in respect of new basic need schools, including diseconomy of scale costs, funding for which may be needed over a number of years. Given this burden of revenue expenditure, the Council will only consider commissioning new schools where there is no possible alternative. It is, therefore, essential that where new educational infrastructure is to be funded externally, that officers can evidence robustly to developers and district councils, the Council’s education infrastructure requirements. Up-to-date and credible forecasting tools, such as child yield multipliers are essential to avoid exposing the Council to the risk of a funding shortfall.

5.2 **Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications**
Developers are only required to fund the level of new places required to mitigate the impact of their developments. If the Council’s child yield multipliers do not reflect accurately the situation in the County there is a risk that education capital projects will be under-resourced.

5.3 **Equality and Diversity Implications**
There are no significant implications for this priority.

5.4 **Engagement and Consultation Implications**
There are no significant implications for this priority.

5.5 **Public Health Implications**
There are no significant implications for this priority.

5.6 **Localism and Local Member Involvement**
There are no significant implications for this priority.
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