

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a special meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 20 January 2005 at 9.00 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor RF Bryant – Chairman
Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Dr DR Bard, RE Barrett, JD Batchelor, EW Bullman, NN Cathcart, JP Chatfield, Mrs PS Corney, Mrs SJO Doggett, Mrs A Elsby, R Hall, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs SA Hatton, Mrs JM Healey, Dr JA Heap, Mrs HF Kember, RMA Manning, RB Martlew, MJ Mason, DC McCraith, Mrs JA Muncey, CR Nightingale, Dr JPR Orme, A Riley, Mrs DP Roberts, NJ Scarr, Mrs GJ Smith, Mrs HM Smith, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, RT Summerfield, Dr SEK van de Ven, Dr JR Williamson, NIC Wright and SS Ziaian-Gillan

Officers:

Chris Bethell	Planning Officer (Tourism & Monitoring)
Jonathan Dixon	Senior Planning Officer (Economic Policy)
David Hussell	Development Services Director
Keith Miles	Planning Policy Manager
Michael Monk	Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport)
Claire Spencer	Senior Planning Officer (Transport Policy)
Chris Taylor	Head of Legal Services

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors SM Edwards, Mrs EM Heazell, JA Hockney, SGM Kindersley, R Page, EJ Pateman, JH Stewart, Mrs BE Waters, JF Williams and TJ Wotherspoon. Councillors Dr DR Bard and Mrs DP Roberts apologised for their late arrivals.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Head of Legal Services emphasised that Members would not be discussing policies and that declarations of interest should depend only on a Member's personal judgement of how close he or she was to a particular issue, and whether or not an independent person, knowing the particular circumstances, would consider a Member's judgement to be biased. Members who had made representations during the consultation period were welcome to repeat their comments during the meeting.

The Chairman reminded Members that it was inappropriate for a Member to sit in the Mezzanine during consideration of an issue for which he or she had declared a prejudicial interest and withdrawn from the Chamber.

The following personal interests were declared:

Councillor Dr DR Bard	As his pension provider was the University Superannuation Scheme, one of the joint funders of the Monsanto site
Councillor NN Cathcart	Representation 4804 (Land between 63 and 71 Spring Lane, Bassingbourn) of the Core Strategies Development Control Policies Response: as owner of a neighbouring property
Councillor CR Nightingale	In representations 5789 (Land at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Great Shelford) and 5816 (Large site at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Great Shelford) as a local

landowner: would not participate in any vote on these issues

Councillor Dr JPR Orme As recipient of a pension from Bayer CropScience

2. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (LDF) - CORE STRATEGY AND RURAL CENTRES

The purpose of the meeting was for Council to consider the general direction of the Local Development Framework (LDF) approach, not the policies, after which officers would draft policies for further consideration before submission to the Secretary of State. Council on 22 July 2004 had approved the Preferred Options documents for public participation and the Planning Policy Team was congratulated on having received nearly 6,000 representations during the consultation exercise.

2 (a) Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report related to all Development Plan Documents and set out how to assess the extent to which the options would help to achieve relevant environmental, social and economic objectives. Cambridgeshire District Councils developed the methodology and independent consultants prepared the initial appraisals. In light of representations received, greater emphasis should be given to health issues and to Rights of Way, and the Strategic Health Authority was developing a Health Impact Assessment protocol with Cambridgeshire Horizons. Further consultation with the health authority would be undertaken to address how to include the protocol in Core Strategy policies.

Methodology

European directives and PPS12 requirements directed the agreed methodology, resulting in delivery of a complex system, incorporating necessary tables and documents. A more publicly accessible document would be produced at the next stage in the LDF process.

Transport

Transport criteria had not been specifically addressed as government guidance was to measure related outcomes, such as pollution, although officers would endeavour to make transport an important issue at the next stage of the LDF process.

Water and Sewage

Cambridge Water hoped to make a presentation to full Council about its ability to deliver water to new developments. Cambridgeshire Horizons, having responsibility for infrastructure, had approached Anglian Water for a response on sewage disposal, and it was hoped that the response would be reported at the next Cambridgeshire Horizons board meeting.

Conclusion

Council **AGREED** the recommendations as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and Appendix 1 as the approach to be taken for all Development Plan Documents, subject to the issues raised during discussion.

2 (b) Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and Rural Centres: Preferred Options Reports

The Core Strategy was a critical document within the LDF, setting the scene for all Area Action Plans and providing the basis for development control actions across the district.

Preferred Approach for the Strategic Vision

The policy document would include a section on monitoring as the new LDF system required annual monitoring and was designed to be flexible, taking into account changing circumstances. Officers agreed to include in the Strategic Vision statements about monitoring, changing circumstances and review.

Village Categories

Criteria for Rural Centres had been defined in the Structure Plan as the final level in the sequence in which development should be accommodated; however, representations received indicated that the Structure Plan approach was too rigid. Officers therefore recommended the introduction of a Minor Rural Centre level, allowing flexibility for larger villages which did not meet all the Rural Centre criteria yet provided a degree of services for a wider geographic area than the village alone.

The Structure Plan set out specific criteria for Rural Centres. Local Plan No. 2 already contained a rural settlement policy and no radical changes were suggested. Four categories of village were proposed:

Rural Centres	No additional housing allocation to be made, although existing allocations under Local Plan No. 2 to be rolled forward. All development to take place within the village framework. No ceiling on scale of development where a suitable site could be assembled.
Minor Rural Centres	No additional housing allocation to be made, although existing allocations under Local Plan No. 2 to be rolled forward. All development to take place within the village framework. Development ceiling limited to 25 dwellings.
Group Villages	Development ceiling limited to 8 dwellings, possibly expanded to 15 in exceptional circumstances to make best use of a brownfield site.
Infill Only Villages	

Rural Centres

The policy would include links between service provision, facility improvements to villages and the effect of both on the quality of village life in identified Rural Centres. As no threshold would be applied to a windfall development size, providing a suitable location within the village framework could be identified, specific qualifications about developer contributions to village facilities and services would have to be tested during the Development Control process through a planning application.

Minor Rural Centres

The Minor Rural Centres concept had been an integral part of the first Structure Plan as a way to introduce a category to serve smaller rural settlements and officers recommended that it be adopted in the LDF as appropriate for the area. Selection criteria of Minor Rural Centres had included taking account of the ability to accommodate growth, the provision of services to rural settlements and the availability of rural transport. The introduction of a category of Minor Rural Centres also allowed a greater geographic spread of services and facilities across the district. Cambridgeshire County Council had not yet been asked to comment on the proposal for designation of Minor Rural Centres until South Cambridgeshire District Council had decided whether or not to include the concept in the LDF.

The policy would make clear that peripheral development outside Minor Rural Centres, or greenfield development on the village edge, would not be allowed. Given the limited size of development in Minor Rural Centres, developer contributions to village services,

although likely to be modest, could be based on identification of any service shortfall and whether the new development could contribute and improve rather than exacerbate the situation.

Gamlingay had been designated as a Minor Rural Centre as it already served as a focus for the surrounding smaller villages, although its proximity to Sandy and Biggleswade had been considered. Waterbeach had been inadvertently left off the list of settlements qualifying as Minor Rural Centres (Appendix 2).

Group Villages

The Development and Conservation Control Committee would need to be aware of the possibility of piecemeal development, with planning applications being made below the ceiling limit of 8 dwellings, exempting developers from making contributions to village facilities. It could be necessary to draft a Supplementary Planning Document to address situations where developers sought to subdivide a larger site and submit applications below the 8 dwelling limit.

Infill Villages

Flexibility was limited as government direction and the Structure Plan would direct the majority of development into the most sustainable locations, possibly causing discrimination against infill villages, although, given the tremendous pressure for large-scale development in any available community in the Cambridge Sub-Region, there could be room for policy exceptions, such as on certain brownfield sites, to ensure growth in smaller villages.

Bar Hill

Bar Hill had not been included on the list of Rural Centres as it did not satisfy the criteria for public transport or access to secondary education, nor would it serve as a Minor Rural Centre following development of Northstowe. Councillor R Hall, Local Member, felt that Bar Hill currently served as a *de facto* Rural Centre and would continue to serve villages south of the A14 even after Northstowe had begun to develop.

Cambourne and A428 Dualling

Representations made on the Rural Centres Preferred Options Report indicated that residents of Cambourne did not want to see development above the 3,000 +10% of homes initially agreed, while the developers preferred the Cambourne Enhanced approach or an expansion of the village framework. Officers recommended maintaining Cambourne as three separate rural villages.

The government had delayed the dualling of the A428, stating that the road was of regional, not national, importance, and that funds should be invested in a rural transport body. Consultation had begun on how the rural transport body would be established and it was unlikely funds would be available until 2008. This information had not been available to put to the Inspector during the Cambourne Enhanced appeal and the Council was seeking legal advice whether to draw attention to it at this late point, as it was believed that the Inspector's report on the Cambourne Enhanced appeal had now been given to the Deputy Prime Minister, although it was unknown when the outcome would be published. Councillor Mrs DSK Spink, Local Member, noted that the Cambourne Enhanced application had given weight to extra money being available for improved bus links, which would be of little benefit if dualling the A428 remained partially completed. Congestion on the A428 would increase substantially when improvements began on the A14.

Cambridge East and Marshalls Aerospace

These issues would be considered at the separate Cambridge East meetings, although

officers advised that there was no basis to consider alternative development strategy options at the present time.

Employment Opportunities and Local Economy

Although employment would be considered at a later stage in the LDF process, policies in the current Local Plan No. 2 which encouraged small industrial development within the local village framework were intended to continue.

Histon and Impington

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) explained that Histon and Impington had scored well against all the Rural Centre criteria, except for employment opportunities, but cautioned that making an exception to exclude Histon and Impington from the Rural Centre designation would create a difficult precedent.

Northstowe and A14 Improvements

Specific discussion on Northstowe and its relationship with the A14 would be held at the Northstowe meeting on 1 February 2005. Concern was expressed about the delay of the A14 improvements and officers would be investigating ways to establish a relationship between the development of Northstowe and the A14 improvements. Planning applications received for any villages along the A14 transport corridor would be subject to consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council and the Highways Authority and the Development and Conservation Control Committee would have to consider the position on the improvements at that time.

Over

Officers noted that the final column on page 103 of the agenda (Page 72 of 358 of Appendix 2) should be omitted as it had been left over from a drafting exercise: Over was not designated as a Minor Rural Centre. If residents of Over wished to be so designated, the Parish Council could make representations to the Inspector during the Examination in Public.

Papworth Everard

Papworth Everard did not meet the criteria for designation as a Rural Centre and, considering its proximity to Cambourne, would not serve the purpose of a Minor Rural Centre, thus it had been classified as a Group Village. Existing development allocations under Local Plan No. 2 would be rolled forward into the LDF. If Papworth Hospital relocated, designation of the village as a Group Village would limit development on the hospital site to 8 dwellings, therefore a specific policy response would be required for the site unless special provision was made in policy.

Sawston

Representation 5986 should refer to Deal Grove, not Dean Grove.

Sewage

Cambridgeshire Horizons was awaiting the outcome of an infrastructure feasibility study by Anglian Water.

Speed Limits

Cambridgeshire County Council used agreed village framework boundaries as locations for placing speed limit signs, but many villages had residential dwellings outside the framework. It was important to persuade the Cambridgeshire County Council to consider such exceptional areas to which speed limits could be extended. Officers agreed to try to include village traffic management in the travel section.

West Wrattling and Weston Colville

Councillor RE Barrett, Local Member, supported the representations to amend the Weston Colville village framework to allow additional growth and asked that this be considered in conjunction with similar representations about West Wrattling. Officers agreed to review the situation.

Conclusion

On a proposal by Councillor R Hall, seconded by Councillor RMA Manning, Council, by 17 votes to 12

AGREED to include Bar Hill on the list of Rural Centres.

Councillor MJ Mason, seconded by Councillor Mrs JA Muncey, proposed that Histon and Impington be moved from the list of Rural Centres to the list of Infill Villages. The proposal was **LOST** by 17 votes to 12.

On a proposal by Councillor RMA Manning, seconded by Councillor A Riley, Council, by 15 votes to 12

AGREED to include Willingham on the list of Minor Rural Centres.

Council **AGREED** the following recommendations as set out in the Core Strategy & Development Control Policies and Rural Centres Preferred Options Reports and Appendices 2 and 3 as the basis for developing the policies to be set out in the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and Rural Centres Development Plan Documents, subject to the issues raised during discussion:

- (a) To confirm the Preferred Approach to the Strategic Vision (CS1), subject to minor wording changes as recommended in the schedule and statements about monitoring, changing circumstances and review;
- (b) To amend the Preferred Approach for Strategy Options (CS2) to take account of climate change, the need to sustain the high technology research and development industry, and to recognise that the requirement to improve biodiversity needs to be appropriate to the development;
- (c) To retain the established approach to the definition of village frameworks (CS3), and that changes be made only where it is clear that there has been a relevant change in circumstances or an anomaly has been identified;
- (d) That the revised list of Rural Centres (CS4, RC1 and RC2) be:
 - Bar Hill
 - Cambourne
 - Sawston
 - Histon & Impington
 - Great Shelford & Stapleford;
- (e) That the new category of Minor Rural Centre be created and that these be:
 - Cottenham
 - Fulbourn
 - Gamlingay
 - Linton
 - Melbourn
 - Waterbeach
 - Willingham;
- (f) That there be no ceiling on windfall development in Rural Centres (CS5) and that all Rural Centres be classified as Rural Centres without peripheral development;
- (g) That there would be a ceiling of 25 dwellings on windfall development in Minor Rural Centres and that there would be no peripheral development in any Minor Rural Centre;

- (h) To confirm the Preferred Approach for additional development in Rural Centres (RC3), but that greater development on the existing residential land parcels in the Cambourne Masterplan beyond that suggested by Annexe C to the Rural Centres Preferred Options report or by enlargement of the site should be resisted as being inconsistent with maintaining the character of Cambourne as three separate villages;
- (i) To confirm the Preferred Approach for development in Group Villages (CS7) as up to 8 dwellings and exceptionally 15 where it would make best use of a brownfield site; and
- (j) To confirm the Preferred Approach for development in Infill Only Villages (CS8).

2 (c) Green Belt

Core Strategies 9-12 set out the Preferred Approach for Green Belt objectives and boundary definition, and the Preferred Approaches for development within the Green Belt and for Major Developed Sites (MDS) within the Green Belt. Many representations sought changes to the established Green Belt boundary, but the recommendations acknowledged maintaining the status quo except where changes would be required, such as at Cambridge East and Northstowe, both of which were subjects for future LDF meetings. Unless specific anomalies could be identified, it was recommended that the established boundaries be confirmed as set out in Local Plan No. 2 and rolled forward into the LDF. Officers now considered that the Bayer CropScience site at Hauxton should be treated as an island within the Green Belt in order to allow flexibility in redevelopment proposals.

The policy would not allow greenfield allocation on the edge of Rural Centres or Minor Rural Centres. The Development and Conservation Control Committee would be in an even stronger position if the village edge were reinforced by a Green Belt in addition to the village framework. Government advice was that brownfield development should occur only where the brownfield site was in a sustainable location.

Members noted that the latest government circular said that travellers could be given planning permission in the Green Belt.

Representation 5985 (Dean Grove, Sawston) should read Deal Grove, Sawston. Representation 6085 (Land West of Ida Darwin Hospital, Fulbourn) would be considered in the context of development in the context of the Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals site, although it was noted that it had previously been the site of the Chesterton Rural District Council dump.

Conclusion

Council **AGREED** the following Cambridge Green Belt recommendations as set out in the report and Appendix 2 as the basis for developing the policies to be set out in the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Documents, subject to the identification of the Bayer CropScience site at Hauxton as an island in the Green Belt:

- (a) To confirm the Preferred Approach for Green Belt objectives and boundary definition (CS9 and CS10); and
- (b) To confirm the Preferred Approach for development within the Green Belt and for Major Development Sites (MDS), subject to inclusion of a definition of what would constitute an MDS (CS11 and CS12).

2 (d) Development Principles

Core Strategies 13-18 set out the Preferred Approach for the Development Principles

objectives, including sustainability, design and landscape, and preparing a policy setting out development criteria for all developments.

Although Area Transport Plans were also included in the travel chapter, the wording of CS13 Development Principles Objectives – Preferred Approach would be strengthened to refer to the recently adopted Supplementary Planning Document on transport plans. Officers agreed to revise the wording in CS16 Design of New Development – Preferred Approach to clarify that material planning considerations in individual design statements and Parish Plans had to conform to agreed planning policy before being adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents. Councillor Mrs SA Hatton agreed to speak to officers about the wording of CS14 Sustainable Development – Preferred Approach.

Conclusion

Subject to the re-wording of Core Strategies 13, 14 and 16, Council **AGREED** the Development Principles recommendations set out in the report as the basis for developing the policies to be set out in the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Documents.

3. MAPS

**The Meeting ended at 1.00 p.m., to
reconvene on the following day at 9.30 a.m.**
