

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB3 6EA

t: 08450 450 500
f: 01954 713149
dx: DX 729500 Cambridge 15
minicom: 01480 376743
www.scambs.gov.uk



27 April 2005

To: Chairman – Councillor RF Bryant
Vice-Chairman – Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt
All Members of the Council

Dear Councillor

You are summoned to attend a special meeting of **COUNCIL**, which will be held in **COUNCIL CHAMBER** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **MONDAY, 9 MAY 2005** at **9.30 a.m.**

Yours faithfully

GJ HARLOCK

Finance and Resources Director

AGENDA

	PAGES
1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To receive any declarations of interest from Members on matters arising in this agenda.	
2. MINUTES To confirm the minutes of the second round of Special Council Local Development Framework meetings as correct records: 15 March 2005 – Core Strategy and Rural Centres Draft DPD 23 March 2005 – Northstowe Draft AAP 15 April 2005 – Cambridge East Draft AAP 21 April 2005 – Cambridge Southern Fringe Draft AAP	1 - 32
3. SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: APPROVAL OF DRAFT DOCUMENTS FOR PUBLICATION FOR PRE-SUBMISSION PARTICIPATION To agree the changes in the draft Development Plan Documents enclosed as Appendices A, B, C and D and authorise their publication for the purpose of public participation. Further details are given in the attached report from the Development Services Director. Please note that the Consultants' Sustainability Appraisal Reports, which will be Appendices A/1, B/1, C/1 and D/1, are not yet available and will be sent to Members at the earliest opportunity.	33 - 38
3 (a) Appendix A - Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document APPENDIX A/1 CONSULTANTS' SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT APPENDIX A/2 POLICY ASSESSMENT BACKGROUND TABLES	

APPENDIX A/3 AUDIT TRAIL OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

3 (b) Appendix B - Northstowe Area Action Plan

APPENDIX B/1 CONSULTANTS' SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

APPENDIX B/2 POLICY ASSESSMENT BACKGROUND TABLES

APPENDIX B/3 AUDIT TRAIL OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

3 (c) Appendix C - Cambridge East Area Action Plan

APPENDIX C/1 CONSULTANTS' SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

APPENDIX C/2 POLICY ASSESSMENT BACKGROUND TABLES

APPENDIX C/3 AUDIT TRAIL OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

3 (d) Appendix D - Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan

APPENDIX D/1 CONSULTANTS' SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

APPENDIX D/2 POLICY ASSESSMENT BACKGROUND TABLES

APPENDIX D/3 AUDIT TRAIL OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

3 (e) Appendix E - Proposals Map

3 (f) Appendix F - Glossary of Terms

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a special meeting of the Council held on
Tuesday, 15 March 2005 at 9.30 a.m.

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

Councillors: Dr DR Bard, RE Barrett, JD Batchelor, JP Chatfield, Mrs PS Corney, SM Edwards, Mrs A Elsby, R Hall, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs SA Hatton, Dr JA Heap, Mrs EM Heazell, Mrs CA Hunt, Mrs HF Kember, SGM Kindersley, RMA Manning, RB Martlew, MJ Mason, DC McCraith, Mrs DP Roberts, NJ Scarr, Mrs GJ Smith, Mrs HM Smith, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, JH Stewart, RT Summerfield, JF Williams, Dr JR Williamson, TJ Wotherspoon and NIC Wright

Officers:	Jonathan Dixon	Senior Planning Policy Officer (Economic Development)
	Caroline Hunt	Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing)
	David Hussell	Development Services Director
	Keith Miles	Planning Policy Manager
	Michael Monk	Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport)
	Claire Spencer	Senior Planning Policy Officer (Transport)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors BR Burling, NN Cathcart, Mrs J Dixon, Mrs SJO Doggett, JA Hockney, Mrs JA Muncey, CR Nightingale, Dr JPR Orme, EJ Pateman, A Riley, J Shepperson, RJ Turner, Dr SEK van de Ven, Mrs BE Waters and DALG Wherrell.

1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

In response to a point of order raised by Councillor Mason, the Chairman stated that the process for discussing the LDF had been agreed by Council and the process for receiving minutes had been agreed by himself as Chairman. Council reaffirmed the method chosen for examining the LDF and expressed its gratitude to officers for their extra work in accommodating Council's wishes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 20th January 2005 were accepted as a correct record subject to the deletion of the second paragraph on page 5 under the heading "Histon and Impington".

The minutes of the meeting held on 21st January 2005 were accepted as a correct record subject to inclusion of Councillor SA Harangozo in the list of Councillors who had given their apologies for this meeting.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt declared a personal interest as a resident of Steeple Morden.

Councillor RMA Manning declared a personal interest as a resident of Willingham.

Councillor Dr DR Bard declared a personal interest, as his pension provider was the University Superannuation Scheme, one of the joint funders of the Monsanto site.

3. LDF - CORE STRATEGY AND RURAL CENTRES (DECISION ON DETAIL OF POLICIES AND PROPOSALS FOR THE DPD)

The Planning Policy Manager reminded members that the responses to representations to the Core Strategy and the approach to drafting the Core Strategy DPD, which would replace the Structure Plan, had been agreed at the Council meeting on 20th and 21st January. This meeting was to consider an emerging draft DPD in the light of those decisions. Council would be invited to agree the Core Strategy for publication at its meeting on 9th May.

Members were warned against being too prescriptive in the setting of policies and that they should be robust but flexible. It was recognised that the Development and Conservation Control Committee would have flexibility to make decisions on a case-by-case basis within the framework of the Core Strategy. It was also understood that it was unlikely that the Government would allow the inclusion of words such as “usually”, as these weakened policy statements and could lead to more appeals.

STRATEGY

Rural Strategy

The category of Minor Rural Centres was introduced to recognise that some villages that do not meet the tests to be Rural Centres nevertheless perform a role in providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. The location of the village was a key-determining factor, for example Duxford was not considered a minor rural centre due to the proximity of Sawston. In recognition of the more limited service base, larger scale development was contingent on contributions towards their development or improvement.

Building of New Homes

The Planning Policy Manager stated that although the Structure Plan figure of 20,000 new homes was challenging, it was achievable through major new developments and housing in villages compatible with their category.

It was noted that the Core Strategy aimed to ensure only sustainable development through the location, form and design of buildings. The number of houses coming forward would be reviewed in the Council’s Annual Monitoring Report required under the new system. Cambridgeshire Horizons’ role was to ensure implementation of the development strategy and the Council was working in partnership with them to that end.

Amendments

It was agreed that all references to “motor car” should be abbreviated to “car”.

The first sentence of paragraph 2.35 was amended to read: “Group villages are generally less sustainable locations for new development than Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, having fewer services ...”

The final sentence of paragraph 2.35 was shortened to read “All Group Villages have at least a primary school and limited development will help maintain remaining services and facilities and provide for affordable housing to meet local needs.”

Council **AGREED** the Strategy Section

DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES

Village Frameworks

A number of members asserted that some of the village framework boundaries needed to be amended to address anomalies. Officer reminded Members that the village

frameworks had been subject to considerable scrutiny including two Local Plan Inquiries and that Council had agreed at its meeting on 20/21 January 2005 to roll forward the frameworks set out in the Local Plan 2004.

It was agreed that the Chairman of Council should send a letter to the County Council seeking a change in the policy to allow the introduction of 30 mile an hour speed limits in the smaller settlements outside village frameworks.

Amendment

Under Policy DP/8 Village Frameworks the word "state" was added to point 1 after the word "present".

Council **AGREED** the Development Principles.

GREEN BELT

Concern was expressed regarding the extension of the Green Belt around Northstowe without formal consultation with the parish councils of Over, Willingham, Rampton and Cottenham. It was proposed that these parish councils be consulted before a final decision on the Green Belt boundary was made at the meeting on 9th May.

Council

AGREED to formally consult with the parishes of Over, Willingham, Rampton and Cottenham regarding the proposed extension of the Green Belt around Northstowe as set out in the maps in Appendix 2 of the report. The results of the consultation would then inform the decision to be taken by Council on 9th May 2005.

It was understood that the Northstowe Green Belt would be discussed at the Council meeting on 23rd March as part of the debate on the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

Council **AGREED** the Green Belt policies and boundaries subject to the above.

HOUSING

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) advised that the Government had published new guidance for consultation which recommended that housing mix in terms of bedroom sizes be left to the market but that authorities should plan for household composition in their areas. Concern was expressed at the failure of the market to build houses to meet the local demands of the residents. It was agreed to pursue a policy on market housing mix given the findings of the Housing Needs Survey.

It was understood a definition of key worker would be provided at the Council meeting on 9th May, in a glossary of terms. Concern was expressed at the proposals for key worker housing as it appeared that there was low demand from key workers for these houses.

It was suggested that horsiculture could be appropriate in the Green Belt and covered by incorporating into the same policy as policy HG/8, dwelling to support a rural-based enterprise. Officers asked to consider whether horsiculture was an appropriate use of the Green Belt in the light of revised PPS7.

Council **AGREED** the Housing policies.

ECONOMY AND TOURISM

The Senior Planning Officer (Economic Policy) presented this item.

Clusters

It was suggested that the Council should encourage small-scale industries to employ local residents who did not necessarily have exceptional scientific or ICT skills. However, it was understood that the Council needed to be consistent with the Structure Plan policy of selective management of employment. It was acknowledged that clusters are of great importance to the success of not only the local, but also the regional and national economy. It was noted that policy EM/3 point 7 addressed the issue of other clusters as they emerged.

In response to concern that policy EM/8 regarding the conversion of rural buildings could have a negative impact on the countryside, the Senior Planning Policy Officer (Economic Development) stated that the policy had clauses that which would minimise the impact of such conversions on the surrounding countryside, and that it must be read alongside the development principles policies.

Council **AGREED** the Economy and Tourism policies.

SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Council **AGREED** the Services and Facilities policies

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Carbon Dioxide Emissions

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) explained that the 10% reduction in CO₂ emissions compared with minimum Building Regulation requirements was a target that developers would be encouraged to meet rather than it being a requirement, responding to GO - East representations that the planning system could not seek to change requirements of other legislation.

Drainage

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) agreed to consider rewording the last sentence of paragraph 8.41 to clarify that the applicant should consult statutory undertakers including any internal Drainage Board about their proposals.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer (Economic Development) agreed to amend paragraph 8.44 to include a reference to the relevant flood maps provided by the Environment Agency.

On page 87, paragraph 8.8, the words "and the objectives of the Cambridge Green Belt" were removed from the second sentence, as it was agreed that all the natural landscape of the District was important.

Council **AGREED** the Natural Environment policies subject to the above.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Adverts and Signage

Members expressed concern regarding the visual impact of advertisements and it was recognised that enforcement of regulations was often slow, as the Council were required to operate within the legal process.

Various concerns were expressed regarding signage in villages. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) advised that if members are concerned about a new sign in a Conservation Area they should contact the Conservation Section.

Historic Buildings

Concern was expressed that developers sometimes deliberately damage historic buildings and then apply for their demolition. This was a matter for the Conservation Section.

Council **AGREED** the Cultural Heritage policies.

TRAVEL

It was understood that applicants would be required to provide a travel to work plan.

It was noted that the current Supplementary Planning Guidance for Area Transport Plans will be replaced by the planning obligations Supplementary Planning Document.

Members agreed the importance that alternatives to car travel be sought and questioned whether it would be possible to include targets for modal split.

Council **AGREED** the Travel policies

APPENDIX 1: CAR PARKING STANDARDS

It was understood that the car parking standards were clear regarding the maximum amount of parking that should be provided but no clear statement regarding the minimum amount of parking. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) noted that Government guidance did not any longer specify any minimum standards.

Amendments

It was agreed to remove the first word, "Generally", from the beginning of paragraph 8 on page 122.

Council **AGREED** the car parking standards.

APPENDIX 2: CYCLING STANDARDS

It was suggested that the Council should ensure that there are adequate facilities for residents who cycle to park and ride sites.

Council **AGREED** the cycling standards.

SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES

Housing Allocations

Members were advised that the figures in the table on pages 132 and 133 were related to March 2004, the latest information available.

Flood Maps

Concern was raised about the accuracy of the flood risk maps produced by the Environment Agency. It was noted that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, which would be presented to the Land Drainage Advisory Group, would address this.

Linton Village Framework

Members were advised that it would be inappropriate to redraw the village framework to include an area south of the A1307 as policies had consistently sought to restrict development here as it was severed by the A1307 from the facilities in the village.

Council **AGREED** to include the Site Specific Policies.

APPENDIX 2

Northstowe Area Action Plan

On behalf of the local member for Longstanton, Councillor Mrs DP Roberts stated that map 78, the Area Action Plan for Northstowe, had caused concern for Longstanton residents, as it appeared to show a transfer of 90% of parish land. She suggested that this could mean that Longstanton would lose its identity. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) advised no changes were proposed to the extent of Longstanton Parish, which is not a planning matter, and that all the proposals maps, including those for the Area Action Plan and village insets, needed to be read together to see the overall picture. Officers were suggesting that Longstanton Inset Plan should be discussed alongside the Northstowe Area Action Plan at the Council meeting on 23rd March 2005. The Area Action Plan coverage had to include all land that was relevant to the proposals for Northstowe including Green Separation. It was suggested that in this circumstance it would have been useful if the site boundary for Northstowe had been included in the Longstanton map. However, officers advised that the LDF Regulations did not allow proposals to be shown on more than one proposals map.

Sawston Village Framework

Councillor Bard proposed and Councillor Mrs Hatton seconded that the village framework for Sawston be amended to include a small triangle of land next to the grounds of Sawston Hall, which he asserted was an anomaly and was suffering from a litter problem. It was understood that the parish council supported this amendment. However, it was suggested that there were a number of other areas in the District where there were parcels of undeveloped land adjacent to the framework and to amend this village framework could set a dangerous precedent of "rounding-off" elsewhere, and that in this case the land was also included in the Green Belt and a Conservation Area. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) advised that a litter problem should not be taken into account in determining the village framework.

A vote was taken and by 18 votes against, 9 in favour and 1 abstention

Council

REJECTED the proposed amendment to the Sawston village framework.

Histon and Impington

Councillor Mason expressed his concern regarding the employment/ housing balance with regard to a planning application on the land of the old Chivers factory. He also stated that action was required to ensure that land on the recreation ground was protected and he suggested that the PVAA at Histon infant school was not allocated on the map. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) agreed to check whether the boundary of the PVAA at Histon infant school needed to be amended on the inset map and to consider whether it was appropriate to allocate a recreation ground that already existed.

Thriplow Village Framework

It was understood that Councillor Quinlan wanted Thriplow's village framework to be amended to include a "brownfield" silo site on the edge of the village. Council agreed

with the officer recommendation to reject this proposal.

The Council **AGREED** the maps in appendix 2.

DELEGATED AUTHORITY FOR FURTHER AMENDMENTS

Council **AGREED** to delegate responsibility for agreeing minor amendments to the Core Strategy to the Planning Director and the portfolio holder for Planning and Economic Development.

It was understood that minor grammatical and editorial corrections, which members had noted, should be passed to the officers.

The Meeting ended at 3.50 p.m.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a special meeting of the Council held on
Wednesday, 23 March 2005 at 9.30 a.m.

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

Councillors: Dr DR Bard, RE Barrett, JD Batchelor, BR Burling, SM Edwards, Mrs A Elsby, R Hall, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs SA Hatton, Mrs JM Healey, Dr JA Heap, Mrs EM Heazell, Mrs CA Hunt, Mrs HF Kember, SGM Kindersley, RMA Manning, RB Martlew, MJ Mason, DC McCraith, Dr JPR Orme, A Riley, Mrs DP Roberts, J Shepperson, Mrs GJ Smith, Mrs HM Smith, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, RT Summerfield, Dr SEK van de Ven, TJ Wotherspoon and SS Ziaian-Gillan

Officers: Jonathan Dixon Senior Planning Officer (Economic Policy)
Jane Green Major Developments Manager
Caroline Hunt Principal Planning Officer (Housing)
David Hussell Development Services Director
Keith Miles Planning Policy Manager
Michael Monk Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport)
Jane Thompson Cultural Services Manager

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors JP Chatfield, Mrs PS Corney, Mrs J Dixon, Mrs SJO Doggett, Mrs JA Muncey, CR Nightingale, NJ Scarr, JH Stewart, RJ Turner, Mrs BE Waters, JF Williams, Dr JR Williamson and NIC Wright, and also from County Councillor Shona Johnstone.

1. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillors **AGREED** during the meeting that the special Council meeting to consider the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan be rescheduled from 8 April to 21 April, starting at 9.00 a.m.

The Chairman welcomed County Councillor John Reynolds and Mr Mark Vigor, Head of Strategic Services at Cambridgeshire County Council, to the meeting. County Councillor Reynolds thanked the Council for inviting him to the meeting and circulated the County's comments on the draft Area Action Plan (AAP). Members were concerned that the paper was tabled at the meeting, which meant that they had no time to give it proper consideration. Members considered that the County Council had had time to submit comments ahead of this meeting on the information available from the two previous special Council meetings on 1 and 11 February 2005, which had informed the draft AAP.

Following a fifteen-minute adjournment of the meeting to allow Members time to review the County Council's comments, Council unanimously

RESOLVED that the County Council's comments be not further considered at the meeting and that Cambridgeshire County Council be advised of the concerns at the late tabling of the paper.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Chairman was authorised to sign the minutes of the meetings held on 1 and 11 February 2005 as correct records, subject to the following amendments:

Attendees (11 February 2005)

Councillors JD Batchelor and Mrs EM Heazell's names to be added to the attendance list.

Land Drainage (11 February 2005)

Council had agreed that Longstanton Brook be diverted along the proposed Longstanton bypass. The Planning Policy Manager agreed to amend the Northstowe Area Action Plan to reflect this decision.

Phasing and Implementation (11 February 2005)

Minor typographical errors were corrected.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following personal interests were declared:

Councillor SM Edwards	As a resident of Oakington.
Councillor RMA Manning	As a resident and landowner in Willingham.
Councillor MJ Mason	As a member of various land drainage boards.
Councillor A Riley	As a resident of Longstanton and as the Chairman of Longstanton Parish Council, as a small field on the B1050 is managed by the Parish Council as Trustees of a Charity

4. LDF - NORTHSTOWE (DECISION ON THE DETAIL OF THE POLICIES AND PROPOSALS FOR THE DPD)

The draft Area Action Plan (AAP) would serve as the basis for the Northstowe Sustainability Appraisal, which would be prepared by consultants and presented to Members as part of the agenda for the 9 May 2005 special meeting of Council.

Chapter A: Introduction

The draft AAP was intended to outline what the Council wanted to achieve with the new town and how it would monitor that achievement. It had been produced in line with government requirements for the preparation of an AAP.

Councillor A Riley, local Member for Longstanton, noted that there had been full and detailed discussions at the two previous meetings in February 2005 and commended officers on preparing a document very accurately reflecting all issues previously agreed upon by Council.

Council **AGREED** Chapter A: Introduction.

Chapter B: Vision and Development Principles

The Development Principles Policy had been created based on the original bullet points suggested at the previous meetings in February 2005, and provided an over-arching policy setting out the key factors for designing the new town. The policy also required that an overall Masterplan be produced, with local Masterplans for each phase of development, all to ensure the successful realisation of the AAP.

Council **AGREED** Chapter B: Vision and Development Principles, subject to minor

typographical amendments in paragraphs (n) and (o).

Chapter C: The Site and Its Setting

The AAP reflected Council's 1 February 2005 decision that Site A be the preferred location for Northstowe, and this section addressed specific landscaping and Green Separation issues for areas adjacent to the site, but not within the site itself. The AAP boundaries had been drawn to cover all land within which would be required for the development, its landscaping and infrastructure.

The Planning Policy Manager suggested Members think of the various Local Development Framework maps as pieces of a jigsaw: no two plans could overlap, thus the Green Belt area to the north of Northstowe was not shown on the AAP maps as it was covered by the District Proposals Map.

The following points were raised:

- Cambridgeshire County Council's school transport policy would mean that children in Oakington and Longstanton would not be eligible for free bus provision to the secondary school proposed in Northstowe so school transport issues (C1.9), restricting school access to footpaths and cycleways, had been addressed properly; and
- Old documents referred to Longstanton St Michael, not Longstanton St Michaels or Longstanton St Michael's.

Council **AGREED** Chapter C: The Site and Its Setting, subject to

- Bar Hill being included at C3/a as a distant neighbour; and
- Inclusion of plants at C3/b in addition to wildlife.

Chapter D: The Town of Northstowe

D1: The Structure of Northstowe

These policies referred to the components building up the town of Northstowe, provision of services, facilities and infrastructure, transport and landscape. The Phasing Policy would direct construction: evidence provided to the Examination in Public had suggested that the only way to meet the required construction rate per annum would be to commence construction in two separate areas. Developers would be given the opportunity to consider this in later consultation and make appropriate representations if they felt this was inappropriate.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) advised against removing references to the Guided Bus, as it remained an infrastructure requirement of the development. He confirmed that the bus route through the town centre would be a dedicated bus lane or similar, not a guideway.

Clarifications were sought and given:

- Landscape treatment at Rampton Drift would be detailed in master planning.
- The policy on flooding infrastructure (D1(j)) would be re-worded to incorporate the diversion of Longstanton Brook;
- "Fenland lode" was a term suggested to reflect the local historic character of lodes and canals, where water was a permanent feature.
- Developers would be required to survey existing buildings on site to see which were worthy of retention, and to identify alternative uses to which they could be put, such as the conversion of the Officers' Mess at Duxford into a hotel.

Council **AGREED** D1: The Structure of Northstowe.

D2: The Town Centre

The objectives addressed the town centre location, form, vitality and viability as agreed by Council in February. Officers explained that “comparison and convenience goods” were agreed planning terms: comparison goods included white goods, electronics and clothing, while convenience goods were items like food and toiletries.

The Planning Policy Manager agreed to reconsider the issue of the start of development of the town centre (Policy NS/7 (g)), possibly requiring a development finish date rather than a development start date, the latter having caused problems with Cambourne.

It was confirmed that:

- The Town Centre Strategy would guide the development of policy surrounding provision of a range of shops: there was no intention to prevent construction of a food-only supermarket, rather an aim to prevent one large store from dominating the town centre;
- The Town Centre Strategy would be developed by experts in the field to advise Members how best to proceed with identifying the most suitable range of shops without being too prescriptive.

Council **AGREED** D2: The Town Centre, subject to officers reviewing the issue of timescale for the town centre development.

D3: Local Centres

Five local centres along the dedicated bus route through the town would provide some convenience shopping and employment opportunities, as well as being the locations of the primary schools and, at one local centre, the secondary school. The policy would be re-worded to refer specifically to bus stops at each local centre. The Cambridgeshire County Council Corporate Services Group, attended by the Planning Policy Manager and Major Developments Manager, was seeking provision of five two-form, 420-place, primary schools at Northstowe: preferred school size was an issue for the education authority.

The Planning Policy Manager agreed to re-word the policy to define an appropriate threshold to require development to begin early on of the local centres to serve each of the neighbourhoods in the first phase of development.

Council **AGREED** D3: Local Centres, subject to the need for local centres to be provided early in the development of each neighbourhood.

D4: Housing

Council had previously agreed that district-wide housing policies relating to affordable housing and mix would be applied to Northstowe. Northstowe housing policy NS/9 addressed density, house types and quality and affordable housing funding.

The Council had made a commitment to produce a separate district-wide Development Plan Document (DPD) to make provision for travellers. This DPD would be prepared following the completion of the Travellers' Needs Survey. Officers agreed to make reference to the DPD in all Area Action Plans. “Housing” referred to all kinds of housing accommodation.

A strategic design guide would address parking issues in high-density areas, to encourage imaginative parking solutions.

Council **AGREED** D4: Housing, subject to the inclusion of reference to the Travellers Development Plan Document in this and all other Area Action Plans.

D5: Employment

Northstowe would provide part of the labour force for Cambridge and its locality, but some employment needed to be provided to create a town that was more than a dormitory. Officers agreed to include reference to construction of live / work units for small business owners.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that Cambourne had the only Business Park in the District without restrictions limiting it to firms that needed to be close to Cambridge. The current economy had a reduced demand for employment development, but it was not anticipated that in the longer term there would be an over-provision.

Council **AGREED** D5: Employment, subject to the inclusion of reference to live / work units.

D6: Community Facilities, Leisure, Arts and Culture Including Community Development

This policy covered a key part of the community development, including both public and private facilities. Conscious of the need to encourage development of buildings which would stand the test of time, officers agreed to include "good design" in objectives D6/c and D6/e, cross-referenced to the strategic design guide.

Officers confirmed that:

- Trigger points for the phasing of community facility provision would be identified through master planning and planning applications: new bodies had been established, such as the Northstowe Project Board, to help direct the successful establishment of the new community;
- Developers could be asked to contribute towards the funding for a Community Development Worker, as had been done at Arbury Camps, with the Council reviewing the role and funding arrangements after a set period of time;
- Some services, such as fire and police, could be co-located;
- Cambridgeshire County Council was proposing a police force of around twenty-two officers for Northstowe;
- It was suggested that the swimming pool and leisure centre would be provided through a dual use scheme at the secondary school;
- A cricket pitch would be included along with other grass pitches such as football and rugby; and
- The document did not include reference to sheltered housing, although it did mention supported housing.

Council **AGREED** D6: Community Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture including Community Development, subject to the inclusion of "good design" in objectives D6/c and D6/e.

D7: Transport

The Principal Planning Officer (Transport) drew attention to a new Policy NS/12(f), an emergency access from Station Road, Oakington at the request of the Fire Service, so that Northstowe could be served from Cottenham. Councillor SM Edwards, local member for Oakington, expressed concerns about an access in the location indicated because of the impact on Green Separation, and suggested that if one were needed, the old airfield road would be better. Councillor A Riley, local member for Longstanton, however, pointed out that the airfield road would have two dual carriageways across it and access would be difficult. Officers suggested that the time limit of any emergency

access could be tied in to the provision of a full fire service and that access could be controlled by rising bollards. Councillor Edwards confirmed that he had no problem with the suggested route being available for walkers, cyclists or horseriders.

Officers confirmed that

- The link to the rail network would be via the guided bus, at the proposed Chesterton Interchange.
- The information on a Willingham Bypass reflected the views of the County Council.
- The County Council had indicated that targets for the different modes of transport would be a matter for the County Council's Long Term Transport Strategy;
- The guided busway service would serve Addenbrooke's;
- Services and facilities at the park and ride site were not matters for the Area Action Plan, but it was understood this site would be open longer each day than currently at existing other sites;
- Traffic management in/into Cambridge would be a matter for consideration in the Long Term Transport Strategy later in the year.

Council **AGREED** D7: Transport, subject to

- Objective D7/c – addition of “highly accessible” before “cycleways”;
- Discussions with the emergency services on options for emergency service access; and
- Further reference to bus stops being within 400m in high-density areas.

D8: Landscape

Council **AGREED** D8: Landscape, subject to the following

- Para D8.8 – “airport road” to read “airfield road”;
- Policy NS/15(b) – add “provided and” before “protected for this purpose” in the 4th line;

D9: Biodiversity

Council **AGREED** D9: Biodiversity, subject to discussion with the Ecology Officer on whether the enhancement of biodiversity addresses adequate support for specific protected bird species.

D10: Archaeology and Heritage

Council **AGREED** D10: Archaeology and Heritage without amendment.

D11: Meeting Recreational Needs

Members expressed their concern that the replacement of the golf course now appeared to be conditional when the understanding locally had long been that it would be replaced. Officers confirmed that Sport England's view was that Northstowe was likely to need a golf course, but that this had to be justified under Planning Policy Guidance and especially if developer funding was being sought.

Officers further confirmed that

- Land acquisition for the country park was not yet under discussion;
- There was a tension between recreation and wildlife but the solution was a matter of design and the possible exclusive designation of some areas. This would be addressed in the Master Plan;
- Golf courses were believed to be an acceptable Green Belt use;
- Provision for children's play areas and youth facilities was based on the National Playing Fields Association standards.

Councillor A Riley declared an interest in a small field on the B1050 managed by the

Parish Council as Trustees of a Charity and expressed the view that the Parish Council would be amenable to access other than immediately south.

Council **AGREED** D11: Meeting Recreational Needs, subject to

- Para D11.16 – replacement of the last sentence by “There may be potential for some sports provision alongside the Green Corridor”;
- Para D11.17 – clarification of wording;
- Para D11.22 – amendment, as recognised by officers;
- Policy NA/21(c) – add specific reference to cricket;
- Policy NS/22(e), golf provision – deletion of first line, to “Provision,”

D12: Land Drainage, Water Conservation, Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal

Councillor MJ Mason emphasised that Northstowe would affect the drainage of all the land to the north, east and west and the importance of consulting all the relevant drainage authorities on conditions, Section 106 Agreements etc for the discharge of water. It was confirmed that the International Drainage Boards were being fully consulted.

Officers and Portfolio Holders further confirmed that

- The developers were required to protect Oakington from flooding even if this meant providing a balancing pond larger than that required just for the development of Northstowe.
- Options for the management and maintenance of watercourses were to be discussed by the Land Drainage Advisory Group

Council **AGREED** D12: Land Drainage, Water Conservation, Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal, subject to:

- Chapter heading to be amended to ‘An Integrated Water Strategy’;
- Policy NS/23(c) – Addition of heading before this paragraph “Mitigating Flood Risk at Oakington”;
- Policy NS/23(d)(i) – addition of “series of” between “a” and “balancing pond”;
- Policy NS23/(d)(ii) – addition of wording to urge early action on the new channel;
- Policy NS/23(e) – reference to balancing pond to become (a). Addition of sub-paragraph (b): “a relief channel for Longstanton Brook which culverts along the Longstanton Bypass”; and
- Paragraph D12.6 – addition of reference to relief channel as in Policy NS/23(e)(b) together with justification.

D13: Telecommunications

Council **AGREED** D13: Telecommunications without amendment.

D14: An Exemplar in Sustainability

This chapter had been widened from the draft, and the Principal Planning Officer (Housing) drew attention to two approaches: to increase sustainability overall or to include specific exemplar projects; or a combination of the two.

A request was made for terms used in paragraph D14.5 to be included in the glossary

Council **AGREED** D14: An Exemplar in Sustainability, subject to:

- Objective D14/b – refer to greenhouse gasses rather than just CO₂;
- Paragraph D14.2 - replacement of “reasonably” in the penultimate line of page 83 with “normally”;
- Discussion with the Strategic Development Officer on the wording of Policy NS25/b to ensure that technology used is practical; and

D15: Waste

Council **AGREED** D15: Waste, without amendment.

Chapter E: Delivering Northstowe

E1: Phasing and Implementation

Some Members expressed concern about the environment for residents if the A14 improvements were delayed, but the Planning Policy Manager advised that the improvements would be carried out in stages: the need was to ensure that the relevant sections were completed first.

Council **AGREED** E1: Phasing and Implementation, subject to:

- Policy NS/26(a) – replacement of “avoid” in the 3rd line with “minimise”; and
- Consideration of a potential discrepancy between the start date required to achieve 6,000 dwellings by 2016 (objective E1/d) and that required to keep in step with improvements to the A14 (paragraph D7.2/3).

E2: Planning Obligations and Conditions

Some concern were expressed at the wording of Objective E2/b in apparently requiring the developers to fund all services and facilities, because of the potential impact on the quality of the development; although the contrary view was that the developers should be required to provide all they had promised.

Council **AGREED** E2: Planning Obligations and Conditions, subject to:

- Objective E2/b – rewording to accord with Policy NS/11(a); and
- A statement that if the developers have to contribute towards the Guided Busway, it be taken into account in determining other developer contributions.

Council then

AUTHORISE the emerging policy approach for the Northstowe Area Action Plan to
D be subjected to independent sustainability/strategic environmental assessment; and

DELEGATE to the Planning Portfolio Holder agreement of any material changes
D resultant from further information and to the Development Services Director authority to approve any minor editing changes.

On the proposal of Councillor Mrs JM Healey, Council gave a **VOTE OF THANKS** to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and the Officers for conducting a good meeting.

The Meeting ended at 5.00 p.m.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a special meeting of the Council held on
Friday, 15 April 2005 at 09.30 a.m.

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

Councillors: RE Barrett, JD Batchelor, SM Edwards, Mrs A Elsby, R Hall, Mrs SA Hatton,
Dr JA Heap, Mrs EM Heazell, Mrs CA Hunt, Mrs HF Kember, SGM Kindersley,
Dr JPR Orme, Mrs DP Roberts, Mrs GJ Smith, Mrs HM Smith, JH Stewart,
RT Summerfield, Dr SEK van de Ven, Dr JR Williamson, NIC Wright and
SS Ziaian-Gillan

Officers: Caroline Hunt Principal Planning Officer (Housing)
David Hussell Development Services Director
Michael Monk Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport)
Chris Taylor Head of Legal Services

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dr DR Bard, EW Bullman, JP Chatfield,
Mrs PS Corney, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs JM Healey, JA Hockney, RMA Manning, MJ Mason,
A Riley, J Shepperson, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, RJ Turner, Mrs BE Waters, JF Williams and
TJ Wotherspoon.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The Minutes of the last meeting held on 8 March 2005 were accepted as a correct record
with the following amendment:

Page 13 –

Energy. Amend first sentence of second paragraph to read 'It was suggested that the
policies for Cambridge East should require a higher target *than 10% of energy*
requirements to be provided by renewable energy'.

**3. SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - CAMBRIDGE
EAST AREA ACTION PLAN: DRAFT PLAN**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) introduced the Cambridge East Area
Action Plan (AAP) Draft Plan.

Members were reminded that the plan was being prepared jointly between South
Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) and Cambridge City Council as the new urban
quarter included land in both Council's areas and therefore both Councils needed to
agree the Plan.

The Cambridge City Council's Environment Scrutiny Committee (CCESC) had met on
22nd March 2005 and had agreed the responses to representations and approach to
drafting the Area Action Plan considered by this Council on 8th March.

The Cambridge East Member Reference Group (CEMRG) had met on 5th April 2005 to
consider the emerging key chapters of the AAP and had proposed some amendments.

In addition, the CCCESC had met on 12th April 2005 and had agreed the Member Reference Group comments and suggested some further changes to the draft AAP.

The proposed changes to the draft AAP resulting from both meetings were tabled and would be considered during the meeting.

A final meeting of Council on 9th May 2005 had been programmed to deal with any amendments that needed to be considered as a result of any of the previous meetings or as a result of the sustainability appraisal, and agreed the plan for publication.

The Draft Plan

It was noted that the heading to paragraph 12 of the covering report at Agenda Item 3 should read 'Approach to drafting the draft *Cambridge East Area Action Plan*.'

A INTRODUCTION

The CCCESC had suggested the addition of a new paragraph to the end of the Introduction (A.10) as follows:

A.10 'The Area Action Plan concerns itself with a number of practical issues concerning the future governance of Cambridge East, which lies partly within Cambridge and partly within South Cambridgeshire, but does not address wider governance issues which are not proper subjects for consideration in a planning policy document.'

This was **AGREED**

B VISION

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) noted that under Policy CE/2 Development Principles – The Urban Quarter of Cambridge East paragraph a, the number of dwellings had been changed from 12, 000 (as in the Preferred Options report) to a range of 10,000 to 12,000. It was recommended that it was more appropriate to suggest a range in view of Members' decision that there should be no playing fields in the Green Corridor, as more work needed to be carried out on the likely capacity of the proposed site, which now needed to incorporate all playing fields to serve the development within the built up area.

The CEMRG had proposed a change to Policy CE2 – Development Principles Paragraph **k** as follows:

'A flexible design, making efficient use of energy and other natural resources, built to be an exemplar of sustainable living with low carbon...'

This was **AGREED**.

The CEMRG had proposed a change to Policy CE/2 – Development Principles Paragraph **s** as follows:

'...which is highly accessible and permeable to all its residents by foot, cycle and High Quality Public Transport, and which has good links to existing centres of employment in Cambridge.'

It was suggested that as residents would also be employed in other parts of the District and that the City centre was also a key destination, the wording should read *'...and which has good links to the City Centre and to existing major employment centres.'*

This was **AGREED**.

Officers would take this recommendation back to the City Council for endorsement.

The CEMRG had proposed a change to Policy CE/2 – Development Principles paragraph **t** as follows:

‘With a well developed and highly accessible network of *dedicated* high quality footpaths, bridleways and cycleways...’

It was noted that by the use of the word ‘dedicated’ the CEMRG was looking for a degree of separation from the rest of the transport system.

It was recommended that the word ‘dedicated’ should instead be placed in front of ‘network’, to read ‘...highly accessible, *dedicated* network...’

This was **AGREED**.

Officers would take this recommendation back to the City Council for endorsement.

It was recommended that under Policy CE/2 – Development Principles, Land Drainage paragraph **dd**, the words ‘*water bodies*’ should be amended to read ‘*water features*’.

This was **AGREED**.

Council **AGREED** the content of **Sections A and B**, subject to the above amendments.

C THE SITE AND ITS SETTING

C1 The Site for Cambridge East

C1 Policy CE/3 - The Site for Cambridge East.

It was noted that the site boundaries were illustrated on the draft Proposals Map at Appendix B.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) confirmed that the number of dwellings quoted at Paragraph 1 was the total proposed for the urban quarter and included any dwellings built after 2016.

It was recommended that the wording in brackets CE/3(1) be amended to read: ‘including *those coming forward* after 2016)’

This was **AGREED**

C2 The Setting of Cambridge East

C2 Policy CE/4 The Setting for Cambridge East

It was noted that the plan identified a minimum width for the Green Corridor of 300m.

C3 Landscaping the Setting of Cambridge East

C3 Policy CE/5 Landscaping the Setting of Cambridge East

It was suggested that Paragraph 1 (ix) should be amended to read:

Include appropriate planting and landscaping of any new *transport links* e.g. to the A14.

This was **AGREED**

C4 Mitigating the impact of Cambridge East on existing villages

C4 Policy CE/6 Green Separation form Fen Ditton and Teversham.

It was noted that the policies for the Green Separation from Fen Ditton and from

Teversham were slightly different, having been written to reflect the circumstances of each village.

It was suggested that under the section Green Separation from Teversham, Paragraph 1, second sentence should be amended to read 'To reflect local circumstances, *where* the exceptions affordable housing development *adjoins* Airport Way...'

This was **AGREED**.

Council **AGREED** the content of **Sections C1, C2, C3 and C4** subject to the amendments above.

D THE URBAN QUARTER AT CAMBRIDGE EAST

Policy CE/7 The Structure of Cambridge East

D1 The Structure of Cambridge East

The CCCESC had proposed a change to Policy CE7 – paragraph 2 to delete the word 'linear' so it reads as follows:

'A District Centre, located at the heart of the urban quarter'

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) suggested that the removal of the word 'linear' was acceptable as its use was not so relevant to the urban quarter as it was when describing the development of a new market town.

This was **AGREED**.

The CEMRG had proposed a change to Policy CE7 – Paragraph 11 as follows: 'With a High Quality Public Transport system based on a dedicated local bus way through the urban quarter linking in to the *public transport system* and serving key destinations in the City.'

This was **AGREED** with the following amendment:

After 'public transport' remove 'and' to read '*...to the public transport system serving key destinations...*'

The CEMRG had proposed a change to Policy CE/7 – Paragraph 12 as follows: 'A high quality, highly accessible network of *dedicated* footpaths...'

It was suggested that the word 'dedicated' be placed in front of 'network, to read '*...highly accessible, dedicated network...*'

This was **AGREED**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) recommended to Members that Appendix C, which illustrated the structure of Cambridge East diagrammatically, should be read in conjunction with Section D.

Members were invited to consider the Concept Diagram at Appendix C. It was **AGREED** that the final version would include two additional narrow arrows to reflect foot and cycle access from Phase 1 to High Ditch Road, and foot and cycle access from the District Centre to Teversham.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) confirmed that the established public footpaths would retain their status.

He also agreed that when the networks of paths were created, they should be accessible to all sectors of society, including the disabled.

D2 The District Centre

It was noted that Policy CE/7 District Centre duplicated the previous policy number and that numbering would need to be revised throughout.

The CCCESC had recommended that Policy CE/7 The District Centre Paragraph 4 (The District Centre will be developed in the form of a linear high street) should be deleted. This was **AGREED**.

Policy CE/7 paragraph 8. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) informed members that the three-year timescale for development of the District Centre after commencement of the Airport area development was consistent with the Northstowe approach.

He advised against stipulating a completion date for the District Centre given uncertainties over the rate of development. For the same reason he advised against tying a start date to the number of dwellings built as the number could not be prescribed at this point in the planning process. The principle was to ensure an early start to the development of the District Centre. Members were reminded that the Cambridge East AAP was a high level plan, due to uncertainties over the timing of the release of the Airport site.

D3 Local Centres

No comments

Council **AGREED** the content of Sections **D1**, **D2** and **D3** subject to the above amendments.

D4 Housing

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) informed Members that the reference to the proposal in the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Scheme to prepare a DPD for Travellers Needs would be inserted into the AAP for endorsement at the meeting on 9th May 2005.

Housing Supply. In response to a question about the continuous supply of land for housing for the development, (paragraph 1) the Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) stated that it could not be confirmed how many dwellings on the whole site would be built before and after 2016 as this was dependant on the release of the airport site. The AAP proposed development of Phase 1 within the plan period, whilst considering it within the context of the wider development.

It was suggested that paragraph 8 was not consistent with the objective of providing affordable housing on-site in larger developments. It was **AGREED** that this paragraph be amended accordingly for the 9th May meeting.

Council **AGREED** the content of Section **D4**, subject to the above amendments.

D5 Employment

No comments

D6 Community Facilities, Leisure, Arts and Culture including Community Development.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) confirmed that the wider need for

services and facilities in the Cambridge Sub Region would be addressed by the infrastructure strategy being prepared by Cambridgeshire Horizons and implemented through Policy CE/39, which would require the Cambridge East development to make appropriate financial contribution towards sub regional services and facilities. Policy CE/12 required the provision of the necessary communal facilities to serve the development of the urban quarter itself.

Phase 1 North of Newmarket Road. Paragraph 12. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) assured members that Community Services would be consulted when reviewing the indicative list of facilities required. Members emphasised the requirement for early provision of facilities to support the local community, including a meeting place.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) confirmed that the last sentence of paragraph D6.20 would be deleted.

It was also confirmed that the supporting text for Faith (paragraph D6.24) would clearly state that the development would provide free serviced land, and that faiths would be responsible for providing their own facilities.

A reference would be added to the supporting text that the potential for the provision of a City Farm would be explored.

Council **AGREED** the content of Sections **D5 and D6**, subject to the above amendments.

D7 Transport

The CCCESC proposed a change to Objective D7/e as follows:

'To secure the vitality of the District Centre by ensuring adequate access *to it* for the residents of Cambridge East...'

This was **AGREED**.

Policy CE/13 Road Infrastructure

A14 Access (paragraph 2). The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) suggested that it might be necessary to remove the word 'Grampian' from this paragraph as it might not necessarily involve a Grampian condition in order to ensure the development of Northstowe was related to improvements in the A14 road corridor. The Highways Agency and Cambridgeshire County Council had advised that it was not appropriate to use Grampian within the policy included in the AAP, but to use the word 'condition' only, as a Grampian condition only applied if the required infrastructure was beyond the boundary of the site.

The Head Of Legal Services agreed to provide a suitable revision.

The CCCESC proposed that a new sentence be added to CE/13 paragraph 2 as follows: 'Such improvements and satisfactory access arrangements will not include junction improvements to the Fen Ditton junction to improve its capacity'.

Councillor JD Batchelor stated that he did not agree with this proposed amendment and that all options should remain open at this stage of the development planning process. Councillor JD Batchelor **proposed** that the amendment should be rejected. This was **seconded** by Councillor R Hall. The Chairman asked Members to vote Yes to accept the CCCESC amendment to CE/13 paragraph 2 and No to reject the amendment. The results were as follows:

Yes – 5

No – 10

Abstentions – 3

No vote – 1

Therefore, the CCCESC proposed addition CE/13 paragraph 2 was **REJECTED**.

The following additional amendments to **D7** were **AGREED**:

- That the wording of CE/13-paragraph 8 (Park and Ride) would be amended to reflect the new policy wording on 'Grampian'.
- CE/14 – paragraph 5 (Cycle, Pedestrian And Horse Riding Infrastructure). To move the word 'dedicated' to read 'There will be a *dedicated* network of highly accessible...'
- Public Transport paragraph D7.17, last sentence. Delete 'might come forward to' and amend to read '... There is a possibility in the longer term to provide a public transport route through the development, which *will link to* the Cambridge Northern Fringe East.
- Cycle, Pedestrian and Horse Riding Infrastructure. Paragraph D7.23, first sentence. Delete the words '*such as the commons*'.

The CCCESC proposed that paragraph D7.34 be amended as follows:

'For this phase, there is no need to consider any change to the present arrangements on the A14. *However, the County Strategic Transport Study* may show that changes are needed for the development of the urban quarter as a whole...'

This was **AGREED** subject to the clarification of the study title.

Council **AGREED** the content of section **D7** subject to the above amendments.

D8 Landscape

It was **AGREED** to amend Paragraph 4 (Existing Landscape Features) to read as follows:

'Existing landscape features on the Cambridge East Site *which are appropriate to the local landscape character* will be retained...'

Council **AGREED** the content of Section **D8** subject to the above amendment.

D9 Biodiversity

Officers agreed to consider whether the Core Strategy on Contaminated Land should be incorporated into the AAP.

Paragraph D9.11 (Retention of Existing Features). The following amendment was **AGREED**:

Third sentence – amend 'wood' to read '*wooded*'.

Council **AGREED** the content of Section **D9** subject to the above amendment.

D10 Archaeology and Heritage

Council **AGREED** the content of Section **D10**

D11 Meeting Recreational Needs

Paragraph 9 Water Features. It was **AGREED** to amend the wording as follows:

'Water Features at Cambridge East will provide opportunities for *non motorised* water-based recreation...'

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) confirmed that the standards for the

provision of allotments (at Appendix 3 of the draft AAP) were derived from those specified by Cambridge City Council and listed as appropriate for a urban area. The Head of Legal Services confirmed that there was no statutory requirement for the District Council to provide allotments.

In response to a question from a member the Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) confirmed that Public Conveniences would be provided within the District Centre and elsewhere as appropriate.

Council **AGREED** the content of Section **11** subject to the above amendment.

D12 Land Drainage, Water Conservation, Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) confirmed that although the figure of 25% reduction in the use of piped water was quoted in paragraph 5 (Water Conservation), that amount was changing and that the average consumption at the time of any planning permission being granted would be used.

Council **AGREED** the content of **Section 12**

D13 Telecommunications

D14 Natural Environment

Council **AGREED** the content of **Sections D13 and D14**

D15 An Exemplar in Sustainability

D16 Waste

Council **AGREED** the content of **Sections D15 and D16.**

E DELIVERING CAMBRIDGE EAST

E1 Phasing and Implementation

The following amendments were **AGREED**:

- Amend numbering of paragraphs under Construction Spoil and Earth Moving.
- Policy CE/38 (Phasing North of Cherry Hinton) Paragraph 1. Revise to read 'North of Cherry Hinton *only* limited development adjacent to the operating airport will be acceptable...'
- Officers to revise the wording of Policy CE/38 Paragraph 2 to clarify the intention that the amenity of any new housing would need to be protected and that it should be well related to and served by existing development at Cherry Hinton.
- Paragraph E1.28, last sentence to be revised to read: 'The review of the Area Action Plan will address in more detail whether a further phase of development could come north of Cherry Hinton before the airport relocates, having particular regard to the *issue of creating a sustainable community in this location*, health impacts, noise and...'

Council **AGREED** the content of **Section E1** subject to the above amendments

E2 Planning Obligations and Conditions

The following amendments were **AGREED**:

- Policy CE/39 (Infrastructure Provision). Renumber last paragraph.
- Policy CE/39 -Table – Revise to reflect changes to policy on ‘grampian’ conditions.
- Table – Recreation. Renumber bullet points in right hand column.

Council **AGREED** the content of **Section E2** subject to the above amendments.

The Meeting ended at 1.18 p.m.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a special meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 21 April 2005 at 9.30 a.m.

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

Councillors: Dr DR Bard, EW Bullman, NN Cathcart, Mrs A Elsby, R Hall, Mrs SA Hatton,
Mrs JM Healey, Dr JA Heap, Mrs CA Hunt, HC Hurrell, Mrs HF Kember,
SGM Kindersley, RMA Manning, MJ Mason, CR Nightingale, Mrs DP Roberts,
J Shepperson, Mrs HM Smith, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, Dr SEK van de Ven,
JF Williams and Dr JR Williamson

Officer: Keith Miles Planning Policy Manager

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors JD Batchelor, BR Burling, JP Chatfield,
SM Edwards, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs EM Heazell, Mrs JA Muncey, Dr JPR Orme, Mrs GJ Smith,
JH Stewart, RT Summerfield, RJ Turner, Mrs BE Waters, TJ Wotherspoon, NIC Wright and
SS Ziaian-Gillan.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Members authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the
meeting held on 11th February 2005 (Cambridge Southern Fringe Results and
Approach).

**3. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE
(DRAFT AREA ACTION PLAN)**

Members considered the emerging content of the draft Cambridge Southern Fringe Area
Action Plan, noting that a final version would be presented to them at the Council
meeting scheduled for 9th May 2005 in order to adopt the plan for publication.

In presenting his report, the Planning Policy Manager corrected an error on page 51 of
the draft Area Action Plan. In Policy CSF/15, paragraph 1(a), the reference in line three
to Haverhill Road should have been to Granhams Road. Members considered the Area
Action Plan as follows:

A. Introduction

In response to a Member's question, the Planning Policy Manager informed Members
that the development would consist of about 1,200 dwellings in total, of which about 600
would be in South Cambridgeshire at a density of approximately 50 to the hectare.
Plans for landscaping around the Bell School had been published by Cambridge City
Council, and South Cambridgeshire District Council would be developing a strategy for
addressing that issue in due course.

B. Vision and Development Principles

In response to a Member's question, the Planning Policy Manager said that

Cambridgeshire County Council had the long-term objective of improving the public Rights of Way network around Cambridge. South Cambridgeshire District Council would be consulted about the proposals in due course. Among other things, the District Council will be eager to secure unbroken public access between the Cambridge Southern Fringe and Wandlebury and the Gog Magog hills. This envisaged the development of a golf course (with its associated rights of way) in Great Shelford: if this project did not come to fruition, the County Council would have to reassess the situation. The Planning Policy Manager undertook to place copies of the Rights of Way proposals in the Members' lounge.

The issue of cycle paths was discussed, and Members noted that the County Council's aspirations in this regard had not been updated since their discussion document published 18 months' ago.

C. Trumpington West and the southern setting of Cambridge

Members noted this part of the Area Action Plan.

D1. The Structure of Trumpington West

Members noted Policy CSF/6 covering the physical structure of Trumpington West and the Concept Plan showing the distribution of its key components. This addressed the main land uses, services, facilities and infrastructure, the character, design and landscaping with particular reference to the importance of this approach to Cambridge and its relationship with the River Cam valley. It sought to provide the basis for subsequent masterplans required by the AAP, which could be prepared by developers or by the Council to show in more detail how the principles of the Structural Policy should be interpreted for the development of the area.

In response to concern about the buildings fronting onto the M11 motorway being of up to four storeys, the Planning Policy Manager reminded Members that they had addressed this issue, and accepted it in principle, at the meeting on 11th February 2005. He commented that substantial landmark buildings on the city edge were characteristic of Cambridge, but acknowledged that such buildings hitherto had been other than residential. There would be landscaping beyond these buildings in any event to soften their impact.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that, while the Council's aspirations might, at first glance, appear ambitious, some of them related only to Trumpington West while others to the Cambridge Southern Fringe as a whole. They reflected the scale of the proposed development. He added that mitigation of the visual impact of buildings was a significant element of the funding package to be negotiated, and all relevant parties would be required to contribute to such mitigation.

Members endorsed Policies CSF/1 to CSF/6 inclusive.

D2. Housing (CSF/7)

In response to a Member's question, the Planning Policy Manager confirmed that the development of the Cambridge Southern Fringe would be carried out seamlessly between those parts in the administrative areas of South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council. There would not be any physical separation.

Stressing the importance of this southern approach to Cambridge, Members insisted that good design and high quality would be essential considerations in finalising house types

in what amounted to an urban area. Sensitively-designed buildings comprising three or four storeys could be built without causing any adverse impact on the character of the area.

In response to a Member's question, the Planning Policy Manager said that paragraph D2.8 did not intend restricting the definition of Key Workers to that only of employees of Addenbrookes Hospital. Members reiterated their view that the general definition of Key Workers was in need of review by central Government. While Cambridgeshire Horizons were currently drawing up their own proposals, it was suggested that the District Council should prepare a separate submission reflecting the specific needs of workers living in South Cambridgeshire.

The Planning Policy Manager acknowledged the desirability of making some provision in the Cambridge Southern Fringe for Travellers.

D3. Employment (CSF/8)

In the light of employment issues in recent years at such places as Monsanto, Bayer Crop Sciences and Hexel at Duxford, Members decided that the employment at Trumpington West would not include any reference to high technology research and development. Justifying the Council's approved policy, the Planning Policy Manager explained that the employment provisions in the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan, as in all the AAPs, had been designed to meet the needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region as a whole. South Cambridgeshire was already one of the fastest growing districts in the country. He added that growth is jobs-led and additional encouragement for job growth would result in even higher levels of housing growth.

A Member stressed the importance of ensuring, as far as possible, that the supply and type of housing should reflect and support the supply and type of employment opportunities in the area. Another Member argued that, on sustainability and economic viability grounds, employment on this site should not be seen as a priority, as most residents would work at existing places of employment.

Councillor RMA Manning proposed and Councillor JF Williams seconded, that Policy CSF/8 (Employment) be amended so as to exclude, from paragraph D3.3, all words after the words "Cambridge Sub-Region".

By 11 votes to seven, with three Members registering their presence but not voting, it was **RESOLVED** that paragraph D3.3 of the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan be amended to read as follows:

"Employment development at Trumpington West will be subject to Policy EM/1 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD that reserves employment land for development that can demonstrate a clear need to be located in the area, to serve local needs, or contribute to the continued success of the Cambridge Sub-Region."

D4. Community facilities, leisure, arts and culture, including community development (CSF/9)

Members noted the positive stance adopted by the existing residents in Trumpington, who had expressed a desire to be engaged fully in developing future community facilities within the proposed development. The Planning Policy Manager clarified that Trumpington West would not be developed as a

standalone community, but rather as an expansion of the existing village, whose centre would therefore need to expand in order to reflect the nature of the new community.

In response to concerns expressed by Members, the Planning Policy Manager stated that Cambridge City Council was taking the lead in developing a framework for the future management of community and leisure facilities within the proposed development. The Community Development section of South Cambridgeshire District Council had been instrumental in the preparation of the South Cambridgeshire Area Action Plan.

In response to a further question, the Planning Policy Manager confirmed that negotiations with the South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge Primary Care Trusts were ongoing in an effort to secure appropriate health facilities, to be funded by the development.

Members endorsed Policies CSF/7 (subject to further consideration being given to Key Workers and Travellers as referred to in D2 above), CSF/8, and CSF/9 (subject to the conclusion of satisfactory negotiations relating to health facilities as referred to in D4 above).

D5. Transport

Referring to Appendix B Map 1 of the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan, the Planning Policy Manager reminded Members that the District Council would have an opportunity to respond to consultation on details relating to the proposed road layout in due course. In response to a Member's concerns that road infrastructure must be in place before any further development takes place, he quoted from Cambridge City Council's Local Plan, which indicated that transport capacity must be adequate relevant to each successive stage of development.

The Planning Policy Manager reminded Members that Appendix C Map 2 was a Concept Map only.

In response to grave concerns from a Member regarding the timing of provision of the Addenbrookes' Link Road in the context of the rest of the development, the Planning Policy Manager said that it would be a County Road from the outset (as opposed to a developer's road that would be adopted as a County road) and that the District, City and County Councils were working in partnership to ensure a satisfactory outcome.

The Leader of the Council requested that officers write to Cambridgeshire Horizons, highlighting the District Council's deep concern that infrastructure should be in place prior to any other development taking place.

In relation to paragraph D5.6 (Cycling and Pedestrians), a Member questioned the reference to cycling being a substitute for short car journeys, particularly those of less than five kilometres (three miles). The opportunity should be taken to promote cycling beyond that distance, from the development area to the southern villages in the District. Quality of cycleways was also important. The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that the development would provide a cycle route that negated the need to cross the slip roads onto and from the M11, but said there was a limit to what the Council could require the developer to provide in relation to cycle routes elsewhere.

The Leader of the Council urged Members to bear in mind that planning obligations tended to increase the market price of new houses. The Planning Policy Manager

added that Section 106 Agreements should be restricted to what a development *needs* in order to make a scheme acceptable in planning terms rather than what individuals or groups might *want*.

Councillor Dr S van de Ven proposed and Councillor Mrs SA Hatton seconded that cycle routes be provided from the development site to the southern villages in the District, and that existing cycle routes to those villages be upgraded as appropriate.

By 13 votes to nine, with one Member registering a presence but not voting), the proposal was **DEFEATED**.

D6. Landscape

D7. Biodiversity (CSF/15)

A Member suggested that the issues of water features and land/water contamination should be core strategies.

Responsibility for maintaining water features must be established at the outset.

Construction spoil would contribute to noise attenuation alongside the M11 motorway.

In response to a Member's question, the Planning Policy Manager explained that the Green Finger linking to Gog Magog Down was to provide public access to the area.

Members endorsed Policies CSF/10 to CSF/15 inclusive, subject to Policy CSF/15-4 (Connecting Green Fingers and the Countryside) being reworded to emphasise the purpose behind the Green Fingers.

D8. Archaeology and Heritage

Members accepted this Chapter without debate.

D9. Meeting Recreational Needs

In response to a Member's question, the Planning Policy Manager reported that negotiations with Cambridge City Council were ongoing in relation to responsibility for the future maintenance of Public Open Space within the development in the absence of a Parish Council.

He added that a number of organisations had expressed an interest in assuming management responsibility for countryside aspects of the development.

D10. Land Drainage, Water Conservation, Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal

Water quality was of paramount importance.

A Member stated that surface water drainage from roads must be by means of appropriate interceptors, thus preventing pollution from fuel.

Members endorsed Policies CSF/16 to CSF/19 inclusive.

- D11 Telecommunications**
- D12. An Exemplar in Sustainability**
- D13. Waste**

Members accepted these Chapters without debate.

E1. Phasing and Implementation

A Member said that appropriate landscaping and noise attenuation measures should be put in place as soon as possible so as to minimise disruption to local residents resulting from construction traffic using the Haul Road. The Planning Policy Manager undertook to amend Policy CSF/22 (Construction Strategy) to reflect this wish.

Officers from the District Council's Environmental Health section would be assisting the Development Services Department in formulating suitable noise attenuation measures.

E2. Planning Obligations and Conditions

Members accepted this Chapter without debate.

Members endorsed Policies CSF/20 to CSF/26 inclusive, and reiterated their endorsement of Policy DP/4 of the Core Strategy.

Subject to the comments and amendments referred to above, Council **RESOLVED**

- (1) To authorise the Director of Development Services to subject the emerging policy approach for the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan to independent sustainability / strategic environmental assessment; and
- (2) To delegate to the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder authority to make any material changes deemed necessary as a result of further information, and to the Director of Development Services authority to approve minor editing changes.

The Meeting ended at 12.45 p.m.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Council
AUTHOR: Director of Development Services

9th May 2005.

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK:
 APPROVAL OF DRAFT DOCUMENTS FOR PUBLICATION FOR PRE-SUBMISSION
 PARTICIPATION**

Purpose

1. To approve for publication the Development Plan Documents in the first tranche of the Local Development Framework, taking into account the revisions brought about by consideration by Council of the preliminary drafts and the results of the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA).

Effect on Corporate Objectives

2.	High quality, accessible, value for money services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist the Council's objectives to deliver quality accessible development in the district. • The provision of affordable housing and the effective delivery of sustainable development at Northstowe and other major developments on the edge of Cambridge and development of sustainable communities. • Assist the delivery of the Community Strategy. • Be used by Cambridgeshire Horizons (formerly the Infrastructure Partnership) to help the early and sustained development of the necessary services and infrastructure.
	Quality village life.	
	A sustainable future.	
	A better future through Partnerships.	

Background

3. The Council published Preferred Options Reports for a number of Development Plan Documents on 1st October 2004. Supporting Studies were also published for consultation. Public participation on the matters, options and approaches raised in these reports took place over a six-week period ending on 12th November.
4. The Preferred Options Reports covered:
 - Core Strategy and Development Control Policies
 - Rural Centres
 - Northstowe Area Action Plan (AAP)
 - Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan
 - Cambridge East Area Action Plan (prepared jointly with Cambridge City Council)

The supporting studies published as consultation drafts were:

- Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report
 - Urban Capacity Study
 - Recreation Study, including Annexe 1 - the Village Results.
5. Council considered the results of public participation at a number of meetings and indicated the general direction which should be taken in developing policies. These meetings were:
- Core Strategy and Development Control Policies on 20th / 21st January 2005. (This included consideration of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, Urban Capacity Study and Recreation Study, including Annexe 1 - the Village Results)
 - Northstowe AAP on 1st / 11th February
 - Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP on 11th February
 - Cambridge East AAP on 8th March.
6. With Council having agreed the general direction of policies, the next round of meetings considered the emerging draft documents as follows:
- Core Strategy and Development Control Policies on 15th March
 - Northstowe AAP on 23rd March
 - Cambridge East AAP on 15th April
 - Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP on 21st April.
7. Cambridge East, which is a joint Area Action Plan with Cambridge City Council was also considered by the Cambridge East Member Reference Group, which considered the results of public participation on 21st February and the emerging draft plan on 5th April. Cambridge City Council's Environment Scrutiny Committee considered the results of public participation on 22nd March and the emerging draft plan on 12th April.

Process Towards Publication of the Draft Documents

8. Attached to this Agenda Item are Appendices containing the four DPDs:
- Appendix A – Core Strategy and Development Control Policies
 - Appendix B – Northstowe AAP
 - Appendix C – Cambridge East AAP
 - Appendix D – Cambridge Southern Fringe
 - Appendix E - Proposals Maps (Note: these are the District-wide Proposals Map, the three AAP Proposals Maps and three inset maps (Hauxton, Longstanton and Histon/Impington) shown because unlike other Inset Maps they have changed since Council on 15th March)
 - Appendix F – Glossary (this is presented to Council as a separate item which applies to all the documents and in the published versions it will be bound into each document).
9. Following approval of the emerging draft documents, the Council's appointed independent consultants for SA/SEA have been able to appraise the policies and proposals. Their recommended amendments have been taken into account in refining the draft documents. Regulations require this process to have been concluded before the documents can be approved as the Council's policy. The consultants' final Sustainability Appraisal Reports for each of the documents are set out as an

Appendix to each of these documents. Members will see that the Sustainability Appraisal Appendix for each document consists of:

- The Consultants Report
- The Policy Assessment Background Tables
- The Audit Trail of Policy Development (which sets out the audit trail of how policies have been developed from options).

Thus, for example, the draft Northstowe AAP is Appendix A, which is followed by Appendix A/1 (the Consultants' SA Report), Appendix A/2 (The Policy Assessment Background Tables) and Appendix A/3 (The Audit Trail of Policy Development).

10. It had been this Council's intention to submit the documents now to the Secretary of State. However, acting on comments from the Government Office, Counsel's advice has recently been obtained which means that the Council would be at risk of legal challenge if it were to proceed to submission without having first consulted on *"the authority's proposals for the DPD and such supporting documents as in the opinion of the authority are relevant to those proposals"*. This will require an additional round of public participation on the drafts of the Core Strategy and Area Action Plans together with the Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal of those drafts and a statement as to how the drafts have been prepared and revised in the light of consultation and assessment.
11. The earlier decision to submit to the Secretary of State after having undertaken considerable public participation on Preferred Options in October/November 2004 had been confirmed by the Government Office, GO-East, as compatible with what have become known as the "Jumping the Gun" Regulations. However, GO-East now concurs with counsel's advice that this would be to risk legal challenge.
12. The draft documents will therefore need to be the subject of what is now referred to in the Town and Country Planning (Local development) (England) Regulations 2004 as Pre-Submission public participation, the results of which will need to be considered by Council and appropriate revision to the documents made prior to formal submission to the Secretary of State in January 2006. To achieve this, I am suggesting a series of five meetings of Council over a three week period starting the third week in November 2005.
13. Preliminary work on revising the subsequent stages of the timetable indicates that this would mean that consultation on objectors' sites would begin in March 2006, the Independent Examination would start in July 2006, with the Inspector's binding report likely to be received in January 2007 and the Documents finally adopted in February 2007. This would be a very challenging timetable for this Council, objectors and the Inspectorate. I should emphasise that this timetable is provisional and will need to be further refined following discussions with GO-East and the Inspectorate.
14. Although this represents a delay in the adoption of the Local Development Framework, your officers have sought to minimise that delay. The Secretary of State should be reminded that the delay is largely due to revisions to draft Regulations and final Regulations being published at a pace which did not meet the Government's own requirements for South Cambridgeshire to make an early start of the LDF.

15. Given the extensive public participation on Preferred Options, it is recommended that a slightly less intensive programme of participation would be appropriate, given that most of the content of the draft documents has been the subject of previous participation. This would also mean that the additional financial costs to the Council can be minimised. It is proposed that the documents should be published for a six week period of consultation from 17th June to 29th July. The documents would be sent to Parish Councils and other statutory consultees as appropriate. The documents would also be available at libraries and public access points, and available on the Council's website with an interactive response form along the lines which proved so successful at the last stage. It is proposed that there should be a series of manned exhibitions at key locations: Teversham, Fen Ditton, Longstanton, Oakington, Great Shelford, Sawston and Histon/Impington. There would also be a permanent exhibition at South Cambridgeshire Hall for the entire consultation period. Cambridge City Council will also mount exhibitions in its area to cover Cambridge East as well as those at Fen Ditton and Teversham.

Revising the Development Plan Documents for Public Participation

16. The documents are the emerging drafts considered by Council previously with the proposed changes shown. These changes arise from:
- Minor editing
 - The need to maintain a consistent approach between documents
 - Decisions made by meetings of the Council
 - Recommendations from the SA/SEA consultants
 - Consideration of the County Council's suggestions on Northstowe
 - Additional matters coming forward which need to be addressed.
17. Members are therefore asked to consider each of the DPDs in turn with the proposed changes.
18. In considering these documents, Members will also need to note the final Sustainability Appraisals for each document. These will be available as follows:
- Core Strategy and Development Control Policies – Appendix A/1
 - Northstowe AAP – Appendix B/1
 - Cambridge East AAP – Appendix C/1
 - Cambridge Southern Fringe – Appendix D/1
19. The cost of progressing the LDF is set out in the Council's budget.

Legal Implications

20. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 imposes a statutory duty to prepare a Local Development Framework and to keep it up to date.

Staffing Implications

21. The programme for the LDF has been compiled having regard to the staffing resources that the Council can commit to planning policy preparation in the context of

wider pressures for the early delivery of the development strategy set out in the Structure Plan.

Risk Management Implications

22. Given the imperative from the Regional Planning Guidance and the Structure Plan that an early start must be made on the increased rate of development in the Cambridge Sub-region, it is important that the District Council, as the plan-making authority, is able to ensure that development takes place consistent with the LDF. If the LDF is not in place at an early stage there is the risk of developments being determined by the development control and appeal process. It is also necessary to ensure that the process is consistent with Regulations in order to avoid the possibility of legal challenge.

Consultations

23. The Preferred Options Reports that guided preparation of the draft documents were the subject of extensive public participation. It is proposed that another round of consultation with the public should now take place on the draft documents

Recommendations

24. Council is recommended to:
- i. Agree the proposed changes highlighted in the draft Development Plan Documents as set out in Appendices A, B, C and D to this report;
 - ii. Note the results of the Sustainability Appraisal
 - iii. Authorise the draft Development Plan Documents attached in Appendices A, B, C, and D for the purpose of public participation;
 - iv. Delegate to the Planning Portfolio Holder any material changes resultant from further information and to the Director of Development Services authority to approve any minor editing changes.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

Core Strategy Preferred Options Report, SCDC, October 2004
Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report SCDC October 2004
Northstowe Preferred Options Report, SCDC, October 2004
Recreation Study Consultation Draft, SCDC, October 2004
Agenda & Minutes – Council meetings:
20th January 2005
21st January 2005
1st February 2005
11th February 2005
8th March 2005
15th March 2005
23rd March 2005
15th April 2005

21st April 2005

Agenda & Minutes – Cambridge East Member Reference Group:

21st February 2005

5th April 2005

Agenda & Minutes – Cambridge City Council Environment Scrutiny Committee:

22nd March 2005

12th April 2005

Contact Officer: Keith Miles – Planning Policy Manager
Telephone: (01954) 713181