

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

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

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt – Chairman  
Councillor JH Stewart – Vice-Chairman

**Councillors:** Dr DR Bard, RE Barrett, JD Batchelor, RF Bryant, EW Bullman, BR Burling, Mrs J Dixon, SM Edwards, R Hall, Mrs SA Hatton, Dr JA Heap, Mrs EM Heazell, Mrs CA Hunt, Mrs HF Kember, SGM Kindersley, RMA Manning, RB Martlew, MJ Mason, Dr JPR Orme, NJ Scarr, Mrs GJ Smith, Mrs HM Smith, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, RT Summerfield, Mrs BE Waters, Dr JR Williamson and NIC Wright

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors NN Cathcart, Mrs PS Corney, Mrs SJO Doggett, Mrs A Elsby, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs JM Healey, JA Hockney, DC McCraith, EJ Pateman, A Riley, J Shepperson, RJ Turner, Dr SEK van de Ven, DALG Wherrell, JF Williams, TJ Wotherspoon and SS Ziaian-Gillan.

### **1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor JD Batchelor as an elected Cambridgeshire County Councillor.

As the owner of Girton Farm, Councillor EW Bullman declared a personal and prejudicial interest in representations 10701 and 10697, which concerned Girton Farm. Councillor Bullman took no part in any discussion of these representations.

Councillor BR Burling declared a personal interest as an owner of green belt land in Over and Willingham.

Councillor SM Edwards declared a personal interest as a lessee of land in Oakington Green Belt.

Councillor SGM Kindersley as an elected Cambridgeshire County Councillor.

Councillor RMA Manning declared a personal interest as a resident and landowner in Willingham and a landowner in Over.

Councillor JPR Orme declared a personal interest as he receives a pension from Bayer Crop Science.

Councillor NIC Wright declared a personal interest as a friend of the proprietors of the following businesses: JW Burgess & Son, Mailer & Sharp and Cambourne Land.

### **2. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - CORE STRATEGY / DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES / SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES**

The Planning Policy Manager reminded Council that the Core Strategy / Development

Control Policies / Sites Specific Policies Development Plan Documents had been considered in Spring 2005 and Members' views had been incorporated into the report before them. He advised Members to only consider the recommended amendments highlighted in the appendices. It was noted that the amount of paperwork allowed Members to note the context of the suggested amendments and there were relatively few changes to consider.

It was understood that the Development Plan Documents (DPDs) would be submitted to the Secretary of State in January 2006. An appointed inspector would examine all the objections. The submission of the DPDs will be subject to public participation for 6 weeks. This will ensure that the public have an opportunity to put their views to the inspector. However it was important that Members considered and agreed the responses to representations received.

### **Consultation With Local Authorities and Statutory Bodies**

Council agreed that Councillor Dr DR Bard, planning and economic development portfolio holder, should write to all parish council chairman informing them of the consultation process regarding the Local Development Framework.

The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) stated that in the interests of joined-up government and partnership, the Local Development Framework had been sent to local authorities and other partners. The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that the Council had consulted with the statutory bodies. It was understood that statutory bodies had been consulted before the drafting of the preferred options, at the Preferred Options stage, and then again at the Pre-Submission Public Participation stage.

### **Green Separation**

Council agreed that the policy on Green Separation at Longstanton should be discussed at the Council meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> November as part of the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

### **Site For Sewage Works**

Council expressed disappointment that despite requests from this authority and from Cambridgeshire Horizons, Anglia Water had not yet determined a new site for their sewage works at Cambridge Northern Fringe East.

### **Representations on New Development**

The Planning Policy Manager explained that representations had been received on the Barton Road development and on possible development close to Duxford. Representations had also been received regarding the size and location of Northstowe. A large number of representations asserted that the development was not sustainable. Housing allocations in villages that had gained planning permission had been removed from the Site Specific Policies, as these were now existing commitments.

### **Housing Provision**

The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) introduced this section by stating that the Council had received a number of representations regarding the lack of housing. She concluded that although the total number of houses up to 2016 was 300 short of the 20,000 target, it was expected that this shortfall would be made up by construction elsewhere in the District, such as in the north west of Cambridge and at the site of Cambridge Airport. It was understood that the 20,000 target had taken into account the potential 700 house shortfall at Northstowe by 2016.

Council noted an apparent disparity between the number of houses predicted to be built in the Housing Trajectory and the predicted increase in the number of households paying Council Tax. The Development Services Director explained that it was prudent to be

conservative in estimating the increase in residents paying tax, as any delay in construction would result in a budgetary shortfall. The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) explained that the 20,000 target assumed that the rate of build would be slower to begin with in new settlements and City edge sites and then increase.

### **Development North West of Cambridge**

The Council was liaising with Cambridge City Council to initiate an Area Action Plan regarding possible development to the northwest of Cambridge between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road. The land was currently owned by NIAB and a planning application was expected next year from David Wilson Homes. The Area Action Plan will have to be subject to public participation. The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) explained that it was the aim of the Council to retain an appropriate green belt boundary round this development.

### **Meeting Local Housing Needs**

The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) expressed reservation regarding the insertion of the word "all" in meeting local needs, as it was too ambitious. Members asked that a definition of "local needs" be included in the plan.

Council

**AGREED** to defer discussion on the definition of "local needs" to the Council meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December, to ensure that affordable housing was built for the benefit of local residents.

### **Schools**

It was agreed that sufficient capacity for schools should be provided within new developments. It was noted that for the early phases of development in Northstowe two schools would be built in two separate areas of development to ensure that there were adequate school places for the first Northstowe residents.

Concern was expressed regarding the school facilities for residents moved from Clay Farm as the school proposed by the County Council would result in more car journeys down a dead-end road.

Rural Settlements

### **Bar Hill**

Council agreed, with the support of the two local members, to re-designate Bar Hill from a Rural Centre, to a Minor Rural Centre.

### **Histon and Impington**

Councillor MJ Mason stated that Histon and Impington had a large infrastructure deficit and suffered from flooding due to over development. He concluded that the villages should no longer be designated as a Rural Centre, as this would protect them from further substantial growth. The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) explained that Histon and Impington met the criteria for a Rural Centre and it was the responsibility of the Development and Conservation Control Committee to reject applications for inappropriate development. Councillor Mason proposed and Councillor SM Edwards seconded the proposal to re-designate Histon and Impington from a Rural Centre to an In-fill Only settlement. A vote was taken and by 21 votes to 7,

Council **REJECTED** the proposal.

### **Development At Haslingfield**

It was agreed that Councillor Mrs EM Heazell should liaise with officers regarding possible reclassification of Haslingfield from a Group to an In-fill Only village.

### **Fulbourn Football Club**

Councillor NJ Scarr expressed concern regarding the lack of a suitable new location for Fulbourn Football Club, as all possible sites were in the Green Belt. The Planning Policy Manager explained that the Council's policies allowed "appropriate use" of green belt land but this was likely to exclude the construction of floodlights. It would be the responsibility of Development and Conservation Control Committee to consider any exceptions.

### **Exceptions Policy For Affordable Housing**

Councillor SGM Kindersley stated that the Council's current policy was to disallow any development over 8 dwellings in Infill villages, as it would significantly alter the village character. The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) explained that this threshold could be exceeded for affordable housing.

### **Phasing and Delivery**

Council **AGREED** to add the words "and necessary infrastructure" to the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence in paragraph 3.2.

### **Monitoring**

On the proposal of Councillor Kindersley, seconded by Councillor Bard, Council **AGREED** to amend the last sentence of paragraph 4.11 on page 572 to read: "Villages are at the bottom of the sequence and no shortfall within or on the edge of Cambridge will be made up through new allocations in villages in South Cambridgeshire."

### **Development Principles**

Council **AGREED** to delete paragraph 3.7 relating to health impact assessment because there is no certainty that an individual website will continue for the whole of the life of the plan.

### **Green Belt**

After a brief discussion Council

**AGREED** to suspend a decision on the exact boundaries of the green belt at Willingham and at Sawston, pending a meeting involving representatives from the Council and the relevant parish councils.

### **House Size**

Councillor JD Batchelor reiterated his suggestion that the size of houses be decided by floor space and not by the number of bedrooms. Concern was expressed that developers were changing the description of rooms in order to build larger 2 or 3 bedroom houses, thus failing to meet local needs.

Council

**AGREED** to defer this matter to Council's meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2005.

### **Horsiculture**

Councillor Edwards expressed concern that horsiculture was prohibited in the green belt, especially as horses were kept in areas that would be assigned as green belt as a result of the Northstowe development. He concluded that horsiculture should be treated the same as agriculture with regards to the green belt.

Council

**AGREED** to defer this matter to Council's meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2005.

### **New Employment Development**

Concern was expressed that the specification for only "high technology" clusters was unnecessarily restrictive. It was agreed that the high technology industry in Cambridgeshire should continue to be supported as the area had benefited greatly by specialising in such an adaptable industry. A vote was taken and by 14 votes to 5, with 1 abstention, Council, in the interests of flexibility,

**AGREED** to remove the words "high technology" from final sector on the list of clusters included in policy ET/3.

### **Farm Diversification**

Members were assured that if necessary a Council meeting would go into confidential session if discussing the merits of a commercially sensitive business plan. It was agreed to insert the word "business" in between the words "farm" and "plan" in the fifth paragraph of policy ET/10. It was also agreed to change paragraph 6.25 to require the submission of a farm business plan.

### **Lord's Bridge**

It was suggested that the University should make a financial contribution in return for any wider consultation on planning applications potentially impacting on the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory.

### **Flood Risk**

Concern was expressed at the inaccuracies of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. However, Council agreed that the Environment Agency Flood Zones should remain on the Proposals Map. The Land Drainage Advisory Group was instructed to liaise with the Environment Agency to ensure that local knowledge was used to amend the Flood Zones.

### **Renewable Energy**

It was suggested that the threshold of 10 dwellings for renewable energy was unnecessary, although it was noted that this was a principle established by the London Borough of Merton, which is a leader in the promotion of renewable energy.

Council

**AGREED** that a more detailed definition of "climate proofing" be included at the Council meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2005.

The word "power" was inserted after the word "wind" on paragraph 8.11 on page 694.

### **Historic Landscapes**

Council

**AGREED** that the Whole Way footpath should be included in the list of landscape features in paragraph 9.1 on page 715.

Concern was expressed regarding the decision not to designate the frontage bounded by New Road, Station Road and The Doles at Over, as an Important Countryside Frontage.

Council

**AGREED** to defer this matter to Council's meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2005.

#### **Site Specific Policies**

It was noted that the report included two policies entitled "SP/2".

It was decided that the local member for Hauxton, Councillor JA Heap, and the parish council should be properly consulted before a decision be made regarding possible development on the Bayer Cropscience site. The policy should ensure that it would be unnecessary to prove that land was contaminated by Bayer Cropscience for the company to be responsible for its remediation.

Council

**AGREED** to defer a decision on the inclusion in the Local Development Framework of the construction of 250 dwellings at the Bayer Cropscience site in the parish of Hauxton to the meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December.

#### **Cambridge Northern Fringe**

It was agreed that the reference to the number of lanes in paragraph 11.4 on page 812 should be removed as the Highways Agency were yet to confirm that the A14 would be widened to 3 lanes.

#### **Community Facilities**

It was understood that the field allocated for recreation use was known as land south of Manor Park and not Chivers Barrell Field.

It was understood that a request for the allocation of land for recreation use was likely to be received from Milton Parish Council.

#### **Former Land Settlement Association Site**

Concern was raised that the policy should make clear that it relates to buildings of substantial structure, and not all buildings including glass houses.

#### **Papworth Everard**

It was noted that since the drafting of the policy, Papworth Hospital have confirmed their decision to relocate to Cambridge. Concern was raised with regard to the impact on the employment balance in the village, and whether the policy should be reworded.

Council

**AGREED** to defer this matter to the Council meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December after the views of the parish council had been sought.

#### **Development at Lolworth**

It was understood that the suggested development near Bar Hill was actually in the parish of Lolworth. Lolworth parish meeting believed that they had not been properly consulted on this issue by those proposing the development, which, it was estimated, would triple the population of the parish.

Conclusion

Council

**AGREED**

- a) The responses to representation to the Pre-Submission Draft Development Plan Documents (DPDs) as contained in Appendices A, B and C.
- b) The responses to representations to the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and the Draft Final Sustainability Report as contained in Appendix I.
- c) The responses to representations to the Monitoring Strategy in Appendix J.
- d) The proposed changes to the draft DPDs as contained in Appendices A, B and C and incorporated into Appendices E, F and G, with the additional amendments detailed above, and that they be submitted to the Secretary of State in January 2006 after the inclusion of any amendments agreed at Council's meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2005.
- e) To delegate further minor editing changes to the DPDs to the Planning Portfolio Holder where they involve matters of policy and to the Development Services Director where they are technical matters.

---

**The Meeting ended at 4.15 p.m.**

---