



**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT
COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL MEETING
THURSDAY, 22 MARCH 2007**

AGENDA AND REPORTS

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne, Cambridge
CB23 6ES

If the press and public are likely to be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item on the grounds that exempt information is to be considered, it will be necessary to pass the following resolution: "That under Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph (quoting relevant paragraph) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A (as amended) of the Act."

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

TO: The Chairman and Members of the
South Cambridgeshire District Council

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the next meeting of the **COUNCIL** will be held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR** at **2.00 P.M.** on

THURSDAY, 22 MARCH 2007

and I am, therefore to summon you to attend accordingly for the transaction of the business specified below.

DATED 14 March 2007

GJ HARLOCK
Chief Executive

Requests for a large print agenda must be received at least 48 hours before the meeting.

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **MINUTES**
To authorise the Chairman to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2007 as a correct record.

(Pages 1 - 18)
3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
4. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
To receive any announcements from the Chairman, Leader, the executive or the head of paid service.
5. **QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND THE PUBLIC**
No questions from councillors and the public have been received at the time of publication. The deadline for the receipt of public questions is **12 noon on Monday 19 March 2007.**
6. **PETITIONS**
To note all petitions received since the last Council meeting.
7. **TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION:**
 - 7 (a) **Investment Strategy (Cabinet, 8 March 2007)**
Cabinet **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL** that the Investment Strategy be approved.
8. **GYPSY AND TRAVELLER DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (GTDPD)**

To consider the report of the Executive Director (attached).

(Pages 19 - 40)

9. AUDIT PANEL: FURTHER REVISION TO TERMS OF REFERENCE

Council previously resolved that approval of the Statement of Accounts be delegated to the Audit Panel. It is necessary to add this provision to Part 3 of the Constitution.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Terms of Reference of the Audit Panel be extended to incorporate approval of the Statement of Accounts and the Constitution updated accordingly.

10. QUESTIONS ON JOINT MEETINGS

Joint Body	Date of Meeting	Minutes Published in Weekly Bulletin
South Cambridgeshire Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership	19 February 2007	7 March 2007
South Cambridgeshire Local Strategic Partnership Board	9 January 2007	14 March 2007
South Cambridgeshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee	12 March 2007	14 March 2007 (decision summary)

11. UPDATES FROM MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OUTSIDE BODIES

12. NOTICES OF MOTION

12 (a) Standing in the names of Councillors RF Bryant, R Hall, SGM Kindersley, AG Orgee and Mrs HM Smith

In accordance with Council Standing Order 2.2 the following Notice of Motion has been submitted.

“We, the undersigned, wish to give notice of a Motion to remove Councillor Mrs Roberts from membership of the Council’s Scrutiny and Overview Committee as we consider that it is not in the best interests of the Council for her to be a member of this important Committee at this time.

Following investigation by the Standards Board for England she was found to have breached the Council’s Code of Conduct on five separate counts. The details of those breaches have persuaded us that Councillor Mrs Roberts is not a fit and proper person to hold such an influential position on this Council. We do not wish the reputation of this important Committee to be tarnished by association with Councillor Mrs Roberts and believe that she should not have accepted the nomination.”

In order to be carried, this Motion requires at least two thirds of the members present at the meeting to vote in favour.

12 (b) Standing in the names of Councillors VG Ford and RE Barrett

“This Council calls for urgent action to reduce the speed of traffic on the A1307 and

requests the Leader and Chairman of the Council to write to the Highways department of Cambridgeshire County Council requesting action be taken."

13. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS

To note the Chairman's engagements since the last Council meeting:

Date	Venue / Event
23 February	East Cambridgeshire District Council: Chairman's reception
25 February	Ely Cathedral: Celebration of 100 years of Scouting
17 March	Reception for overseas visitors to Bassingbourn Village College

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR VISITORS TO SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE HALL

Whilst the District Council endeavours to ensure that you come to no harm when visiting South Cambridgeshire Hall you also have a responsibility to ensure that you do not risk your own or others' safety.

Security

Visitors should report to the main reception desk where they will be asked to sign a register. Visitors will be given a visitor's pass that must be worn at all times whilst in the building. Please remember to sign out and return your pass before you leave. The visitors' book is used as a register in cases of emergency and building evacuation.

Emergency and Evacuation

In the event of a fire you will hear a continuous alarm. Evacuate the building using the nearest escape route; from the Council Chamber or Mezzanine viewing gallery this would be via the staircase just outside the door. Go to the assembly point at the far side of the staff car park.

Do not use the lifts to exit the building. If you are unable to negotiate stairs by yourself, the emergency staircase landings are provided with fire refuge areas, which afford protection for a minimum of 1.5 hours. Press the alarm button and wait for assistance from the Council fire wardens or the fire brigade.

Do not re-enter the building until the officer in charge or the fire brigade confirms that it is safe to do so.

First Aid

If someone feels unwell or needs first aid, please alert a member of staff.

Access for People with Disabilities

All meeting rooms are accessible to wheelchair users. There are disabled toilet facilities on each floor of the building. Hearing loops and earphones are available from reception and can be used in all meeting rooms.

Toilets

Public toilets are available on each floor of the building next to the lift.

Recording of Business

Unless specifically authorised by resolution, no audio and / or visual or photographic recording in any format is allowed at any meeting of the Council, the executive (Cabinet), or any committee or sub-committee of the Council or the executive.

Banners / Placards / Etc.

No member of the public shall be allowed to bring into or display at any Council meeting any banner, placard, poster or other similar item. The Chairman may require any such item to be removed.

Disturbance by Public

If a member of the public interrupts proceedings, the Chairman will warn the person concerned. If they continue to interrupt, the Chairman will order their removal from the meeting room. If there is a general disturbance in any part of the meeting room open to the public, the Chairman may call for that part to be cleared.

Smoking

The Council operates a NO SMOKING policy.

Food and Drink

Vending machines and a water dispenser are available on the ground floor near the lifts. There shall be no food and drink in the Council Chamber.

Mobile Phones

Please ensure that your phone is set on silent / vibrate mode during meetings.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 22 February 2007 at 2.00 p.m.

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

Councillors: Dr DR Bard, RE Barrett, JD Batchelor, Mrs PM Bear, NCF Bolitho, RF Bryant, EW Bullman, BR Burling, JP Chatfield, Mrs PS Corney, NS Davies, Mrs SJO Doggett, SM Edwards, Mrs SM Ellington, Mrs A Elsby, Mrs VG Ford, Mrs JM Guest, R Hall, Mrs SA Hatton, Mrs EM Heazell, JA Hockney, MP Howell, Mrs CA Hunt, Mrs HF Kember, SGM Kindersley, Mrs JE Lockwood, RMA Manning, RB Martlew, MJ Mason, RM Matthews, DC McCraith, DH Morgan, CR Nightingale, AG Orgee, A Riley, Mrs DP Roberts, NJ Scarr, Mrs HM Smith, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, RT Summerfield, Mrs VM Trueman, Dr SEK van de Ven, Mrs BE Waters, JF Williams and NIC Wright

Officers:	Steve Hampson	Executive Director
	Greg Harlock	Chief Executive
	Richard May	Democratic Services Manager
	Fiona McMillan	Assistant Solicitor

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors AN Berent, TD Bygott, NN Cathcart, Dr SA Harangozo, PT Johnson, JA Quinlan, RJ Turner and TJ Wotherspoon.

1. MINUTES**RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the meetings held on 25 January 2007 and 2 February 2007 (Extraordinary Meeting) be confirmed as correct records subject to the following amendments:

25 January 2007

Minute 3 – Refer to Councillor SGM Kindersley (Typographical error).

Minute 3 – Councillors RT Summerfield and Mrs HM Smith were Members of the Community Centre and Grounds Committee not the Countryside, Recreation and Grounds Committee.

Minute 6 – Reference should be to Melbourn not Meldreth Parish Council.

2 February 2007 (Extraordinary Meeting)

Include Councillor A Riley in the list of Members present.

Minute 2, page 18: Deletion of the word 'to' from Resolution (7) (Typographical error).

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors JD Batchelor, SGM Kindersley, DC McCraith and AG Orgee declared personal non-prejudicial interests as elected Cambridgeshire County Councillors.

Councillor Mrs HF Kember declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda items 7b (Hostel charges, Housing rents and service charges) and 9 (Corporate Governance Inspection) as a Council tenant. Councillor Mrs Kember advised that she would leave the room during consideration of this item and take no part in the discussions and voting.

Councillor Mrs SM Ellington declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 8 (Swavesey Byeways Rate) on the basis that she was a member of the Swavesey Byeways Committee and resident of Swavesey but did not pay the byeways rate. Notwithstanding this interest, Councillor Mrs Ellington advised she would remain in the room during consideration of this item and take part in the discussions and voting.

Councillor BR Burling declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Agenda item 8 (Swavesey Byeways Rate) as a ratepayer. Councillor Burling advised that he would remain in the meeting during consideration of this item but would not take part in the vote.

Councillors MP Howell and NJ Scarr declared personal non-prejudicial interests in Agenda Item 7c (Discretionary Compensation Regulations) as members of UNISON. Notwithstanding these interests Councillors Howell and Scarr remained in the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Mrs DP Roberts advised that she would leave the meeting during consideration of Agenda Item 7(e) (Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document).

3. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman announced the resignation of Councillor EJ Pateman from the Council, thanking Councillor Pateman for his contribution as a district and parish councillor over many years. With the Chairman's permission, Councillors RMA Manning, JD Batchelor, Mrs DSK Spink MBE and DH Morgan made statements on the matter.

The Chairman welcomed Richard Hales, the new Sustainability Officer to the Council.

The Chairman drew Members' attention to the Charity Concert taking place on 28 April 2007. The Cambridge and Peterborough Youth Choir would be providing entertainment and Members were encouraged to support this event, the proceeds of which would go to the Children's Hospice at Milton. Tickets would shortly be available from the Chief Executive's Personal Assistant.

4. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND THE PUBLIC

There were no questions from Councillors and the public.

5. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received since the last Council meeting.

6. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:

6 (a) Capital and Revenue Estimates, Council Tax and Prudential Indicators (Cabinet, 8 February 2007)

Councillor SM Edwards, Resources, Staffing, Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holder, presented 2007-2008 Revenue Estimates, the capital programme up to

the year ending 31 March 2010, and the Council Tax and Prudential Indicators to the Council. In respect of the capital programme he advised that action would be required to address an anticipated 40% reduction in capital receipts by 2010-2011. In respect of revenue estimates for 2007-2008, the General Fund expenditure was lower than expected due to higher interest on balances. The objective for reserves to reach £1.5 million by 2016 was dependent on the achievement of savings arising from the Business Process Reviews and the ongoing effects of fluctuating interest rates. There remained a budgetary deficit of £1 million per year from 2010-2011. Council was advised that the proposed District Council Tax increase of 4.9% was the equivalent to £5 per year on a Band D property.

Following a short debate on the proposals Council **RESOLVED** that:

- (1) the capital programme up to the year ending 31 March 2010 be approved as submitted, which includes the sum of £33.285 million to be spent on affordable housing for the years from 2007/08 to 2009/10;
- (2) the increase in staffing costs due to an approved saving no longer being achieved be reviewed in September 2007;
- (3) the revised revenue estimates for the year 2006/07 and the revenue estimates for 2007/08 be approved as submitted, incorporating the decision made at (2);
- (4) the District Council demand for general expenses for 2007/08 be £5.798 million;
- (5) that the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2007-08 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:
 - (a) **£65,897,369** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act (gross expenditure including parish precepts, the Housing Revenue Account and additions to reserves)
 - (b) **£49,334,380** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act (gross income including the Housing Revenue Account and use of reserves)
 - (c) **£16,562,989** being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year (net expenditure) being the district amount of £13,370,580 and the parish precepts of £3,192,409
 - (d) **£7,573,050** being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates and revenue support grant increased/decreased by the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from/to its collection fund to/from its

general fund in accordance with Section 97(3) (Council Tax transactions) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988

- (e) **£158.57** being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year (average Council Tax for a band D property for the District including parishes)
- (f) **£3,192,409** being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (parish precepts)
- (g) **£102.26** being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates (average Council Tax for a Band D property for the District excluding parishes), the amounts being for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£ 68.17	£ 79.54	£ 90.90	£ 102.26	£ 124.98	£ 147.71	£ 170.43	£ 204.52

- (h) In accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, the basic amounts of council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a special item relates are shown by adding the amounts for band D in paragraph (g) and **Appendix 'A' (attached)**
- (i) In accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands are shown by adding the amounts for each band in paragraph (g) and **Appendix 'A' (attached)**.
- (j) that it be noted that for the year 2007-08 the Cambridgeshire County Council and the Cambridgeshire Police and Fire Authorities have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Valuation Bands - County Council

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£ 621.66	£ 725.27	£ 828.88	£ 932.49	£ 1,139.71	£ 1,346.93	£ 1,554.15	£ 1,864.98

Valuation Bands - Police Authority

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£ 99.60	£ 116.20	£ 132.80	£ 149.40	£ 182.60	£ 215.80	£ 249.00	£ 298.80

Valuation Bands – Fire Authority

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£ 34.92	£ 40.74	£ 46.56	£ 52.38	£ 64.02	£ 75.66	£ 87.30	£ 104.76

and

- (k) that the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the amounts set out in **Appendix 'B' (attached)** as the amounts of council tax for the year 2007-08 for each of the categories of dwellings shown in **Appendix 'B' (attached)**.

- (6) The prudential indicators in Part 3 of the Cabinet report be approved.

6 (b) Hostel Charges, Housing Rents and Service Charges (Cabinet, 8 February 2007)

Councillor Mrs HF Kember left the meeting during consideration of this item and took no part in the discussions and voting, having declared a personal and prejudicial interest at the start of the meeting (See Minute 3 above).

Council **RESOLVED** that:

- (a) from the first week in April 2007, rents be increased by an average of 5%, based on an inflationary increase of 4.1%, plus or minus a maximum of £0.65 towards the phasing in of rent restructuring;
- (b) permission be granted to Hereward Housing to increase hostel rents by £11.06 per week, in addition to 4.1% for inflation, from April 2007; and
- (c) charges for services and facilities be increased as outlined in the following table:

Service or facility	Current charge p.w.	Proposed Charge p.w.	Increase
	£	£	% (£)
Sheltered Housing Charges			
<i>Tenants</i>			
<i>- support element</i>			
- those in residence prior to 01/04/2003	11.04	12.37	12.0 (1.33)
- Other tenants	14.13	14.48	2.5 (0.35)
- Communal Facilities	6.04	6.29	4.1 (0.25)
Equity Shareholders			
<i>Schemes with Communal Facilities</i>			
- Those in residence prior to 01/04/2003	20.58	22.16	7.7 (1.58)
- Other shareholders	23.67	24.27	2.5 (0.60)

- <i>schemes without communal facilities</i>			
- those in residence prior to 01/04/03	14.54 current p.w.	15.87 proposed p.w.	Increase 9.3% (£1.33)
- other shareholders	17.63	17.98	2.0 (0.35)
Alarm System Service Charges			
Individual alarms	3.28	3.36	2.5 (0.08)
- <i>Those not in receipt of benefit</i>			
- where the Council supplies the alarm	3.61	3.70	2.5 (0.09)
- where the user supplies the alarm	2.92	2.99	2.5 (0.07)
- <i>Those in receipt of benefit</i>			
- Where the Council supplies the alarm	2.30	2.70	17.4 (0.40)
- Where the user supplies the alarm	1.63	2.00	22.7 (0.37)
Group alarms	3.28	3.36	2.5 (0.08)
Garage rents			
Garages rented to a Council tenant or leaseholder (NB In excess of garages will be subject to VAT)	6.11	6.36	4.1 (0.25)
Other garages (subject to VAT)	8.43	8.78	4.1 (0.35)

6 (c) Discretionary Compensation Regulations (Cabinet, 8 February 2007)

Council **RESOLVED** that the following discretionary compensation policy be adopted:

- (a) **General policy**
- (i) The revised policy should seek to minimise any adverse impact on the terms and conditions of employment for Council employees.
 - (ii) The Council should continue not to seek to use the LGPS augmentation provisions due to the costs and complexities this would entail.
 - (iii) The revised policy should be applied consistently to all, regardless of age.
 - (iv) The revised policy should be reviewed after six months of operation in order to manage any potential risks and issues arising.
- (b) **Transitional protection**
- (i) The Council should continue to use the discretions it currently applies under the 2000 regulations to award Compensatory Added Years (CAY) for any protected employees made redundant / subject to Premature Retirement in the Interest of the Efficient Exercise of the Authority's Functions (PRIEEAF) before 1 April 2007
- (c) **Redundancy policy**
- (i) Redundancy should remain calculated on actual week's pay, rather than statutory redundancy provisions.
 - (ii) All local government service, even if broken, should continue to count for the purposes of redundancy payment calculations; however, no period of employment should count twice, i.e., where the employee concerned has previously received compensation, only the remaining, un-compensated, service should be counted;
 - (iii) The revised redundancy policy for all employees should be to award an overall lump sum of 1 1/2 times the redundancy payment to employees with two or more years' continuous employment within local government

(or a public sector company recognised by Modification Order), regardless of their membership of the LGPS, with effect from 1 April 2007. (Note: The overall lump sum so awarded would include the statutory redundancy payment due.)

- (d) **PRIEEAF policy**
- (i) The revised PRIEEAF policy for the Council should be a flexible approach to award a lump sum of up to 104 weeks' pay.

6 (d) Joint Planning Services Arrangement (Cabinet, 8 February 2007)

Council **RESOLVED** that, having due consideration for sections 19 (Discharge of functions of and by another local authority) and 20 (Joint exercise of functions) of the Local Government Act 2000:

- (a) The joint working arrangements set out in Appendices 1-3 of the report, including the creation of the Joint Strategic growth Implementation Committee, Northstowe Development Control Committee and Fringe Sites Development Control Committee, be approved subject to agreement of detailed operational arrangements and adequate financial resources being made available by the Minister;
- (b) Subject to the relevant provisions being made, the following appointments to the joint committees be made,
- (i) Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee – 2 Members of the Conservative Group and 1 Member of the Liberal Democrat Group, including the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder
- (ii) Northstowe Development Control Committee – 6 Councillors, in accordance with the rules of political balance; and
- (iii) Fringe Sites Development Control Committee – 6 Councillors, in accordance with the rules of political balance;
- (c) Subject to the relevant provisions being made, that the planning powers listed in Annex 1 to Appendix 1e of the report, be delegated to the joint development control committees, with the Constitution being amended accordingly, subject to a detailed scheme of delegation to Officers being prepared for subsequent approval by Council; and
- (d) The Chief Executive be authorised to make any further minor or consequential amendments to the scheme as may be from time to time required.

The voting on this Resolution was recorded as follows:

FOR: (39)

Dr DR Bard	RE Barrett	JD Batchelor
Mrs PM Bear	NCF Bolitho	RF Bryant
EW Bullman	BR Burling	Mrs PS Corney
NS Davies	SM Edwards	Mrs SM Ellington
Mrs A Elsby	Mrs VG Ford	Mrs JM Guest
R Hall	Mrs EM Heazell	JA Hockney
MP Howell	Mrs CA Hunt	Mrs HF Kember
SGM Kindersley	Mrs JE Lockwood	RMA Manning
RB Martlew	RM Matthews	DC McCraith
DH Morgan	CR Nightingale	AG Orgee
A Riley	Mrs HM Smith	Mrs DSK Spink MBE
JH Stewart	RT Summerfield	Dr SEK van de Ven
Mrs BE Waters	JF Williams	NIC Wright

AGAINST: (4)

Mrs SJO Doggett
NJ Scarr

Mrs SA Hatton

Mrs DP Roberts

ABSTAINED: (2)

JP Chatfield

MJ Mason

6 (e) Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document (GTDPD) (GTDPD Member Reference Group, 15 February 2007)

Councillor Mrs DP Roberts left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Dr DR Bard, Planning and Economic Development Holder, presented the recommendations of the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document Member Reference Group to Council. Details of minor amendments to Appendices 2-4 agreed by the working party were tabled.

Councillor A Riley proposed and Councillor SM Edwards seconded an amendment deleting 'wherever possible' from policies GT13, 14, 15C, 16A and 17A. Councillor SM Edwards raised further concerns regarding the following issues:

- the need to establish a maximum number of pitches per site;
- consideration of the density of adjoining settlements;
- consideration of pitch size;
- changes to the scoring matrix since the reference group meetings.

In response to these concerns Council was advised that the issues raised would be picked up through the delegation of authority to the Corporate Manager for Planning and Sustainable Communities and to the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder to make minor and material changes.

Councillor A Riley withdrew his amendment.

Council **RESOLVED** that, subject to the alterations tabled at the meeting,

- (a) The responses to representations on the GTDPD Issues and Options 1 Report and the Sustainability Appraisal at Appendix 3 be agreed.
- (b) The list of Preferred Options at Appendix 2 be approved in order for stage 2, the site options search to begin.
- (c) The actions put forward in Appendix 1 and summarised in Appendix 2 be addressed and taken forward into stage 2 of the Issues and Options process (Site options selection).
- (d) The three-tier scoring matrix at Appendix 4 be used in the next stage of the GTDPD Issues and Options process.
- (e) Authority be delegated to the Corporate Manager for Planning and Sustainable Communities, to make any minor editing changes necessary to the responses as set out in Appendices 1 and 3 with any which involve a material change being delegated to the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder.

7. SWAVESEY BYEWAYS RATE

Council **RESOLVED** that:

- (a) the current level of bye-way maintenance be maintained for the period 2007/08; and
- (b) a rate of 90 pence be levied to fund the required maintenance for the period 2007-2008.

8. **CORPORATE GOVERNANCE INSPECTION (CGI) - TOWARDS AN IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Councillor RMA Manning, Leader of the Council, presented recommendations to the Council setting out proposed next steps in responding to the CGI report and requesting additional resources for this purpose.

Council supported the recommendations, resolving further that the Independent Remuneration Panel be requested to consider the payment of a Special Responsibility Allowance to the Leader of the Opposition.

Council **RESOLVED**, with no votes against that:

- (a) The Council's acceptance of the findings and conclusions of the CGI report, and its determination to address the recommendations of the report as a matter of urgency, be confirmed.
- (b) That the establishment of an Improvement Board with terms of reference and membership set out in the Appendix to the report be approved.
- (c) That Cabinet be requested to take the lead in the development and delivery of an Improvement Plan (subject to approval of the Plan by Council) and to recognize the valuable contribution that all Members can make to the improvement process and involve them accordingly.
- (d) The Transformation Committee be disbanded and that its powers be transferred to the Cabinet to enable a co-ordinated approach to be taken to the implementation of the Transformation Project and Improvement Plan.
- (e) That the addition of up to £300,000 per annum from 2007/08 be approved (to be divided appropriately between the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account) for posts to strengthen the Council's capacity to respond to the CGI recommendations, with the expenditure being financed initially by the use of reserves and reviewed as part of the next revision of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- (f) That Cabinet be requested to place a standard item on the agenda for all its meetings on the Improvement Plan, ensure a regular briefing on progress to all Members and to identify areas where the Scrutiny and Overview Committee can contribute to the process.
- (g) That the support so far given to the Council by external agencies be welcomed and that the Chief Executive be requested to continue to work with partners to attract further capacity to support the improvement programme.
- (h) That the Independent Remuneration Panel be requested to consider the payment of a Special Responsibility Allowance to the Leader of the Opposition.

9. **APPOINTMENT TO VACANCY ON THE SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE**

Council received the nomination of the Independent Group to appoint Councillor Mrs DP Roberts to fill the vacancy on the Scrutiny and Overview Committee.

In light of the recent Standards Board for England case and Corporate Governance Inspection, Councillor RMA Manning, Leader of the Council, called upon Councillor Mrs Roberts not to accept the nomination as to do so would be detrimental to the Council's reputation at the present time. Notwithstanding this request, Councillor Mrs Roberts replied that she intended to accept her group's nomination.

10. **UPDATES FROM MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

Councillor RB Martlew advised that he had attended the last meeting of the Citizens' Advice Bureau (CAB) Executive. The organization had recently moved into new

accommodation incorporating an advice hub together with capacity for a variety of other advisory and support organisations. The CAB welcomed the Council's commitment to funding on a 3-year basis.

Councillor RE Barrett advised that he had attended the last meeting of the County Council's Health Scrutiny Committee. He reported that principal services at Hinchinbrooke Hospital were continuing but that there would be significant changes. The trust retained a sizeable deficit.

Councillor R Hall advised that he had attended the last meeting of the County Archives and Local Studies Group. He reported that Huntingdon Library would open in 2008, whilst the Cambridgeshire Collection was available at the Milton Road library and also via Cottenham Library and the Norfolk Record Office. It was hoped that the Central Library in Cambridge would reopen in 2008.

Councillor MJ Mason advised that he had attended the last meeting of the Waterbeach Internal Drainage Board at which technical issues in respect of the Cambridge Lakes planning application had been discussed.

Councillor NIC Wright advised that he had attended the last meeting of the Swavesey Internal Drainage Board at which concerns were expressed in response to a proposal by Anglian Water to use Webb's Hole sluice for the Northstowe development. In particular, there were serious problems with the operation of this sluice.

Councillor Dr SEK van de Ven advised members that, at a recent meeting of the Royston CAB, it had been revealed that South Cambridgeshire District Councillors were using the resource far less than their counterparts in North Hertfordshire. Councillor Dr van de Ven reminded Members that the CAB was a valuable resource in helping to deal with enquiries from residents.

11. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS

Council noted the list of engagements attended by the Chairman since the last meeting.

The Meeting ended at 5.00 p.m.

APPENDIX A

PARISH	Parish Council Special Expenses per dwelling							
	Valuation bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p
Great Abington	26.81	31.27	35.74	40.21	49.15	58.08	67.02	80.42
Little Abington	29.77	34.74	39.70	44.66	54.58	64.51	74.43	89.32
Abington Pigotts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Arrington	29.42	34.32	39.23	44.13	53.94	63.74	73.55	88.26
Babraham	52.94	61.76	70.59	79.41	97.06	114.70	132.35	158.82
Balsham	34.14	39.83	45.52	51.21	62.59	73.97	85.35	102.42
Bar Hill	38.83	45.31	51.78	58.25	71.19	84.14	97.08	116.50
Barrington	43.25	50.45	57.66	64.87	79.29	93.70	108.12	129.74
Bartlow	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Barton	19.75	23.04	26.33	29.62	36.20	42.78	49.37	59.24
Bassingbourn	24.74	28.86	32.99	37.11	45.36	53.60	61.85	74.22
Bourn	48.31	56.36	64.41	72.46	88.56	104.66	120.77	144.92
Boxworth	17.18	20.04	22.91	25.77	31.50	37.22	42.95	51.54
Caldecote	42.78	49.91	57.04	64.17	78.43	92.69	106.95	128.34
Cambourne	74.51	86.93	99.35	111.77	136.61	161.45	186.28	223.54
Carlton	12.33	14.39	16.44	18.50	22.61	26.72	30.83	37.00
Castle Camps	25.97	30.30	34.63	38.96	47.62	56.28	64.93	77.92
Caxton	27.42	31.99	36.56	41.13	50.27	59.41	68.55	82.26
Childerley	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chishill	44.45	51.85	59.26	66.67	81.49	96.30	111.12	133.34
Comberton	42.11	49.12	56.14	63.16	77.20	91.23	105.27	126.32
Conington	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coton	41.73	48.68	55.64	62.59	76.50	90.41	104.32	125.18
Cottenham	35.34	41.23	47.12	53.01	64.79	76.57	88.35	106.02
Croxton	25.81	30.11	34.41	38.71	47.31	55.91	64.52	77.42
Croydon	16.22	18.92	21.63	24.33	29.74	35.14	40.55	48.66
Dry Drayton	8.12	9.47	10.83	12.18	14.89	17.59	20.30	24.36
Duxford	24.64	28.75	32.85	36.96	45.17	53.39	61.60	73.92
Elsworth	37.92	44.24	50.56	56.88	69.52	82.16	94.80	113.76
Eltisley	28.71	33.50	38.28	43.07	52.64	62.21	71.78	86.14
Great & Little Eversden	9.30	10.85	12.40	13.95	17.05	20.15	23.25	27.90
Fen Ditton	26.51	30.92	35.34	39.76	48.60	57.43	66.27	79.52
Fen Drayton	24.83	28.97	33.11	37.25	45.53	53.81	62.08	74.50
Fowlmere	29.95	34.94	39.93	44.92	54.90	64.88	74.87	89.84
Foxton	17.63	20.56	23.50	26.44	32.32	38.19	44.07	52.88
Fulbourn	42.09	49.10	56.12	63.13	77.16	91.19	105.22	126.26
Gamlingay	46.26	53.97	61.68	69.39	84.81	100.23	115.65	138.78
Girton	26.34	30.73	35.12	39.51	48.29	57.07	65.85	79.02
Little Gransden	21.68	25.29	28.91	32.52	39.75	46.97	54.20	65.04
Grantchester	43.73	51.01	58.30	65.59	80.17	94.74	109.32	131.18
Graveley	34.19	39.88	45.58	51.28	62.68	74.07	85.47	102.56
Hardwick	33.69	39.31	44.92	50.54	61.77	73.00	84.23	101.08
Harlton	33.07	38.59	44.10	49.61	60.63	71.66	82.68	99.22
Harston	22.57	26.33	30.09	33.85	41.37	48.89	56.42	67.70
Haslingfield	50.00	58.33	66.67	75.00	91.67	108.33	125.00	150.00
Hatley	14.25	16.62	19.00	21.37	26.12	30.87	35.62	42.74

APPENDIX A

PARISH	Parish Council Special Expenses per dwelling							
	Valuation bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p
Hauxton	26.39	30.78	35.18	39.58	48.38	57.17	65.97	79.16
Heydon	16.39	19.13	21.86	24.59	30.05	35.52	40.98	49.18
Hildersham	56.13	65.48	74.84	84.19	102.90	121.61	140.32	168.38
Hinxton	29.82	34.79	39.76	44.73	54.67	64.61	74.55	89.46
Histon	45.11	52.63	60.15	67.67	82.71	97.75	112.78	135.34
Horningsea	43.43	50.67	57.91	65.15	79.63	94.11	108.58	130.30
Horseheath	24.45	28.53	32.60	36.68	44.83	52.98	61.13	73.36
Ickleton	26.11	30.47	34.82	39.17	47.87	56.58	65.28	78.34
Impington	40.75	47.54	54.33	61.12	74.70	88.28	101.87	122.24
Kingston	34.11	39.79	45.48	51.16	62.53	73.90	85.27	102.32
Knapwell	25.21	29.41	33.61	37.81	46.21	54.61	63.02	75.62
Landbeach	27.08	31.59	36.11	40.62	49.65	58.67	67.70	81.24
Linton	48.65	56.76	64.87	72.98	89.20	105.42	121.63	145.96
Litlington	36.36	42.42	48.48	54.54	66.66	78.78	90.90	109.08
Lolworth	18.99	22.16	25.32	28.49	34.82	41.15	47.48	56.98
Longstanton	48.95	57.11	65.27	73.43	89.75	106.07	122.38	146.86
Longstowe	17.66	20.60	23.55	26.49	32.38	38.26	44.15	52.98
Madingley	46.43	54.17	61.91	69.65	85.13	100.61	116.08	139.30
Melbourn	62.11	72.46	82.81	93.16	113.86	134.56	155.27	186.32
Meldreth	33.61	39.22	44.82	50.42	61.62	72.83	84.03	100.84
Milton	39.87	46.51	53.16	59.80	73.09	86.38	99.67	119.60
Guilden Morden	30.15	35.18	40.20	45.23	55.28	65.33	75.38	90.46
Steeple Morden	30.81	35.94	41.08	46.21	56.48	66.75	77.02	92.42
Newton	10.98	12.81	14.64	16.47	20.13	23.79	27.45	32.94
Oakington/Westwick	43.90	51.22	58.53	65.85	80.48	95.12	109.75	131.70
Orwell	34.07	39.75	45.43	51.11	62.47	73.83	85.18	102.22
Over	15.47	18.05	20.63	23.21	28.37	33.53	38.68	46.42
Pampisford	35.25	41.13	47.00	52.88	64.63	76.38	88.13	105.76
Papworth Everard	45.81	53.44	61.08	68.71	83.98	99.25	114.52	137.42
Papworth St Agnes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rampton	67.45	78.70	89.94	101.18	123.66	146.15	168.63	202.36
Sawston	56.19	65.55	74.92	84.28	103.01	121.74	140.47	168.56
Great Shelford	26.68	31.13	35.57	40.02	48.91	57.81	66.70	80.04
Little Shelford	24.71	28.83	32.95	37.07	45.31	53.55	61.78	74.14
Shepreth	25.17	29.36	33.56	37.75	46.14	54.53	62.92	75.50
Shingay-cum-Wendy	11.97	13.96	15.96	17.95	21.94	25.93	29.92	35.90
Shudy Camps	14.57	16.99	19.42	21.85	26.71	31.56	36.42	43.70
Stapleford	30.47	35.54	40.62	45.70	55.86	66.01	76.17	91.40
Stow-cum-Quy	29.73	34.69	39.64	44.60	54.51	64.42	74.33	89.20
Swavesey	32.64	38.08	43.52	48.96	59.84	70.72	81.60	97.92
Tadlow	4.92	5.74	6.56	7.38	9.02	10.66	12.30	14.76
Teversham	28.79	33.59	38.39	43.19	52.79	62.39	71.98	86.38
Thriplow	14.94	17.43	19.92	22.41	27.39	32.37	37.35	44.82
Toft	38.27	44.64	51.02	57.40	70.16	82.91	95.67	114.80
Waterbeach	40.33	47.05	53.77	60.49	73.93	87.37	100.82	120.98

APPENDIX A

PARISH	Parish Council Special Expenses per dwelling							
	Valuation bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p
Weston Colville	26.07	30.41	34.76	39.10	47.79	56.48	65.17	78.20
West Wickham	20.08	23.43	26.77	30.12	36.81	43.51	50.20	60.24
West Wratting	24.60	28.70	32.80	36.90	45.10	53.30	61.50	73.80
Whaddon	46.17	53.86	61.56	69.25	84.64	100.03	115.42	138.50
Whittlesford	22.99	26.82	30.65	34.48	42.14	49.80	57.47	68.96
Great Wilbraham	17.58	20.51	23.44	26.37	32.23	38.09	43.95	52.74
Little Wilbraham	10.51	12.26	14.01	15.76	19.26	22.76	26.27	31.52
Willingham	40.57	47.33	54.09	60.85	74.37	87.89	101.42	121.70
Wimpole	28.27	32.99	37.70	42.41	51.83	61.26	70.68	84.82

APPENDIX B

PARISH	County Precept, Fire Precept, Police Precept and District Council General and Special Expenses per dwelling							
	Valuation bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p
Great Abington	851.16	993.02	1,134.88	1,276.74	1,560.46	1,844.18	2,127.90	2,553.48
Little Abington	854.12	996.49	1,138.84	1,281.19	1,565.89	1,850.61	2,135.31	2,562.38
Abington Pigotts	824.35	961.75	1,099.14	1,236.53	1,511.31	1,786.10	2,060.88	2,473.06
Arrington	853.77	996.07	1,138.37	1,280.66	1,565.25	1,849.84	2,134.43	2,561.32
Babraham	877.29	1,023.51	1,169.73	1,315.94	1,608.37	1,900.80	2,193.23	2,631.88
Balsham	858.49	1,001.58	1,144.66	1,287.74	1,573.90	1,860.07	2,146.23	2,575.48
Bar Hill	863.18	1,007.06	1,150.92	1,294.78	1,582.50	1,870.24	2,157.96	2,589.56
Barrington	867.60	1,012.20	1,156.80	1,301.40	1,590.60	1,879.80	2,169.00	2,602.80
Bartlow	824.35	961.75	1,099.14	1,236.53	1,511.31	1,786.10	2,060.88	2,473.06
Barton	844.10	984.79	1,125.47	1,266.15	1,547.51	1,828.88	2,110.25	2,532.30
Bassingbourn	849.09	990.61	1,132.13	1,273.64	1,556.67	1,839.70	2,122.73	2,547.28
Bourn	872.66	1,018.11	1,163.55	1,308.99	1,599.87	1,890.76	2,181.65	2,617.98
Boxworth	841.53	981.79	1,122.05	1,262.30	1,542.81	1,823.32	2,103.83	2,524.60
Caldecote	867.13	1,011.66	1,156.18	1,300.70	1,589.74	1,878.79	2,167.83	2,601.40
Cambourne	898.86	1,048.68	1,198.49	1,348.30	1,647.92	1,947.55	2,247.16	2,696.60
Carlton	836.68	976.14	1,115.58	1,255.03	1,533.92	1,812.82	2,091.71	2,510.06
Castle Camps	850.32	992.05	1,133.77	1,275.49	1,558.93	1,842.38	2,125.81	2,550.98
Caxton	851.77	993.74	1,135.70	1,277.66	1,561.58	1,845.51	2,129.43	2,555.32
Childerley	824.35	961.75	1,099.14	1,236.53	1,511.31	1,786.10	2,060.88	2,473.06
Chishill	868.80	1,013.60	1,158.40	1,303.20	1,592.80	1,882.40	2,172.00	2,606.40
Comberton	866.46	1,010.87	1,155.28	1,299.69	1,588.51	1,877.33	2,166.15	2,599.38
Conington	824.35	961.75	1,099.14	1,236.53	1,511.31	1,786.10	2,060.88	2,473.06
Coton	866.08	1,010.43	1,154.78	1,299.12	1,587.81	1,876.51	2,165.20	2,598.24
Cottenham	859.69	1,002.98	1,146.26	1,289.54	1,576.10	1,862.67	2,149.23	2,579.08
Croxton	850.16	991.86	1,133.55	1,275.24	1,558.62	1,842.01	2,125.40	2,550.48
Croydon	840.57	980.67	1,120.77	1,260.86	1,541.05	1,821.24	2,101.43	2,521.72
Dry Drayton	832.47	971.22	1,109.97	1,248.71	1,526.20	1,803.69	2,081.18	2,497.42
Duxford	848.99	990.50	1,131.99	1,273.49	1,556.48	1,839.49	2,122.48	2,546.98
Elsworth	862.27	1,005.99	1,149.70	1,293.41	1,580.83	1,868.26	2,155.68	2,586.82
Eltisley	853.06	995.25	1,137.42	1,279.60	1,563.95	1,848.31	2,132.66	2,559.20
Great & Little Eversden	833.65	972.60	1,111.54	1,250.48	1,528.36	1,806.25	2,084.13	2,500.96
Fen Ditton	850.86	992.67	1,134.48	1,276.29	1,559.91	1,843.53	2,127.15	2,552.58
Fen Drayton	849.18	990.72	1,132.25	1,273.78	1,556.84	1,839.91	2,122.96	2,547.56
Fowlmere	854.30	996.69	1,139.07	1,281.45	1,566.21	1,850.98	2,135.75	2,562.90
Foxton	841.98	982.31	1,122.64	1,262.97	1,543.63	1,824.29	2,104.95	2,525.94
Fulbourn	866.44	1,010.85	1,155.26	1,299.66	1,588.47	1,877.29	2,166.10	2,599.32
Gamlingay	870.61	1,015.72	1,160.82	1,305.92	1,596.12	1,886.33	2,176.53	2,611.84
Girton	850.69	992.48	1,134.26	1,276.04	1,559.60	1,843.17	2,126.73	2,552.08
Little Gransden	846.03	987.04	1,128.05	1,269.05	1,551.06	1,833.07	2,115.08	2,538.10
Grantchester	868.08	1,012.76	1,157.44	1,302.12	1,591.48	1,880.84	2,170.20	2,604.24
Graveley	858.54	1,001.63	1,144.72	1,287.81	1,573.99	1,860.17	2,146.35	2,575.62
Hardwick	858.04	1,001.06	1,144.06	1,287.07	1,573.08	1,859.10	2,145.11	2,574.14
Harlton	857.42	1,000.34	1,143.24	1,286.14	1,571.94	1,857.76	2,143.56	2,572.28
Harston	846.92	988.08	1,129.23	1,270.38	1,552.68	1,834.99	2,117.30	2,540.76
Haslingfield	874.35	1,020.08	1,165.81	1,311.53	1,602.98	1,894.43	2,185.88	2,623.06
Hatley	838.60	978.37	1,118.14	1,257.90	1,537.43	1,816.97	2,096.50	2,515.80

APPENDIX B

PARISH	County Precept, Fire Precept, Police Precept and District Council General and Special Expenses per dwelling							
	Valuation bands							
	A £ p	B £ p	C £ p	D £ p	E £ p	F £ p	G £ p	H £ p
Hauxton	850.74	992.53	1,134.32	1,276.11	1,559.69	1,843.27	2,126.85	2,552.22
Heydon	840.74	980.88	1,121.00	1,261.12	1,541.36	1,821.62	2,101.86	2,522.24
Hildersham	880.48	1,027.23	1,173.98	1,320.72	1,614.21	1,907.71	2,201.20	2,641.44
Hinxton	854.17	996.54	1,138.90	1,281.26	1,565.98	1,850.71	2,135.43	2,562.52
Histon	869.46	1,014.38	1,159.29	1,304.20	1,594.02	1,883.85	2,173.66	2,608.40
Horningsea	867.78	1,012.42	1,157.05	1,301.68	1,590.94	1,880.21	2,169.46	2,603.36
Horseheath	848.80	990.28	1,131.74	1,273.21	1,556.14	1,839.08	2,122.01	2,546.42
Ickleton	850.46	992.22	1,133.96	1,275.70	1,559.18	1,842.68	2,126.16	2,551.40
Impington	865.10	1,009.29	1,153.47	1,297.65	1,586.01	1,874.38	2,162.75	2,595.30
Kingston	858.46	1,001.54	1,144.62	1,287.69	1,573.84	1,860.00	2,146.15	2,575.38
Knapwell	849.56	991.16	1,132.75	1,274.34	1,557.52	1,840.71	2,123.90	2,548.68
Landbeach	851.43	993.34	1,135.25	1,277.15	1,560.96	1,844.77	2,128.58	2,554.30
Linton	873.00	1,018.51	1,164.01	1,309.51	1,600.51	1,891.52	2,182.51	2,619.02
Litlington	860.71	1,004.17	1,147.62	1,291.07	1,577.97	1,864.88	2,151.78	2,582.14
Lolworth	843.34	983.91	1,124.46	1,265.02	1,546.13	1,827.25	2,108.36	2,530.04
Longstanton	873.30	1,018.86	1,164.41	1,309.96	1,601.06	1,892.17	2,183.26	2,619.92
Longstowe	842.01	982.35	1,122.69	1,263.02	1,543.69	1,824.36	2,105.03	2,526.04
Madingley	870.78	1,015.92	1,161.05	1,306.18	1,596.44	1,886.71	2,176.96	2,612.36
Melbourn	886.46	1,034.21	1,181.95	1,329.69	1,625.17	1,920.66	2,216.15	2,659.38
Meldreth	857.96	1,000.97	1,143.96	1,286.95	1,572.93	1,858.93	2,144.91	2,573.90
Milton	864.22	1,008.26	1,152.30	1,296.33	1,584.40	1,872.48	2,160.55	2,592.66
Guilden Morden	854.50	996.93	1,139.34	1,281.76	1,566.59	1,851.43	2,136.26	2,563.52
Steeple Morden	855.16	997.69	1,140.22	1,282.74	1,567.79	1,852.85	2,137.90	2,565.48
Newton	835.33	974.56	1,113.78	1,253.00	1,531.44	1,809.89	2,088.33	2,506.00
Oakington/Westwick	868.25	1,012.97	1,157.67	1,302.38	1,591.79	1,881.22	2,170.63	2,604.76
Orwell	858.42	1,001.50	1,144.57	1,287.64	1,573.78	1,859.93	2,146.06	2,575.28
Over	839.82	979.80	1,119.77	1,259.74	1,539.68	1,819.63	2,099.56	2,519.48
Pampisford	859.60	1,002.88	1,146.14	1,289.41	1,575.94	1,862.48	2,149.01	2,578.82
Papworth Everard	870.16	1,015.19	1,160.22	1,305.24	1,595.29	1,885.35	2,175.40	2,610.48
Papworth St Agnes	824.35	961.75	1,099.14	1,236.53	1,511.31	1,786.10	2,060.88	2,473.06
Rampton	891.80	1,040.45	1,189.08	1,337.71	1,634.97	1,932.25	2,229.51	2,675.42
Sawston	880.54	1,027.30	1,174.06	1,320.81	1,614.32	1,907.84	2,201.35	2,641.62
Great Shelford	851.03	992.88	1,134.71	1,276.55	1,560.22	1,843.91	2,127.58	2,553.10
Little Shelford	849.06	990.58	1,132.09	1,273.60	1,556.62	1,839.65	2,122.66	2,547.20
Shepreth	849.52	991.11	1,132.70	1,274.28	1,557.45	1,840.63	2,123.80	2,548.56
Shingay-cum-Wendy	836.32	975.71	1,115.10	1,254.48	1,533.25	1,812.03	2,090.80	2,508.96
Shudy Camps	838.92	978.74	1,118.56	1,258.38	1,538.02	1,817.66	2,097.30	2,516.76
Stapleford	854.82	997.29	1,139.76	1,282.23	1,567.17	1,852.11	2,137.05	2,564.46
Stow-cum-Quy	854.08	996.44	1,138.78	1,281.13	1,565.82	1,850.52	2,135.21	2,562.26
Swavesey	856.99	999.83	1,142.66	1,285.49	1,571.15	1,856.82	2,142.48	2,570.98
Tadlow	829.27	967.49	1,105.70	1,243.91	1,520.33	1,796.76	2,073.18	2,487.82
Teversham	853.14	995.34	1,137.53	1,279.72	1,564.10	1,848.49	2,132.86	2,559.44
Thriplow	839.29	979.18	1,119.06	1,258.94	1,538.70	1,818.47	2,098.23	2,517.88
Toft	862.62	1,006.39	1,150.16	1,293.93	1,581.47	1,869.01	2,156.55	2,587.86
Waterbeach	864.68	1,008.80	1,152.91	1,297.02	1,585.24	1,873.47	2,161.70	2,594.04

APPENDIX B

PARISH	County Precept, Fire Precept, Police Precept and District Council General and Special Expenses per dwelling							
	Valuation bands							
	A £ p	B £ p	C £ p	D £ p	E £ p	F £ p	G £ p	H £ p
Weston Colville	850.42	992.16	1,133.90	1,275.63	1,559.10	1,842.58	2,126.05	2,551.26
West Wickham	844.43	985.18	1,125.91	1,266.65	1,548.12	1,829.61	2,111.08	2,533.30
West Wrating	848.95	990.45	1,131.94	1,273.43	1,556.41	1,839.40	2,122.38	2,546.86
Whaddon	870.52	1,015.61	1,160.70	1,305.78	1,595.95	1,886.13	2,176.30	2,611.56
Whittlesford	847.34	988.57	1,129.79	1,271.01	1,553.45	1,835.90	2,118.35	2,542.02
Great Wilbraham	841.93	982.26	1,122.58	1,262.90	1,543.54	1,824.19	2,104.83	2,525.80
Little Wilbraham	834.86	974.01	1,113.15	1,252.29	1,530.57	1,808.86	2,087.15	2,504.58
Willingham	864.92	1,009.08	1,153.23	1,297.38	1,585.68	1,873.99	2,162.30	2,594.76
Wimpole	852.62	994.74	1,136.84	1,278.94	1,563.14	1,847.36	2,131.56	2,557.88

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Council	22 March 2007
AUTHOR/S:	Corporate Manager for Planning and Sustainable Communities / Executive Director	

GYPSY AND TRAVELLER DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (GTDPD)**Purpose**

1. To seek Member approval for the 'three tier scoring matrix' to be used in the next stage of the Issues and Options process of the Gypsy and Traveller DPD, to agree revisions to the plan preparation timetable, and to agree the approach for Member involvement in the future development of the plan.

Executive Summary

2. Following Council (22 February), it has been identified that the recommendation agreed by Council did not formally delegate authority to the portfolio holder to agree changes to the 'three tier scoring matrix' (appendix 4 of the 22nd February report), although this had been the intention and understanding of Members. Advice by the Principal Solicitor was that this should be rectified through the next Council meeting, and this report seeks approval of a revised 'three tier scoring matrix'.
3. At the GTDPD Member Reference Group it was noted that the timetable for production of the document would need to be revised in order to reflect resources available, and the need to avoid consultations that rely on time within the summer break. An updated timetable has now been prepared, and Members are now asked to note this timetable.
4. This report also reviews the plan preparation process and member involvement, and proposes a return to special council meetings to take forward decisions on the DPD.

Background

5. The GTDPD, as part of the Council's new Local Development Framework, will provide a vision for the future of Gypsies and Travellers in South Cambridgeshire and will set out policies and proposals as they relate to planning for Gypsies and Travellers in the District up to 2016. The Issues and Options 1 Report indicated that the plan period would be to 2021, but on reflection the period should be consistent with the current adopted RPG6 and the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy adopted January 2007 which both cover the period to 2016.
6. The GTDPD will also identify a number of sites for Traveller and Gypsy settlements to meet demand up to 2010, taking into consideration the recent *Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment*, which identified a need for 110 to 130 pitches in South Cambridgeshire between 2005 and 2010. It will then be reviewed to take account of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) review, which will identify the number of pitches required in the district to 2021.
7. The purpose of the GTDPD is not only to provide sites for Gypsies and Travellers to meet identified current and future housing needs, but also to set out a robust strategy for addressing the problem of illegal encampments in the District. The GTDPD will

address the full range of land use and planning issues that need to be taken into account in bringing forward Gypsy and Traveller sites over the plan period, including how they relate to the settled community.

8. The Issues and Options Report 1: General Approach was the first stage in the production of the GTDPD. Representations on report were invited during a six-week period running from 13 October 2006 to 24 November 2006. Public participation involved a display in reception at South Cambs Hall, an inter-active website, articles in the South Cambs Magazine delivered to all households in the District, copies of the reports being made available at the Council's offices and at public libraries and local access points and interviews with the Leader on the Travellers radio station "Rokker Radio". Copies of the Reports were also sent to key organisations such as statutory bodies including Parish Councils. During the consultation period 1150 representations were received.

Decisions of Council 22nd February 2007

9. At the Council meeting on 22 February Members considered the responses received during the Issues And Options Stage 1 consultation, together with a schedule of responses to those individual representations, and a schedule of resulting actions. Members agreed the following recommendations:
 - (a) The responses to representations on the GTDPD Issues and Options 1 Report and the Sustainability Appraisal at Appendix 3 of the 22nd February agenda.
 - (b) The list of Preferred Options at Appendix 2 of the 22nd February agenda.
 - (c) The actions put forward in Appendix 1 (of the 22nd February agenda) and summarised in Appendix 2 (of the 22nd February agenda).
 - (d) The three-tier scoring matrix at Appendix 4 of the 22nd February agenda.
 - (e) Authority be delegated to the Corporate Manager for Planning and Sustainable Communities, to make any minor editing changes necessary to the responses as set out in Appendices 1 and 3 (of the 22nd February agenda) with any which involve a material change being delegated to the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder.
10. Following Council (22 February), it has been identified that the recommendation agreed by Council did not formally delegate authority to the portfolio holder to agree changes to the 'three tier scoring matrix' (appendix 4 of the 22nd February report), although this had been the intention and understanding of Members. Advice by the Principal Solicitor was that this should be rectified through the next Council meeting. As such, and in the light of Members' comments received through email correspondence, the revised scoring matrix is included at Appendix 1 for formal Council agreement.
11. Following Council on 22 February, all Members have been consulted on two draft 'three tier scoring matrices' and comments/responses are attached at Appendix 2 for information. The resulting final 'three tier scoring matrix' is attached as Appendix 1, and is recommended for approval. It should be noted that this 'three tier scoring matrix' reflects the decisions on the options made by the Council at the previous meeting. Details of which option the individual criteria developed from are provided in the table.

12. Members should also note that the decisions already taken have allowed work on the GTDPD to continue, and the need for this additional report has not created any additional delay in the plan making process.

Timetable

13. At the GTDPD Member Reference Group it was noted that the timetable for production of the document would need to be revised in order to reflect resources available, and the need to avoid consultations that rely on time within the traditional summer break, which has in the past caused problems for some consultees. An updated timetable has now been prepared. A summary is provided below showing the delays with the full timetable available at Appendix 3. Members are now asked to note this revised timetable.
- (a) Approval of representation responses to the Issues and Options 1 Consultation and identification of Preferred Options (part of Regulation 25 - current stage) – February/March 2007
 - (b) Issues and Options 2 Consultation (part of Regulation 25) - September 2007 (*was June/July 2007*)
 - (c) Pre-Submission Draft GTDPD Public Participation (Regulation 26) – May/June 2008 (*was February/March 2008*)
 - (d) Draft GTDPD submitted (Regulation 28) – November/December 2008 (*was August/September 2008*)
 - (e) Objection Sites Consultation (Regulation 32) – January - March 2009 (*was October – November 2008*)
 - (f) Public Examination – June/July 2009 (*was March 2009*)
 - (g) Inspectors Report - September 2009 (*was June 2009*)
 - (h) Adoption - October 2009 (*was July 2009*)

Plan Making Decision Process

14. The process for agreeing the GTDPD was a matter of concern at the last Council meeting. In order to progress and ensure the decision making process is transparent, efficient and unlikely to be challenged, discussions have taken place regarding the future process for this document.
15. There are three main options:
- (a) Continue as before with special meetings of Council;
 - (b) Continue as now with a two-stage process whereby matters of detail are debated in a member reference group, which makes recommendations to Council.
 - (c) Enable the Portfolio Holder to take all decisions on the document up to the decision to submit to the Secretary of State.
16. Option (b) requires 2 meetings to make a decision and, if not managed effectively, will add time to the plan-making process, which will be taken up by servicing meetings rather than by plan making. The Government will not change its targets for the time for plan making and as a consequence we will spend more time on process and less time on plan making with an inevitable reduction in the quality of the product.
17. There is also more opportunity for delay if Council does not accept the recommendations of its member reference groups - as happened in July 2004 when Council requested further work on the Northstowe Area Action Plan and suspended the meetings of the Northstowe Member Reference Group to take charges of this DPD.

18. Option (c) is employed by and works for other Councils. The expectation is that because Portfolio Holder Decisions are subject to Scrutiny, by the time of Council's decision to submit to the SOS the Council would agree with the approach. However, that cannot be guaranteed and as such there are risks associated with this option.
19. Option (a) is the same process which was used for previous LDF documents, involving special Council meetings held to discuss the document in open session with participation invited from all Members. To take this document forward using this approach it is anticipated that four such meetings would be required over the next two years.
20. The advantage of this approach is that decisions are taken at each stage in the process at a single meeting and decisions are final as they are decisions of Council. Given the pressure from Government to produce DPD's quickly this may be seen as the most efficient method, allowing more time to be spent on plan-making and less time to be spent on process. It is also the least risky as Council makes decisions as it goes along and it also builds ownership.
21. To continue with the current two-stage process whereby the document is first considered by the Member Reference Group and then sent onto Council is considered to be less efficient (requiring more officer resource) and allows more opportunity for delay. It is therefore proposed that the MRG is disbanded.
22. It is recommended that option (a) be taken forward at this stage. There is a commitment to undertake a detailed review of the Council's decision-making structures as part of the response to the recent CGI report. The process for developing the Local Development Framework will be considered as part of this exercise, during which the advantages and drawbacks of the favoured option will be investigated in detail along with potential new ways of working. It is therefore recommended that the option chosen should be subject to further consideration following the review of process.

Implications

23.	Financial	<p>Cabinet on 12 January 2006 agreed to fund the production of the GTDPD, taking funds from the Travellers budget.</p> <p>In terms of process the cost of printing the Agenda and papers for Special Full Council meetings is around £500 per meeting. This does not include the costs of colour printing, binding or associated costs such as refreshments. The cost of producing similar papers for consideration by the Member Reference Group is lower, however there remain resource implications arising from the need to administer these meetings.</p>
	Legal	<p>The GTDPD will become a statutory Development Plan Document and therefore a very significant material planning consideration in determining planning applications. Advice from external Counsel is also being sought throughout the production of the GTDPD in order to reduce the risk of any successful challenges later in the adoption process.</p>

Staffing	<p>The corporate projects officer is managing the production of the GTDPD with assistance from Planning Policy.</p> <p>The requirement to arrange and administer four additional Special Meetings of Council over the next two years will have staffing implications for officers in Democratic Services, Planning Policy and Facilities.</p>
Risk Management	<p>The preparation of the GTDPD adds to an already very heavy workload in Planning Policy and for the corporate projects officer. To delay or withdraw would risk planning applications being submitted without adequate planning policy guidance and framework in place and call into question earlier enforcement action, which has in part been supported by the positive approach the Council, has taken to planning for Travellers.</p>
Equal Opportunities	<p>In line with statutory duties under the Race Relations Acts and Disability Discrimination Acts, this Council's operates both a Race Equality Scheme and a Disability Equality Scheme (the latter considered by the Council on 23 November 2006). Travellers represent the biggest ethnic minority in the district (1% of the population) and suffer disproportionately high levels of ill-health and disability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Council is committed to treating everyone fairly and justly, whatever their race or background. b) The Scheme gives priority to actions relating to Travellers as the biggest ethnic minority in the district (around 1.0% of the district's population). c) Planning is identified as being amongst the services most relevant to promoting race equality.

Consultations

24. The Issues and Options report 1 has been subject to extensive public consultation. Senior Management Team, the Principal Solicitor, Democratic Services Manager, Leader, Deputy Leader and Planning Portfolio Holder have also been consulted on the issue of Special Council meetings.

Effect on Annual Priorities and Corporate Objectives

25.	<p>Affordable Homes</p> <p>Customer Service</p> <p>Northstowe and other growth areas</p> <p>Quality, Accessible Services</p> <p>Village Life</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <p>Partnership</p>	<p>The need to address Gypsy and Traveller issues has implications for all three Council priorities and all four corporate objectives. This is also reflected in the Council's policy on Traveller issues, agreed July 2004. The production of the GTDPD is central to identifying how and where Gypsy and Travellers' housing needs can be met. The document will look at public/private provision of sites, location, relationship to settlements and effects on neighbouring uses amongst other issues. Both Issues and Options reports and the Draft GTDPD are subject to a Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environment Assessment to ensure their compliance with these issues.</p>
-----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Recommendations

26. Council is recommended to:
- (a) Note the comments from Members and the officer responses to them at Appendix 2.

- (b) Approve the 'three tier scoring matrix' at Appendix 1 for use in the site search phase of the GTDPD Issues and Options process
- (c) Delegate authority to the Corporate Manager for Planning and Sustainable Communities, to make any minor editing changes necessary to the 'three tier scoring matrix', with any which involve a material change being delegated to the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder.
- (d) Agree to hold Special Council meetings at future stages of the GTDPD in order to discuss the development of the GTDPD therefore disbanding the GTDPD Member Reference Group, subject to this process being reviewed following the wider review of decision-making structures in response to the Corporate Governance Inspection of the Council.

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

- Council Agenda 22nd February 2007
- Report on Issues and Options Report 1 Consultation – CDN Planning Ltd
- Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document – Issues and Options Report 1: General Approach
- Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document – Issues and Options Report 1: General Approach – Sustainability Appraisal
- Representations received in response to the above documents

Contact Officer: Jon Dixon - Principal Planning Policy Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713194

Kirsty Simmons – Corporate Projects Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713297

DRAFT THREE-TIER APPROACH SCORING SHEET

TIER 1 – LOCATION

Sites must score 3+ to move on to Tier 2 (Subject to sensitivity testing)

Issue	Score	Min Score	Selected Option	Notes
1. The Site				
1a. Site Location and Size		-		
Specify Site Location Total Site Area				
1b. Current land use		-	GT18	Preference would be given to Brownfield sites in sustainable locations (to be determined through other tests)
Brownfield or Greenfield?				
Yes				
No	YES/NO	-	GT21	Although a site is in the Green Belt, it would still be assessed but kept in reserve should there be no other suitable alternate sites, having regard to other factors, e.g. sustainability of location.
1c. Is the site located in the Green Belt?				
2. Relationship to Settlements				
2a. Site is located within 1000m via a safe walking or cycle route (or where one could be made available) of the following settlements (as defined in the Core Strategy):	+4 +3 +2 +1	+1	GT4C GT15C	For the initial map sieving process 1000m buffer/search zone to be drawn from the edge of the settlement framework; selecting a point within a village and drawing a 1000m search circle would be too arbitrary.
2b. Site is located within 2000m via a safe walking or cycle route (or where one could be made available) of the following settlements (as defined in the Core Strategy):			GT4C	This is to be used as a reserve should no sites be identified under 2a Reflects GT4C and Circular 01/2006 requiring rural/semi rural locations to be considered.
3. Environmental Constraints				
3a. Is the site within a valued area?				
Internationally or Nationally Recognised Designations				
- Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)				
- Special Protection Areas (SPA)				
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)				
- Scheduled Ancient Monuments				
- Historic Parks and Gardens				
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)				
- Ramsar sites				
- Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological sites				
Locally Recognised Designations				
- Conservation Areas				
- Protected Village Amenity Areas				
- Important Countryside Frontages				
- Listed Buildings (curtilage or setting of)				
- Archaeological Sites				
- Protected Mineral Workings and any future Waste Safeguarding Areas, Sustainable Transport Protection Zones	YES/NO			
- County Wildlife Sites				
- Biodiversity Action Plan areas				
		Must be NO (at this stage)	GT12 GT24 GT25 GT26	This would identify 'no-go' areas for the initial site selection exercise. Future applications for pitches in these areas would not be automatically refused. In these instances, an approach reflecting the Development Control Policies DPD should be adopted where, depending on the designation, if no detrimental/harmful/adverse impact would result, the proposal would be considered. ¹ Either existing or future, reflects GT24 (Internationally and Nationally Recognised Designations) ² Either existing or future, reflects GT25 (Conservation Areas), GT26 (Locally Recognised Designations), GT12 (Protection of Mineral Workings). Account will need to be taken of sites in adopted plans, and an appropriate weight given to proposals in draft plans e.g. Minerals and Waste LDF.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Linton Special Policy Area - Duxford Imperial War Museum - River Valleys, public footpaths/bridleways 					
3b. Is the site in close proximity to a hazardous area?	<p>Flood Plain</p> <p>Poor Ground Stability</p> <p>Poor Drainage</p> <p>Contaminated Land</p> <p>Hazardous Installations</p> <p>Poor Highway Safety</p> <p>Dual Carriageway, Railway Line, River</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>	YES/NO	-	GT5 GT9 GT10 GT11 GT6 GT7	Proposals would only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that these issues can be addressed through appropriate mitigation measures secured by planning conditions or S106.	
3c. Can any of the above be addressed through mitigation or through sensitive design of the site?	Yes No	YES/NO	Must be YES			
4. Social Infrastructure						
4a. Access to 5 local amenities/services is provided:	<p>Within 1000m of the site</p> <p>Within 2000m of the site</p>	+3 +2	+2	GT13 GT15C	<p>At least 80% of the site must be within the specified distance of 5 of the following Local Amenities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Food Shop</i> – a supermarket or village shop where a range of products are available for purchase; a restaurant or take-away will not qualify as a food shop - <i>Bank/Cash Point</i> – a post office providing a cash service would also apply. - <i>Postal Facility</i> – can be a post office or a postal subsidiary within for example a supermarket - <i>Pharmacy</i> - <i>Medical Centre</i> – doctor’s surgery, hospital - <i>Primary School</i> - <i>Secondary School</i> - <i>Leisure/Recreation Centre</i> – must be open for public use although an entry fee may be charged (i.e. not a subscription). - <i>Community Centre</i> - <i>Public House</i> - <i>Children’s Play Area</i> – will only classify as such if it is a clearly defined and designated publicly available play area - <i>Outdoor open access public area</i> – can be a public park, village green or any other type of outdoor amenity area with unrestricted public access. <p>Definitions reflect Building Research Establishment (BRE) EcoHomes Guidance (2006)</p>	
5. Other Considerations						
5a. Is the site located within 1000m of other Gypsy/Traveller pitches/sites?	Yes No	YES/NO	If NO, proceed to Tier 2		Other pitches can be authorised or unauthorised or potential future allocations, within SCDC or in neighbouring authorities.	
5b. If Yes, what is the total number of pitches?	Number of Pitches		-		Identify total number of unauthorised/authorised pitches within 1000m of a proposed site, including any proposed allocations.	
5c. Would there be any harmful impact to local physical/social infrastructure should additional pitches be permitted?	Yes No	YES/NO	Must be NO	GT27 GT29	Provide explanation of what impacts on infrastructure would result from allowing additional pitches – eg. impact on physical infrastructure such as sewage/water capacity and impact on social infrastructure such as capacity of schools.	

TIER 2 – ACCESS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Sites must have a Tier 2 score of 5+ to proceed to Tier 3

Issue	Score	Min Score	Selected option	Notes
1. Physical Infrastructure				
1a. What is the maximum capacity of the site in terms of pitches?			GT30	The Cambridgeshire sub-region Travellers Needs Assessment states that existing Council sites average 2.3 caravans per pitch. This will provide an initial basis for the site search, with the size of a pitch guided by the conditions of the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960.
1b. Does the maximum capacity of the site reflect the settlement hierarchy?	YES/NO	Must be YES	GT30	The number of pitches must reflect the settlement hierarchy as listed below: with each individual scheme limited to: <i>Cambridge/Northstowe</i> – 30 new pitches per scheme <i>Rural Centres</i> – limited to 30 new pitches per scheme <i>Minor Rural Centres</i> – limited to 15 new pitches per scheme <i>Group Villages</i> – limited to 8 new pitches per scheme.
1c. Is basic infrastructure (water, electricity) available on site or within a reasonable distance away from the site to enable a practical connection?	YES/NO	Must be YES	GT8 GT27	Note option GT30, sites should be kept relatively small, normally no more than 15 pitches. Details of local infrastructure must be provided, including any capacity issues, how far the nearest connection is, and feasibility of connection. It would be based on the recommendation of utility providers as to whether or not a connection is practical.
1d. Does this basic infrastructure have the capacity to serve the maximum site capacity?	YES/NO	-		A similar approach to residential development where no connection to basic infrastructure is available on the site will be used.
1e. If No, are there measures that can be taken to address this?	YES/NO	Must be YES		
2. Transport Infrastructure				
2a. Where access involves routes through built-up areas, is access available by distributor roads without the need to use more local roads within industrial areas, recognised commercial areas or housing areas?	+1 0	+1		
2b. Can the site be serviced by an independent vehicular access point, which adheres to the Highway Authority's guidance and standards?	+1 0	+1	GT7	
2c. Does the site have a safe pedestrian or cycle access/route to the nearest local area centre (or could one be provided)?	+1 0	+1	GT6	
2d. Access to a transport node is provided via a safe walking or cycle route:	+2 +1	+1	GT16A	This can be either a bus stop or rail stop or community share service.
2e. The nearest public transport node provides:	+2 +1	+1	GT17B	

TIER 3 – DELIVERABILITY, DESIGN AND IMPACT

The highest scoring/rated sites will have a detailed assessment considering the elements in the table below along with a draft illustrative layout prepared for practical purposes.

Issues	Topics for Exploration	Selected Option	Notes																		
1. Design and Impact																					
1a. Satisfaction of Identified Need	Identified Need Establish optimum site size Establish practical 'raw' layout	GT1B GT2 GT3																			
1b. Impact on designations listed in 3a	Level and nature of impact Possible mitigation measures	GT24 GT25 GT26	Sites would not be permitted in areas where there would be any detrimental/harmful/adverse impact on designations and residential amenity and local character.																		
1c. Effect on residential amenity of nearby residential properties	Level and nature of impact Possible mitigation measures	GT29																			
1d. Impact on local character/appearance	Level and nature of impact Possible mitigation measures Consider Landscape Character Area, and Historic Landscape Character	GT28																			
1e. Site Appraisal	Topography Aspect Level / quality of existing vegetation Emergency Response Times Uses within the site* Relationship to key local amenities** Other issues	GT28/ Action from I&O 1	<p>Sites should have a natural/logical boundary, or where one is proposed it must be sensitive to the character/appearance of its surroundings. Sites should not be too steep or visually intrusive.</p> <p>Adequate response times should be available from Police/Fire/Ambulance services – this will be determined in consultation with service providers.</p> <p>* Uses within the site can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Space for visitors - Space for an amenity area should be provided with facilities such as a day room, WC and washing facilities - Play area <p>** Sites should be located via safe pedestrian/cycle route to the following key amenities:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="925 56 1252 999"> <tr> <td>A Primary School</td> <td>within 1000m of the site within 2000m of the site</td> <td>+4 +2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Secondary School</td> <td>within 1000m of a public transport node providing service to school</td> <td>+1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medical Centre</td> <td>within 2000m of the site within 1000m of a public transport node providing service to the school</td> <td>+2 +1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Food Shop</td> <td>within 1000m of the site within 2000m of the site</td> <td>+4 +2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Children's Play Area</td> <td>within 1000m of a public transport node providing service to Medical Centre within 1000m of the site within 2000m of the site within 1000m of a public transport node providing service to Food Shop</td> <td>+1 +3 +2 +1</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>within 500m of the site within 1000m of the site</td> <td>+2 +1</td> </tr> </table> <p>(Note: scoring will be used for comparison of site.)</p>	A Primary School	within 1000m of the site within 2000m of the site	+4 +2	Secondary School	within 1000m of a public transport node providing service to school	+1	Medical Centre	within 2000m of the site within 1000m of a public transport node providing service to the school	+2 +1	Food Shop	within 1000m of the site within 2000m of the site	+4 +2	Children's Play Area	within 1000m of a public transport node providing service to Medical Centre within 1000m of the site within 2000m of the site within 1000m of a public transport node providing service to Food Shop	+1 +3 +2 +1		within 500m of the site within 1000m of the site	+2 +1
A Primary School	within 1000m of the site within 2000m of the site	+4 +2																			
Secondary School	within 1000m of a public transport node providing service to school	+1																			
Medical Centre	within 2000m of the site within 1000m of a public transport node providing service to the school	+2 +1																			
Food Shop	within 1000m of the site within 2000m of the site	+4 +2																			
Children's Play Area	within 1000m of a public transport node providing service to Medical Centre within 1000m of the site within 2000m of the site within 1000m of a public transport node providing service to Food Shop	+1 +3 +2 +1																			
	within 500m of the site within 1000m of the site	+2 +1																			
2. Deliverability																					
2a. Ease of Acquisition	Private/Public Ownership Purchase/Lease Compulsory Purchase	GT28 GT39/40																			
2b. Notional Costings	Land value Utility connections Road infrastructure Landscaping																				

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 2 - Comments / Questions from Members

Member	Section	Comment	Officer Response
Cllr Hazel Smith	Tier 1 2a. & 2b	Should be clarified to say - 'Centre NEAR Cambridge or Northstowe'	This part of the table tests the location relative to the level of the settlement in the hierarchy. The word 'near' is not required.
Cllr Hazel Smith	3b	Power lines are mentioned in the policy as hazardous - should be included on the last line	Power lines must be considered according to the option selected by members. They are picked up under the general term 'hazardous installations', and are one of a number of types of installation that must be taken account of.
Cllr Hazel Smith	4a	Concerned about increasing list to include so many types of facilities. Would 3 pubs a community centre and a play area give the 5 required, or do the pubs count as 1? Why 80% of the site?	The list reflects the agreed option, and doesn't introduce any new facilities from that in the options report. It uses a list created by the BRE, and they also recommend the 80% test. In reality, due to the small size of new travellers sites, the 80% is unlikely to make a great deal of difference. The tests will operate more as a yes/no rather than counting, i.e. is there a bank y/n, yes = 1 point, rather than 3 banks = 3 points.
Cllr Hazel Smith	5a	If potential future allocations count, then 2 possible sites within 1000m of each other could rule each other out In this case you would sometimes need to count both in at this stage and choose between them with regard to the Tier 2 criteria?	This test does not rule out sites being near each other. It means that if there are other existing sites nearby, it moves on to the next questions (5b and 5c) of assessing the impact on physical / social infrastructure of additional sites. If you had two potential sites in one area you would need to consider the impact of allocating them both, and this would need to be done as an exercise at the end (tier 3) rather than in the tier 1 sieving.
Cllr Hazel Smith	Tier 2: 2a	Does this give more preference to a site in a built-up area served by a distributor road than to a more rural site where there are no industrial, commercial or housing areas?	This criteria aims to avoid conflict with other uses, by seeking access that minimises disturbance. It doesn't give greater preference to sites in built up areas.

Member	Section	Comment	Officer Response
Cllr Hazel Smith	2c	If one 'could be provided' would it be the subject of a S106?	Yes, sites could be subject to s106 or condition if infrastructure was required to meet the sites needs
Cllr Hazel Smith	Tier 3: 1e	Uses within the site - should include also Business use (GT33) and Stables (GT34)?	This could be examined on a case-by-case basis as appropriate when sites have been identified at tier 3.
Cllr Vicky Ford		Concerned about the points for social infrastructure, and risk of double counting.	There are two distinct testing mechanisms being developed through the matrix. 1) The site should be within 1000m / 2000m of at least 5 key local amenities. This is the test developed from the BRE test, and was included in the Issues and Options Report at GT/15, and draft scoring matrices. It therefore sets a minimum requirement for sites to move to tier 2 (subject to sensitivity testing). 2) An action coming from the representations, that was approved by Council, was to give greater weight in the scoring to sites near key amenities, so that sites that meet all the absolute tests could then be better differentiated by score. Although these do repeat some of the amenities above, they operate in a different function. For example, being within 1000m of a doctor's surgery is not an absolute requirement from the options, but sites that are should be shown up by a higher positive score than sites that are not.
Cllr Simon Edwards		The GTDPD needs to pay more regard to the housing density of the surrounding area, in particular the compatibility with high-density urban land uses. This should be addressed in the 1 st tier rather than the 3 rd tier.	Density was not an issue explicitly covered in the Issues and Options report. It is considered that the density issue can be appropriately covered in the scoring matrix at tier 3. At that time, it will be possible to look at the characteristics of nearby residential areas and consider whether the density of those areas makes them incompatible for locating a travellers site.

Member	Section	Comment	Officer Response
			<p>The first tier is essentially a factual sieve map exercise where locations that do not meet the respective tests are shaded out as potential areas of search for sites for travellers. We do not have detailed information on the density of our built up areas to use for this exercise, and indeed inclusion of such a test would raise questions about what density, measured over what sort of extent of area, would be excluded from further consideration.</p>
Cllr Simon Edwards		<p>Proximity to a medical centre should be given greater importance in the scoring matrix. It needs to be a Yes/No answer and sites without access to medical centre should only be considered when all other sites with good access to medical facilities have been exhausted. It should not have a lower weighting than proximity to a primary School, or be comparable to access to a children's play area.</p>	<p>There is no firm requirement in the Issues and Options Report for sites to have access to medical facilities. However this does not mean it is not an important issue that should be considered through this site selection process.</p> <p>The matrix seeks to develop the accessibility tests so that sites score better if they are close to certain key facilities to help identify the most sustainable sites. In terms of taking a comparable approach to traveller sites and traditional housing, access to a primary school is a key criteria in designating Group villages where modest levels of development are appropriate. A comparable approach is also indicated by Circular 01/2006 which lists both access to schools and health facilities as key sustainability criteria. I see no evidence base for distinguishing between these facilities. However, they both score more than other "key" facilities" because of their importance. The Circular talks about considering the wider benefits of easier access to GP and other health facilities, but there is no suggestion that this is an</p>

Member	Section	Comment	Officer Response
			<p>absolute requirement.</p> <p>The latest version of the matrix has added extra criteria to tier 3 so that those sites that come through the sieving process and are subject to detailed consideration are tested as to how close they are to key facilities, and get extra points to help identify which are the most sustainable and appropriate to take forward as site options for consultation. The weighting proposed gives the highest scores to sites close to a primary school and to a medical centre of a maximum of 4 points depending on how far the facilities are, for specifically the reasons you mention. Additional points are proposed for other key facilities including children's play areas, but only to a maximum of 2 points, so there is a distinction drawn.</p> <p>This scoring is not used to rule sites in or out but what it will do is give detailed information on access to key facilities on a site-by-site basis, rather than mix it in with the sieving part of the process. So, at the 3rd stage, all sites that come through the process can be considered and compared looking at all the relevant criteria and if there were to be a long "short list", a choice can be made on the most sustainable sites to take further.</p> <p>The scoring process can only take us so far. There will be judgements to make at the end of the process. Members could at that point decide that it would be reasonable in the light of the shortlist of sites coming through the process to take forward only sites that are close to medical facilities for example. However, until we</p>

Member	Section	Comment	Officer Response
Cllr Simon Edwards		All the Fringe Developments around Cambridge should be considered for Gypsy and Traveller Sites, not just Cambridge as a whole.	<p>undertake the process, we do not have any indication how many sites will meet the tests and whether sufficient sites can be identified to take forward as potential traveller allocations if these sorts of criteria were made absolute requirements.</p> <p>The urban extensions would be covered by the test of being located close to Cambridge. They would be considered alongside other sites around the edge of Cambridge if they meet the locational tests. It is agreed that the urban extensions should be treated as separate entities as opposed to one single settlement when considering the potential scale of development.</p>
Cllr Simon Edwards		A sequential approach to development of sites, in the same way as National Guidance approaches a sequential approach to housing development, is needed. Therefore it makes sense to bring forward sites in the most sustainable areas first, with those less sustainable sites, or those relying on future infrastructure to come forward when appropriate.	<p>The sequential approach is indeed important and it is covered by Tier 1, 2a which gives higher scores to more sustainable settlements. The matrix will be used to identify sites that meet the locational, accessibility and design and deliverability tests. However, it will not (necessarily) do the whole job of identifying the site options for consultation. Depending on how many sites fall through that sieve mapping and assessment process, there will be a choice to be made on which are the most appropriate site options to consult on and that could include consideration of the relative merits of the various sites such as having regard to the settlement hierarchy.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Timetable for production of the GTDPD

The consultant will be involved in all the stages shaded below. SCDC will administer the other stages.

1. Issues and Options 1 (Criteria)

Stage	Duration	Start Date	End Date
Background work, prepare (criteria) Issues & Options report	10 weeks	2 May 06	7 July 06
Revisions to draft I&O Report & Legal check	5 weeks	10 July 06	11 Aug 06
Strategic Environment Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal (SEA/SA)	4 weeks	21 Aug 06	15 Sept 06
Revise Issues and Options report	1 week	18 Sept 06	22 Sept 06
Print deadline and despatch	1 day	7 Sept 06	
Member Reference Group	1 day	14 Sept 06	
Council print deadline and despatch	1 day	20 Sept 06	
SCDC Council	1 day	28 Sept 06	
Printing, letters, etc	3 weeks	11 Sept 06	29 Sept 06
Revise following Council and put on Website	2 weeks	2 Oct 06	13 Oct 06
Issues and Options consultation (Reg 25)	6 weeks	13 Oct 06	24 Nov 06
Database entry/cleaning	3 weeks	27 Nov 06	15 Dec 07
Prepare representation responses and GTDPD approach	6 weeks	18 Dec 06	02 Feb 07
Print deadline and despatch	2 days	W/b 5 Feb 07	
Member Reference Group	1 day	W/b 12 Feb 07	
Committee print deadline and despatch	2 days	W/b 12 Feb 07	
SCDC Council - representation responses and GTDPD approach	1 day	22 Feb 07 & 22 March 07	

2. Issues and Options 2 (Site Specific)

Stage	Duration	Start Date	End Date
Background work, prepare (site specific) Issues & Options report following agreement of I&O1 at Council on 22/2/ and 22/3/07	6 weeks	26 March 07	4 May 07
Revisions to draft I&O Report & Legal check	3 weeks	7 May 07	25 May 07
Strategic Environment Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal (SEA/SA)	4 weeks	28 May 07	22 June 07
Revise Issues and Options report	1 week	25 June 07	6 July 07
Council print deadline and despatch	2 days	11 July 07	
SCDC Council	1 day	19 July 07	
Printing, letters, etc	3 weeks	23 July 07	10 Aug 07
Revise following Council and put on Website	1 weeks	13 Aug 07	17 Aug 07
Issues and Options consultation (Reg 25) Including a 6 week period avoiding the main summer break 3 Sept – 15 Oct	6 weeks	20 Aug 07	15 Oct 07
Database entry/cleaning	4 weeks	15 Oct 07	9 Nov 07
Prepare representation responses and GTDPD approach	6 weeks	12 Nov 07	21 Dec 07
Committee print deadline and despatch	2 days	16 Jan 08	
SCDC Council - representation responses and GTDPD approach	1 day	24 Jan 08	

3. Pre-Submission Draft GTDPD

Stage	Duration	Start Date	End Date
Prepare Pre-Submission draft GTDPD	4 weeks	4 Feb 08	29 Feb 08
Revisions & legal check	1 week	3 March 08	14 March 08
Strategic Environment Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal (SEA/SA)	3 weeks	17 March 08	4 April 08
Revise draft GTDPD	1 week	7 April 08	11 April 08
Committee print deadline and despatch	2 days	16 April 08	
SCDC Council	1 day	24 April 08	
Printing, letters, etc	3 weeks	14 April 08	2 May 08
Revise following Council and put on Website	2 weeks	28 April 08	9 May 08
Pre-Submission consultation (Reg 26)	6 weeks	12 May 08	23 June 08
Database entry/cleaning	4 weeks	23 June 08	18 July 08
Prepare representation responses and changes to GTDPD	9 weeks	21 July 08	19 Sept 08
Committee print deadline and despatch	2 days	15 Oct 08	
SCDC Council - representation responses and changes to GTDPD	1 day	23 Oct 08	

4. Submission

Stage	Duration	Start Date	End Date
Printing, letters, etc	3 weeks	27 Oct 08	14 Nov 08
Submission (Reg 28)	6 weeks	17 Nov 08	26 Dec 08
Database entry/cleaning, prepare, print and despatch Objection Sites	3 weeks	5 Jan 09	23 Jan 09
Objection Sites Consultation (Reg 32)	6 weeks	26 Jan 09	2 March 09
Database entry/cleaning/Issues	5 weeks	2 March 09	3 April 09
Pre-Inquiry Meeting (8 weeks before start of examination)	1 day	W/b 6 April 09	
Public Examination	4 weeks	8 June 09	3 July 09
Inspector's Reporting	12 weeks	6 July 09	25 Sept 09
Receipt of Inspector's Report	1 day	W/b 28 Sept 09	
Council Adopts (4 weeks after receipt)	1 day	W/b 22 Oct 09	
Notice of Adoption (2 weeks after Council (23 July))	4 weeks	W/b 9 Nov 09	4 Dec 09
Printing	4 weeks	7 Dec 09	8 Jan 2010
Publication	1 day	W/b 11 Jan 2010	

This page is intentionally left blank