

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a special meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 28 June 2012 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor David Bard – Chairman
Councillor Robert Turner – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Richard Barrett, Val Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Tom Bygott, Nigel Cathcart, Jonathan Chatfield, Pippa Corney, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Alison Elcox, Sue Ellington, Jose Hales, Roger Hall, Steve Harangozo, Lynda Harford, Tumi Hawkins, Roger Hickford, James Hockney, Mark Howell, Clayton Hudson, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Cicely Murfitt, Charles Nightingale, Robin Page, Alex Riley, Deborah Roberts, Neil Scarr, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Jim Stewart, David Whiteman-Downes, John Williams, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright

Officers:

Patrick Adams	Senior Democratic Services Officer
Jonathan Dixon	Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport)
Gary Duthie	Senior Lawyer
Caroline Hunt	Local Development Framework Team Leader
Keith Miles	Planning Policy Manager
Jo Mills	Planning and New Communities Director
David Roberts	Principal Planning Officer

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Trisha Bear, Sally Hatton, Mark Hersom, Caroline Hunt, Pauline Jarvis, Tony Orgee, Ted Ridgway Watt, Ben Shelton, Edd Stonham and Buntly Waters.

4. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE MEETING

In the absence of the Chairman, Councillor David Bard, Vice-Chairman, became the Acting Chairman. Councillor Robert Turner was nominated by Councillor Richard Barrett and seconded by Councillor Tim Wotherspoon for the position of Vice-Chairman. There being no other nominations Councillor Turner was duly elected as Vice-Chairman for this meeting.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Council agreed to suspend Standing Orders 12.5 and 14.5, regarding the debating of motions, to ensure that debate was not unnecessarily curtailed.

Councillor David Bard declared a personal and prejudicial interest in site 9, land east of Sawston, as it backed onto his premises. He stated that if this site was discussed he would leave the Chamber.

Councillor Tom Bygott declared a personal interest in Issue 13 as the owner of a house opposite the Oakington Guided Busway station, and in Broad Location 6 as a Governor of Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust.

Councillor Roger Hall declared a personal interest in sites that could improve transport for those who worked for the NHS.

Councillor James Hockney declared a personal interest as a Board member of the Hundred Housing Society and as a member of the Waterbeach Forward group.

Councillor Mark Howell declared a personal interest in the Papworth Trust, a Registered Social Landlord, and as a volunteer of Papworth Hospital.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley declared a personal interest as a County Councillor, as part of Trumpington Meadows lay within the Parish of Haslingfield in the Gamlingay Division.

Councillor Mervyn Loynes declared a personal interest in site 17 land west of Cambourne Business Park, as he knew one of the owners of the land in question.

Councillor Mick Martin declared a personal interest as an employee of the Imperial War Museum.

Councillor Cicely Murfitt declared a personal interest in the Bourn airfield site as she knew one of the owners.

Councillor Charlie Nightingale declared a personal interest in site 20, Granta Terrace, Stapleford, as his property adjoins the site.

Councillor David Whiteman Downes declared a personal interest in sites 18: Cambridge Road, Great Shelford; 19: London Road, Great Shelford and 20: Granta Terrace, Great Shelford.

Councillor Nick Wright declared a personal interest as a Governor of Papworth Hospital.

6. SOUTH CAMBS LOCAL PLAN: AGREEMENT OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Councillor Pippa Corney, Planning Policy and Localism Portfolio Holder, introduced the Local Plan by explaining that it would be going out to consultation on 12 July and the aim of the meeting was to ensure that the right questions were included in the Plan. It was noted that Council's recommendations would be considered by the Planning Policy and Localism Portfolio Holder, at a meeting on Tuesday 3 July where the final wording of the Plan would be agreed.

Minor amendments

It was suggested that questions be broken in sub-sections to ensure that issues and questions of the same subject had the same number. It was noted that some question numbers were duplicated and so would have to be renumbered.

VISION

The Planning Policy Manager introduced this topic, which sought to link the Council's vision statement with the Local Plan.

Members of Council made the following suggestions:

- The Plan should recognise the importance of those who study in the District.
- The Plan should recognise the importance of rail travel.
- The Plan should seek to respond robustly to the challenges of climate change.

It was suggested that the pledge to promote economic growth included in the Council's vision statement could be construed as encouraging more housing development in the District. However, it was also stated that phrases included in the vision statement should

not be viewed in isolation and the targets for housing development were set by the national Government.

Council noted that it had agreed its vision statement less than a year ago and no recommendations were made to amend it. No suggestions were made to amend the questions in the Plan under this section.

DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

The Planning Policy Manager introduced this issue, which sought to ensure that the correct questions were asked in the consultation with regard to ensuring that the Local Plan provides the appropriate levels of employment and housing development in the right locations.

Provision of new houses

Council noted that the figures in question 4b, in relation to medium housing growth, had been amended to 7,300 dwellings, which equated to 1,075 dwellings per year. It was suggested that the majority of new homes would be lived in by commuters to London and what was required was more employment for local people. It was also suggested that a diagram was required to show the jobs/home ratio.

Windfall development

Concern was expressed regarding the accuracy of forecasting new jobs and new dwellings. It was suggested that the Council had underestimated the number of homes built as part of a "windfall development" and that if the current trends continued approximately 4,000 homes could be built this way, which could largely negate the need for new developments. It was also suggested that the village framework was key to number of houses built as part of "windfall developments". It was further suggested that the words "no limit" for windfall developments in villages be amended to clarify that natural limits to these forms of developments already existed.

Northstowe

It was suggested that the Guided Bus would not be able to meet the demand of commuters from Northstowe to Cambridge. It was also suggested that actual figures should be included in question 5 on the delivery of housing at Northstowe.

Council

RECOMMENDED that figures be included in question 5 to indicate how many homes are expected to be built at Northstowe and at what rate.

SPATIAL STRATEGY

The Local Development Framework Team Leader introduced this issue, which sought to ensure that the correct questions were asked in the consultation with regard to ensuring that the Local Plan provides the right development strategy.

Green Belt land north and south of Barton Road

It was suggested that the proposal of building on Green Belt land north and south of Barton Road should not be consulted on, as this was not a sensible location for construction and was opposed by the four local parish councils. This was countered with the view that the City Council would be consulting its residents on this proposal, as the land was in both Districts, and it would be unfair to deny our residents the same right. It was also suggested that consulting with residents would ensure that compelling evidence would be gathered against sites where construction should not take place.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley proposed and Councillor Francis Burkitt seconded that the land to the north and south of Barton Road be removed from the list of possible locations to be released from the Green Belt that the Council intended to consult on. A vote was taken and with 19 votes in favour, 22 against and no abstentions the motion was **LOST**.

Rural Centres

It was noted that the recommendations made by the Council with regard to the lists of which villages should be made rural centres or minor rural centres were not always accepted by the Planning Inspector.

It was suggested that the sub-question on whether villages near the Guided Busway should be reclassified be removed, as the impact of the Guided Bus to these settlements was not considered to be significant. Councillor Brian Burling proposed and Councillor Simon Edwards seconded that **question 14(f)**, which referred to reclassifying villages close to the Guided Busway, be removed. A vote was taken and with 26 votes in favour, 13 against and 1 abstention the motion was **CARRIED**.

It was suggested that a diagram or graphic be included depicting the scale of housing developments at the different sizes of rural centres.

Village frameworks

It was suggested that residents should be consulted on the possibility of altering the boundaries of the village framework. Council recommended

Recommendations

Council **RECOMMENDED**

- a) that question 14f be removed;
- b) that question 15 be amended to clarify the fact that residents were being invited to consider whether housing developments within the village framework but on land not designated for housing should take place;
- c) that question 17 be amended to clarify the fact that residents were being invited to suggest alterations to existing village framework boundaries.

DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS

The Principal Planning Policy Officer introduced this issue, which sought to ensure that the correct questions were asked in the consultation with regard to the allocation of specific sites for new housing development to meet the long term needs of the District.

It was agreed that consultees should be encouraged to state whether they supported or objected to the site options and why. It was suggested that a clearer definition was required in the key which defined the sites with development potential and sites with limited development potential.

Council

RECOMMENDED that question 17 be amended to allow consultees to state whether they supported or objected to the site options, with reasons why.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The Planning Policy Manager introduced this issue, which sought to ensure that the correct questions were asked in the consultation with regard to ensuring that the Local Plan met the challenges of climate change. It was suggested that certain terms, such as BREEAM ratings, needed to be defined.

It was suggested that references to identifying sites for renewable and low carbon energy sources should be removed, as this was a leading question. A member of the Climate Change Working Group expressed concern that the original proposals in the Local Plan for reducing carbon emissions were being diluted. It was suggested that all development should have to be sustainable to gain planning permission.

Renewable energy features on listed buildings

It was suggested that a question should be asked on whether improvements to listed buildings which reduced carbon emissions should be allowable, providing that they were reversible.

Wind farms

It was suggested that the provision for allowing wind farms closer than 2 kilometres from residential properties should be removed, as it was unlikely to be supported by the Council. However, this was countered by the suggestion that the 2 kilometre provision should be removed, as this could not be defended at appeal.

Flood risk

It was suggested that there should be a question on flood risk.

Council

RECOMMENDED that

- a) Question 19A be deleted.
- b) A question on managing flood risk should be included.

DEVELOPING HIGH QUALITY HOMES

The Principal Planning Policy Officer introduced this issue, which sought to ensure that the correct questions were asked in the consultation with regard to ensuring that the Planning in the District will “seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings” as per the National Planning Policy Framework.

Street width

It was suggested that the Council should consult on the design of streets, in particular their width. It was noted that national guidance existed for this.

Public art

It was suggested that question 30 should be removed, as it could limit what art could be. It was also suggested that question 32 be removed as it was a leading question that invited a positive response.

Design guide

It was suggested that questions 27, 28 and 29 should refer to the design guide.

Council

RECOMMENDED that

- a) Questions 27, 28 and 29 made reference to the design guide.
- b) Questions 30 and 32 be removed.

PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

The Principal Planning Policy Officer introduced this issue, which sought to guarantee that the correct questions were asked in the consultation with regard to ensuring that the landscapes of the District, with their biodiversity are protected for the future.

Grades of agricultural land

Council recognised the importance of farming to the District and it was suggested that question 34 be amended to make reference to whether residents wanted to see protection of grades 1, 2 and 3a of agricultural land.

Biodiversity

Concern was expressed that question 35 was a leading question and it was suggested that it be reworded to encourage residents to make suggested amendments to the current Local Plan.

Green infrastructure

It was suggested that consultees should be encouraged to suggest other enhancements to the Local Plan with regard to green infrastructure.

Allotments and orchards

The importance of allotments was discussed. It was noted that community orchards could not be protected by law.

Drainage

Council noted the importance of drainage in the District and it was suggested that that this be reflected in question 44.

Heritage assets

It was suggested that question 46 should be amended to allow consultees to list additional buildings or heritage assets that should be included in the Local Plan.

Council

RECOMMENDED that

- a) Question 35 be reworded to encourage residents to make suggestions relating to the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document.
- b) A sentence be added to question 36, which invited consultees to suggest other enhancements to the Local Plan with regard to green infrastructure.
- c) Question 44 be amended to recognise the importance of drainage to the District.
- d) Question 46 be amended to encourage consultees to list any specific buildings or other heritage assets that should be included in the Local Plan.

DELIVERING HIGH QUALITY HOMES

The Principal Planning Officer introduced this issue, which sought to ensure that the correct questions were asked in the consultation with regard to guaranteeing that the right types of homes in the right places were built.

Gypsy and Travellers

It was noted that the Council had already agreed a separate Gypsy and Traveller Plan which would feed into the Local Plan. It was suggested that the Council was meeting its target for the provision of 85 extra pitches for Gypsy and Travellers by making temporary pitches permanent.

Self-build

It was suggested that the Plan should consult on whether residents wished to build their own homes. However, this was countered with the assertion that it would be unwise to relax rules to encourage self-build and there was no obligation on the Council to consult on such issues.

Housing density

It was understood that the number of houses per hectare in the planning guidance was an average and it was recognised that there was a need for flexibility.

Affordable housing

It was suggested that reference to 40% of affordable housing be removed from question 51 in order to recognise that flexibility was often required when not-for-profit organisations were building on an exception site to ensure that the maximum amount of affordable housing was built. It suggested that question 50c be reworded from a leading to an open question with regard to the threshold for affordable housing provision.

Live/work units

It was suggested that there was very little demand for live/work units. It was also suggested that question 57 should make reference to maintaining the residential use of live/work units.

Countryside homes of exceptional quality

It was suggested that it was unnecessary to build more £1 million plus category homes in the District, as it was considered that there were plenty of such homes available and it should not be the priority of the Council to ensure more were built. This was countered by the suggestion that having such houses available was important to attracting and retaining businesses. Council decided that it was not necessary to amend question 58 on this issue.

Council

RECOMMENDED that

- a) Council recommended that question 47 be reworded, to reflect that the target of 30 houses per hectare was an average net target;
- b) Council recommended that reference to 40% of affordable housing be removed from question 51;
- c) Question 50c be reworded to an open question with regard to the threshold for affordable housing provision;

- d) Question 57 be amended to make reference to maintaining the residential use of live/work units.

BUILDING A STRONG AND COMPETITIVE ECONOMY

The Planning Policy Manager introduced this section, which explored how the Council could assist strong and sustainable local economic growth and support a district where entrepreneurship, innovation and inward investment were actively encouraged.

Forecast employment growth

It was considered that the aim expressed in Question 60 was fundamental to the entire section relating to the economy and as such should be presented as a statement not a question.

Clusters

Concern was expressed that the definition of clusters given in the text related exclusively to the Cambridge Phenomenon, whereas there existed other clusters of industry in outlying areas of the district.

Barrington Cement Works

The text required amendment to reflect that buildings had been removed from this site.

Employment development on the edge of villages

It was considered that the Issues and Options consultation should include reference to a possible new category of village.

Conversion or Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment

It was considered that the reference to 'modest' extensions should be removed, as the size of extension should not be as a factor so long as the proposals were appropriate in character and impact.

Council **RECOMMENDED** that the questions in section 10 of the Issues and Options Consultation paper be approved, subject to the following amendments:

- a) Question 60, regarding the forecasting of employment growth, be amalgamated with question 61.
- b) Question 71 be amended to reflect that buildings have been removed from the Barrington Cement Works site.
- c) Question 72 be amended to clarify the definition of small scale development.
- d) Question 73b be amended by adding the words "Better Served Group villages if added as a new category of village – see question 4."
- e) Question 76 be amended by removing the word "modest".
- f) Question 85 be amended by adding an explanatory note stating that floorspace figures are gross and not net and that examples will be included in the main document.

PROMOTING SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITIES (Section 11)

The Local Development Framework Team Leader introduced this section, which sought views on the following issues:

- The introduction of tests to protect village services and facilities;
- Principles which should apply to new communities;
- Whether future growth should include sub-regional facilities such as a concert hall or ice rink
- The proposal for a community stadium on the Trumpington Meadows development;
- Open space provision
- Issues around light, odour, noise, contaminated land and air quality.

Protecting village services and facilities

Concern was expressed that the objective of protecting local services had the potential to raise expectations unrealistically given the amount of influence the council could exert; it was agreed to add the caveat 'where possible' to reflect this.

Community Stadium – specific proposal by Grosvenor Estates

Members considered that it was not appropriate to include a specific proposal within the Issues and Options consultation paper for the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and that question 92 should be deleted.

Other sub-regional facilities

It was considered that views should be sought on what, if any, additional sub-regional facilities were required in the district.

Council **RECOMMENDED** that the questions in section 11 of the Issues and Options Consultation paper be approved, subject to the following amendments:

- a) Question 86 be amended to include the words "where possible" with regard to the protection of local services and facilities.
- b) Question 92 be deleted.
- c) An additional question be included seeking views on what, if any, additional sub-regional facilities were required in the district.

PROMOTING AND DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT (Section 12)

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) introduced this section which sought views on issues relating to sustainable transport.

Planning for Sustainable Travel

Concern was expressed around ensuring access to existing amenities. Council was advised that this issue could be taken forward as part of the consultation on the county

council's Local Transport Plan, rather than as part of the SCLP which focussed on new development in the district.

Residential Garage Sizes

This question required clarification to make explicit references to the role of garages in contributing towards parking standards.

Cycle Parking Standards

It was considered that a design-led approach to secure cycle parking provision without standards being designated should be strengthened by the requirement for new developments to include cycle parking policies to ensure adequate provision.

Council **RECOMMENDED** that the questions in section 12 of the Issues and Options Consultation paper be approved, subject to the following amendments:

- a) Question 105 be amended to refer to the principles in Issue 82 **and (not or)** any additional issues to be included.
- b) Question 109 be amended by including reference to parking standards with regard to garages.
- c) Question 110c be amended by including a requirement for policies for cycle parking provision.

SITE SPECIFIC ISSUES (Section 13)

Caroline Hunt introduced this section which proposed the inclusion in the new local plan of a number of policies from current plans.

Policies to be carried forward

Question 115 did not appear to offer any alternative options therefore Members recommended its deletion.

North of Newmarket Road

The first paragraph should be designated as option "a" and subsequent options re-designated accordingly.

Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Site (LSA)

It was considered that the Issues and Options Consultation should seek views on how the LSA should evolve during the local plan period.

Council **RECOMMENDED** that the questions in section 13 of the Issues and Options Consultation paper be approved, subject to the following amendments:

- a) Question 115 be deleted.
- b) Question 117 be amended by labelling the first paragraph under the title sentence as "a" and then re-labelling the second and third paragraphs as "b" and "c" respectively.

Question 121 be amended to invite consultees to suggest how the former Fen Drayton LSA should evolve.
Council

RECOMMENDED that

- a) Question 60, regarding the forecasting of employment growth, be amalgamated with question 61.
- b) Question 63 be amended by removing the cross reference to the fact that this site had been identified as an option for housing development.
- c) Question 73b be amended by removing the words "Better Served Group villages if added as a new category of village – see question 4."
- d) Question 76 be amended by removing the word "modest".
- e) Question 79 be amended by making reference to the detailed tests referred to in issue 71.
- f) Question 85 be amended by adding an explanatory note stating that floorspace figures are gross and not net and that examples will be included in the main document.
- g) Question 87 be amended to include the words "new or improved" with regard to the development of local shops.

PROMOTING SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITIES

Council

RECOMMENDED that

- a) Question 86 be amended to include the words "where possible" with regard to the protection of local services and facilities.
- b) Question 92 be deleted.

PROMOTING AND DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

Council

RECOMMENDED That Question 109 be amended by including reference to parking standards with regard to garages.

SITE SPECIFIC ISSUES

Council

RECOMMENDED that

- a) Question 115 be deleted.

- b) Question 117 be amended by labelling the first paragraph under the title sentence as “a” and then re-labelling the second and third paragraphs as “b” and “c” respectively.
- c) Question 121 be amended to invite consultees to suggest how the former Fen Drayton LSA should evolve.

The Meeting ended at 6.00 p.m.
