

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 13 March 2014 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor David Bard – Chairman
Councillor Sue Ellington – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Richard Barrett, Trisha Bear, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Nigel Cathcart, Jonathan Chatfield, Pippa Corney, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Alison Elcox, Andrew Fraser, Jose Hales, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Tumi Hawkins, Mark Hersom, Roger Hickford, James Hockney, Mark Howell, Clayton Hudson, Caroline Hunt, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Cicely Murfitt, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Robin Page, Alex Riley, Deborah Roberts, Neil Scarr, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Jim Stewart, Edd Stonham, Peter Topping, Robert Turner, Susan van de Ven, Bunty Waters, Aidan Van de Weyer, David Whiteman-Downes, John Williams, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright

Officers:	Graham Aisthorpe-Watts	Democratic Services Team Leader
	Alex Colyer	Executive Director, Corporate Services
	Jean Hunter	Chief Executive
	Fiona McMillan	Legal & Democratic Services Manager and Monitoring Officer

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Val Barrett and Tom Bygott.

94. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor David Bard declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Site H1/c in Sawston due to his wife being the Chair of Ward's Charity, which owned part of the proposed site. He was granted a dispensation to both speak and vote by the Monitoring Officer on 26 February 2014 and so could fully participate in the meeting. In addition, Councillor Bard declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Sawston Parish Council, due to the fact that the Parish Council had made representations during the Local Plan consultation process.

Councillor Nigel Cathcart declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in relation to Policy H/9 regarding the proposal to increase the number of homes on any one site requiring an affordable housing contribution from 2 to 3, as he was the owner of a potential site in Bassingbourn that would be affected by this change. He was granted a dispensation to both speak and vote by the Monitoring Officer on 5 March 2014 and so could fully participate in the meeting.

Councillor Kevin Cuffley declared a non-pecuniary interest due to personally making a representation to the Local Plan consultation. In addition, he declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Sawston Parish Council due to the Parish Council having also made representations to the consultation. Councillor Cuffley indicated that he would listen to and consider all options arising from the discussion and information presented at the meeting before making any personal decision on the Local Plan item.

Councillor Simon Edwards declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Oakington Parish Council due to the fact that the Parish Council had made representations as part of the Local Plan consultation process. He stated that he came to this meeting with a fresh and open mind.

Councillor Alison Elcox declared a non-pecuniary interest due to having personally made representations during the Local Plan consultation and was open to considering all options before making a personal decision on the Local Plan item. She also declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Arrington Parish Council due to the Parish Council having made representations to the consultation. Councillor Elcox would be considering all of the evidence presented at the meeting before reaching a final view.

Councillor Tumi Hawkins declared a non-pecuniary interest as she had made personal representations at all stages of the Local Plan consultation and had commented in the media to encourage local residents to engage in the process. Councillor Hawkins stated that she would consider all evidence presented before reaching a final view.

Councillor Roger Hickford declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a member of Linton Parish Council at the time it made representations to the Local Plan consultation process. He stated that he came to this meeting with an open mind.

Councillor James Hockney declared a non-pecuniary interest due to having personally made representations during the Local Plan consultation process. Councillor Hockney would be considering all of the evidence presented at the meeting before reaching a final view.

Councillor Clayton Hudson, given that he had commented in the press and on the Cambourne Forum to encourage people mainly to participate in the Local Plan consultation, had declared a non-pecuniary interest and stated that any comments or opinions that he may have made previously were to help inform a balanced consideration of the District Council's position on the issue. He made it clear that he was still open to consider other views that may be put forward before coming to a final view.

Councillor Peter Johnson declared a non-pecuniary interest due to having personally made representations during the Local Plan consultation process. He also declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Waterbeach Parish Council due to the Parish Council having made representations to the consultation. Councillor Johnson would be considering all of the evidence presented at the meeting before reaching a final view.

Councillor Douglas de Lacey declared a non-pecuniary interest as he and his Parish Council, of which he was Chairman, had submitted responses to the Local Plan. He did not believe he was predetermined as a result and would vote on the basis of the evidence presented.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley declared a non-pecuniary interest as he had made personal representations as part of the Local Plan consultation process. He also declared a non-pecuniary interest as a County Councillor and due to the fact that Parish Councils within his electoral ward had made representations to the Local Plan consultation. He stated that he came to this meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Janet Lockwood declared a non-pecuniary interest as she had made personal representations as part of the Local Plan consultation process. She stated that she came to this meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Mervyn Loynes declared a non-pecuniary interest due to having personally made representations during the Local Plan consultation and was open to considering all options before making a personal decision on the Local Plan item. He also declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Eltisley Parish Council due to the Parish Council having made representations to the consultation. Councillor Loynes stated that he would be considering all of the evidence presented at the meeting before reaching a final view.

Councillor Ray Manning declared a non-pecuniary interest as a County Councillor and as a member of Willingham Parish Council due to the Parish Council having made representations as part of the Local Plan consultation process. He stated that he came to this meeting with a fresh and open mind.

Councillor Mick Martin declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Duxford Parish Council due to the Parish Council having made representations as part of the Local Plan consultation process. He stated that he came to this meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Raymond Matthews declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Sawston Parish Council, due to the Parish Council having made representations as part of the Local Plan consultation process. He stated that he came to this meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Cicely Murfitt declared a non-pecuniary interest regarding Bourn Airfield, as she knew one of the landowners.

Councillor Charles Nightingale declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Great Shelford Parish Council and stated that he came to the meeting with a fresh and open mind.

Councillor Tony Orgee declared a non-pecuniary interest as a County Councillor, a member of Sawston Parish Council and due to him having made personal representations as part of the consultation process on the Local Plan. He stated that he would consider all evidence presented before reaching a final view.

Councillor Robin Page declared a non-pecuniary interest as a landowner and Chairman of the Countryside Restoration Trust, with land in Bourn Valley. He stated that he had a completely open mind.

Councillor Deborah Roberts declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Fowlmere Parish Council, which had made representations as part of the consultation process on the Local Plan. She stated that she had not made any individual representations and came to the meeting with a fresh and open mind.

Councillor Neil Scarr declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member Fulbourn Parish Council due to the Parish Council having made representations as part of the consultation process, but stated that he had an open mind.

Councillor Timothy Scott declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Comberton Parish Council due to the Parish Council having made representations as part of the Local Plan consultation process. He stated that he came to this meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Ben Shelton declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Stapleford Parish Council and Great Shelford Parish Council and also as he had made personal representations during the consultation process, but stated that he came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Bridget Smith declared a non-pecuniary interest as she had made personal representations at every stage of the Local Plan. She stated that she came to this meeting with a fresh and open mind.

Councillor Hazel Smith declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Milton Parish Council, who had made representations and as she had also made personal representations but stated that she came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Edd Stonham declared a non-pecuniary interest as he had made representations as part of the consultation process on the Local Plan. Any comments or opinions that he may have made previously were to help inform a balanced consideration of the District Council's position on the issue and he made it clear that he was still open to consider other views that may be put forward at this meeting before coming to a final view.

Councillor Neil Scarr declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Fulbourn Parish Council, due to the fact that the Parish Council had made representations during the Local Plan consultation process.

Councillor Jim Stewart declared a non-pecuniary interest as he had made personal representations as part of the Local Plan consultation process. In addition, he declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Hardwick Parish Council due to the fact that the Parish Council had also made representations as part of the Local Plan consultation process. Councillor Stewart stated that he came to this meeting with an open mind on the matter.

Councillor Peter Topping declared a non-pecuniary interest as a County Councillor and a member of a Parish Council. Councillor Topping also declared a non-pecuniary interest having personally made a representation to the Local Plan consultation and stated that he was willing to consider other options or possibilities and did not come to the Local Plan item with a closed mind.

Councillor Susan van de Ven declared a non-pecuniary interest as a County Councillor and due to the fact that she had made personal representations on aspects of the Transport Strategy. She stated that she came to this meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Aidan Van De Weyer declared a non-pecuniary interest due to having personally made representations during the Local Plan consultation and was open to considering all options before making a personal decision on the Local Plan item. He had also declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Barrington Parish Council due to the Parish Council having also made representations to the consultation. Councillor Van De Weyer stated that he would be considering all of the evidence presented at the meeting before reaching a final view.

Councillor John Williams declared a non-pecuniary interest due to having made personal responses objecting to certain aspects of the proposed Local Plan submission. He was also a member of Cambridgeshire County Council and Fulbourn Parish Council, both of which had also made representations. Councillor Williams indicated that he would consider all evidence presented before coming to a final decision on the matter.

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Cottenham Parish Council and the Cottenham Village Design Group due to both organisations having made representations as part of the Local Plan consultation process. He stated that he came to this meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Nick Wright declared a non-pecuniary interest in the proposed sites at West Cambourne and Bourn Airfield due to personal associations with the site owners. He indicated that he would consider these sites objectively on the basis of the evidence in front of him at the meeting.

95. SOUTH CAMBS LOCAL PLAN - CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND CONSIDERATION ON WHETHER TO SUBMIT FOR EXAMINATION

Councillor David Bard, Chairman, introduced this item and stated that he intended to facilitate consideration of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan in three parts as follows:

- 1) Development Targets, Strategy and Strategic Sites (Chapters 1 – 3);
- 2) Village Sites (Chapter 7 – Policies H/1 to H/4 and any site specific proposals in Chapters 4 – 10);
- 3) Development Management Policies (Chapters 4 – 10).

In order to accommodate this, Councillor Bard proposed that Standing Order 14.4 be suspended to allow for Members to speak once for up to three minutes on each of the three parts of this debate, other than the Portfolio Holder who would be entitled to respond to individual questions or points as they were made during debate of each part. It was noted that this motion did not require a seconder, but at least two thirds of those Members in attendance needed to vote in favour for it to be carried.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley moved an amendment, that Standing Order 14.4 be suspended to allow for Members to speak on an unlimited basis, in terms of the time they could speak and the number of occasions they were entitled to speak for. Councillor John Williams seconded the amendment.

Upon being put to the vote, with 25 votes in favour, 28 votes against and 1 abstention, the amendment was lost.

Voting on the original motion, with 38 votes in favour, 11 votes against, 3 abstentions and 2 not voting, Council **AGREED** that Standing Order 14.4 be suspended to allow for Members to speak once for up to three minutes on each of the three parts of this debate, other than the Portfolio Holder who would be entitled to respond to individual questions or points as they were made during debate of each part.

In addition, Councillor Bard proposed that Standing Order 20.1 be suspended in order that Members did not have to stand to address the Chairman. This was **AGREED** by Council.

Details of petitions that had been received were set out in the agenda, and two petition organisers were invited to present their petitions prior to consideration of the report, as follows:

E-petition by Mr Des O'Brien

Mr O'Brien submitted an e-petition consisting of 200 signatures, which asked the Council to invalidate the recent Local Plan consultation as it had wilfully ignored over 1700 objections to the new settlement developments at Bourn Airfield and West Cambourne.

In making his presentation, Mr O'Brien stated that many lives over generations to come would be affected by the proposal for new settlement developments at Bourn Airfield and West Cambourne and pleaded that Members took the issue seriously for the sake of South Cambridgeshire's future. He said that the National Planning Policy Framework

made a great play about local community leadership, with an emphasis on enhancement and improvement. Focussing on the consultation process, Mr O'Brien said that the Council's Planning Policy Team claimed that it had gone to great lengths to consult with the public, but in truth he felt that there was far more interest in getting the Plan done rather than getting it right. He went on to say that in decades to come no one would say thank you for getting the Plan done on time, but they would ask 'what were you thinking?' and 'how is this good for the district?' Talking specifically about the proposed development at Bourn Airfield, Mr O'Brien was of the opinion that conviction had been ruled by expediency and that it was the perfect example of a lack of vision. He questioned why an area where employment opportunities were expected to fall and not rise had been chosen as the best location to build a new development and added that the roads were already too crowded.

Petition by Jane Williams

A petition consisting of 153 signatures was submitted by Mrs Williams entitled 'Waterbeach new town – a flawed proposal'.

Mrs Williams presented her petition and focussed on the consultation process and framework that residents had been consulted upon for Waterbeach. She stated that residents found out during the Area Action Plans that the train station would be moving, together with proposed locations for the waste water treatment works and balancing ponds on a Greenfield site, which was flood risk land. If these details had been made clear at the outset, the consultation responses would have been very different from Waterbeach residents. In terms of the proposed development at Waterbeach, Mrs Williams said that if it was built on the Brownfield site first it would bring the development closer to the village and A10 and keep the vibrancy and community of the village alive. She pleaded that Members considered future generations to come and the other options that were available and could be achieved.

(Councillor Roger Hall attended the meeting at this stage of proceedings)

Raising a point of information, Councillor Hockney reported that a number of other residents from Waterbeach had requested to speak at this meeting, but that these requests had been turned down.

Consideration of report

Development Targets, Strategy and Strategic Sites (Chapters 1 – 3)

Councillor Pippa Corney, Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Localism, introduced the report and reflected on the very long Portfolio Holder Meeting that she held on 11 February 2014 regarding the Local Plan, which had been attended by at least 40 of the 57 Members of the Council who were given unlimited opportunities to put forward comments on any aspects of the proposals. The draft minutes from that meeting were appended to the report and Members challenged a number of points as being inaccurate, as follows:

- Councillor Tony Orgee clarified that he was speaking on behalf of the Abington Ward under the section entitled 'Village Housing sites in the Plan' in respect of Sawston, which included the village of Babraham;
- Councillor David Bard challenged the same minute with regard to the section where it stated that it was 400 metres to the bus stop from the middle of the new site, which he thought was more likely to be 600m by the shortest pedestrian route;

- Councillor Jim Stewart should be included in the list of those Members present;
- Councillor Deborah Roberts said that she had not made the comments in the two bullet points under the heading 'where should it go';
- Councillor Tumi Hawkins said that none of the issues she raised regarding flooding had been included in the section entitled 'Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West';
- Councillor James Hockney was disappointed that his lengthy speech had been reduced to a couple of paragraphs in the minutes. He also made four legal challenges which he felt should have been recorded.

These points were noted and it was reported that Councillor Pippa Corney would consider the minutes as a correct record at her next Portfolio Holder Meeting.

At this stage of the meeting Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, made it clear that Members of his group had a completely free vote on this item and requested that a recorded vote be held. Council unanimously **AGREED** to hold a recorded vote for this item.

Councillor Pippa Corney proposed the recommendations contained within the report, which were seconded by Councillor Francis Burkitt.

In considering the sections entitled Development Targets, Strategy and Strategic Sites (Chapters 1 – 3), Members made the following points as part of the debate:

Councillor de Lacey referred to the Issues and Options report which proposed that the village of Girton should be upgraded to a Minor Rural Centre. Since the Issues and Options papers had been produced the village had lost one of three shops and the Post Office had been reduced to 15 hours per week, so he considered an upgrade now inappropriate. He also failed to see how, given the village's situation, it could be regarded as a centre for surrounding settlements and hoped that, should the Local Plan be submitted, the Inspector would give due consideration to this issue.

The Chairman informed Council that Councillor Tom Bygott, who was unable to attend the meeting today, agreed with Councillor de Lacey's comments in respect of the village of Girton.

Councillor Deborah Roberts felt that the Council was being put in a difficult position by the Government and the leadership of the authority in that, if the Local Plan was not agreed for submission at this meeting, the district would be open to attack by developers whose applications, if rejected by the Council, would go through on appeal. She questioned the way in which the proposed number of houses for specific areas had been generated and claimed that she was given three separate numbers as options for her area, rather than a plan of what was really necessary for South Cambridgeshire. Councillor Roberts argued that the Local Plan did not seek to contribute to the quality of life for residents of South Cambridgeshire, but provide housing for people working in the cities of Cambridge and London.

Councillor Pippa Corney reported that the figures of proposed housing allocation had been gathered following a lot of work and evidence gathering by experts on a regional basis with South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridge City Council and other districts in the surrounding area. She added that this evidence base was available for viewing.

Councillor John Williams referred to Policy S/6 in relation to strategic sites and the three new settlements, expressing his concern with their delivery by 2031, considering that a brick had not yet been laid at Northstowe. He felt that the evidence showed this was undeliverable and that the main aim for the Plan should be to develop existing settlements, rather than looking at building completely new settlements. In particular, Bourn Airfield on the A428 corridor would be dependent on the Transport Strategy and the City Deal, which had not yet been signed. He did not believe that the necessary infrastructure to support these new settlements would be delivered.

Councillor Pippa Corney responded by saying that Cambourne was a great place to live and a good example of a new development built via multiple agency delivery. She added that there was a 20 year plan in place for Northstowe which was progressing. In terms of the Transport Strategy, it was still very high level at this stage and she reported that more detail would become clear when the Plan moved forward.

Councillor Robin Page was of the opinion that the Council was being asked to support something unsustainable, un-green and undemocratic. He referred to the latest housing list figures in the district, which totalled 1710, when the Council was being asked to build 19,000 new homes. Questioning the real driver behind this, Councillor Page referred to the New Homes Bonus, which the Council received £2.72 million for in 2013/14, the amount for which would increase year on year.

Councillor Pippa Corney clarified that the housing list did not relate to the total number of homes the Council was required to provide. Those numbers were to support anticipated growth and demand in the area for future generations.

Councillor Simon Edwards, in his capacity as Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, explained that the New Homes Bonus effectively replaced Government grant funding. He made it clear that the Council's budget did not rely on this funding and had been allocated as a separate infrastructure fund which, subject to it being signed-off, would be used to contribute towards the Greater Cambridge City Deal. Councillor Edwards said that should the City Deal not go ahead, the funding would be available to use for infrastructure investment. In terms of housing allocation, Councillor Edwards conceded that some housing would be developed for people who worked in Cambridge or London, but made it clear that houses were also required for a vast number of people in the district who experienced real problems housing their families. He reflected on the fact that this was a 20 year Plan and that the district's population would grow.

Councillor Susan van de Ven expressed her concern that millions of pounds of tax payers' money had been spent on sustainable transport infrastructure via the Guided Bus Way. She felt that the Bus Way should be utilised or exploited as part of proposed developments in the Local Plan. Councillor van de Ven was also of the view that the Plan ignored potential development north of Northstowe and she made the point that Waterbeach relied upon its train station in its current location.

Councillor Pippa Corney reported that Northstowe had already been allocated in excess of 5,500 additional homes as part of the Local Plan and felt that the area could not deliver any more houses in the Plan period.

Councillor Bridget Smith's opinion was that the Plan would create two urbanised corridors and that all three of the major sites were unsustainable. She questioned why the 5,500 homes at Northstowe could not be exceeded and suggested that this was due to the fact that developers would not be able to deliver that volume of development by the required time. Councillor Smith asked, in that case, why the Portfolio Holder had confidence in developers being able to deliver development elsewhere in the district.

Councillor Pippa Corney responded by saying that experience informed her that the development at Northstowe would not be able to be delivered any quicker, so if additional houses were added outside of the 5,500 and the development stalled for any reason, all of it would stall including any additional allocation.

Councillor Tumi Hawkins felt that there was a discrepancy between the housing allocation of the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, with the City being required to provide 19,000 houses and South Cambridgeshire being required to provide 22,000 houses. She asked where the additional houses proposed had come from. Councillor Hawkins said that the Local Plan was forcing houses onto the A428 corridor, whether or not the infrastructure needs could be delivered. Councillor Hawkins added that Highways stated in the SHLAA document that there was the potential for over 19,750 daily trips to be generated from the Bourn Airfield Development, but that the County Council was providing nothing to support them. She referred to her paper that she had circulated to Members before the meeting, highlighting the fact that the only transport solution was the proposed dedicated bus lane, but asked who would pay for it and where the funding would come from. Councillor Hawkins also referred to a joint transport meeting that she attended recently, where there was unanimous concern regarding the large funding gap. She was of the view that infrastructure had to be in place before any development commenced. In closing she stated that the strategy behind the Local Plan was not correct and that it would damage a beautiful rural part of the South Cambridgeshire countryside.

Councillor Pippa Corney responded by saying that infrastructure would be delivered in phases, similar to the way in which Northstowe was being developed, but these phases would be dependent on the A14 improvements. Details would be made clearer at the Area Action Plan stage.

Councillor Aidan Van De Weyer agreed that there was a housing crisis in South Cambridgeshire, but felt that something had gone wrong in choosing the options and proposals set out in the Local Plan. Lots of choices were available following the number of public workshops and meetings that had been held and he cited north of Northstowe as an example. Councillor Van De Weyer conceded that if rejected at this meeting the current Plan would take another six to twelve months to re-submit. He was not sure how bad that situation would be, but stated that if the current Plan was accepted the consequences of its implementation would be irreversible.

Councillor Pippa Corney assured Council that she had gone through lots of options following all of the consultation events and processes that were put in place and that the proposals put forward in the Plan did come out of the responses received. She also warned Members that the timespan for the Plan coming back to Council for reconsideration if it was refused at this meeting would more likely be eighteen months to two years. In explaining the reasoning behind this, it was noted that any major changes to the Plan would require all or most of the relevant evidence to be undertaken again, together with further public consultation.

Councillor Neil Scarr emphasised the importance of affordable housing, but highlighted that South Cambridgeshire's close proximity to London with its road and rail links meant that it was obvious that some of the housing allocation would be provided for people working in the city. He went on to ask how the proposed development would actually be achieved.

Councillor Pippa Corney informed Council that part of the process for allocating sites consisted of ensuring that they were available and ready to be developed. She was confident that the majority of the sites included in the Local Plan would meet the criteria in this respect.

Councillor James Hockney outlined his opposition to the prospect of a town at Waterbeach due to its effect on villages and infrastructure in the area. He reminded Council that similar proposals had been rejected before, in 2001, 2004 and 2008 and said that there were existing major drainage issues in the area which the local Internal Drainage Board had raised as part of its objections. Councillor Hockney also made the point that the A10 was already busy and that there was no guarantee of the City Deal delivering the required infrastructural improvements. He added that the Cambridge Transport Study update report identified a funding gap of £40 million and asked where that would come from, together with the cost of relocating the train station which could cost millions of pounds. No costings had been identified for the required A10 improvements or the massive consequences of what was being proposed, including the re-siting of the station together with waste management drainage and sewerage issues. In view of this, he estimated that the true cost would be in the region of £500 million. Councillor Hockney accepted the need for additional housing in the area and proposed an amendment that the 1,400 houses be brought forward for building in the area of the barracks to help grow the local economy, but called for the community town proposal to be removed. This amendment was seconded by Councillor Sebastian Kindersley.

Councillor Pippa Corney informed Council that this proposal would constitute a 'major change' and could therefore not be added at this stage without refusing to accept the Plan as a sound document for referral to the Secretary of State.

Councillor Nick Wright said that the Local Plan was about need, and the need was there due to so many jobs being created in South Cambridgeshire, the numbers for which had grown year on year since the recession. He added that over the years the housing list had also been reducing and that this was being addressed well with exception sites.

Councillor Jonathan Chatfield was impressed that people were not necessarily ruling out the proposals in the Plan for Waterbeach and that they acknowledged that additional houses were necessary. He also recognised how much the area had suffered with the closure of the barracks but was of the opinion that the proposed development was far too much for one village. He was also concerned about the flood risk and the desperate need for transport infrastructure and lacked confidence in developers being able to deliver or contribute where necessary. He said the Local Plan at the moment was unworkable.

Councillor Alison Elcox praised the officers for doing a fantastic job in producing a Plan for submission to the Secretary of State, but questioned whether anyone had actually objectively looked at the proposals included within the document and considered their ramifications. She felt that this part of the process had been missed out completely and suggested that West Cambourne was only included because it was immediately deliverable, with Bourn Airfield being included to satisfy a requirement to redevelop a large brownfield site. She said that the A428 needed a serious upgrade which could not be paid for from developer contributions or the City Deal if it actually came into fruition. Local roads had trouble coping now and she reported recent incidences of local flooding in Bourn Valley that should also be taken into account. She did not think that the Plan would improve the quality of life for residents and was storing up real social problems for the future if West Cambourne in particular was allowed to go ahead. She added that this was all about control and becoming vulnerable to appeals from unwanted developments. The proposed Plan proposed 5,000 additional unwanted houses in an area with no real

employment prospects, no railway line, no joined up transport and in an area miles from major local employment centres with no real answers to transport problems for the next 20 years.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley agreed with Councillor Elcox's comments. He made the point that the Local Plan was not setting out proposals until 2031, it was actually until 2061 at the very least as made clear in Policy S/6. He was concerned that this decision would bind the existing Council and its successors, and their children, for years to come and claimed that the Local Plan was unsustainable in every way, believing the funding gap was more likely to total £1 billion. Councillor Kindersley said that the proposals would have no infrastructure and that it would never come as the economy did not work in that way. Referring to Cambourne as an example of a new development, he stated that Cambourne was built in a completely different time when more money was available and that those days were over. With regard to the Transport Strategy, he thought that 80% of it was undeliverable and that the City Deal would hardly dent the required funding even at Waterbeach let alone other sites in the Local Plan, meaning that there would be nothing for the A428 corridor or Bourn Airfield. He questioned how much worse it would be if developers came in with proposals instead of implementing the proposed Local Plan.

Councillor Hazel Smith felt that the Local Plan process had not been democratic and that local Members' views or those views put forward by residents at the workshops had not been taken into account, suggesting a lack of local accountability. She posed Waterbeach as an example of where the Plan had been driven through without any focus or consideration of what local people thought or wanted and added that the consultation in Waterbeach saw local people vote overwhelmingly for a moderate amount of development to help the village services to survive. Councillor Smith was concerned that the majority of land proposed for development in the Local Plan in Waterbeach was below the 5 metre contour, which was the lowest level of the built-up area of villages on the Great Ouse or on the River Cam. She explained that when developers put in plans for building at Whitmore Way in Waterbeach, the planners ignored the local Parish Council's advice due to the Environment Agency being unconcerned about any flood risk, but they had subsequently had to build flood protection after homes were flooded. Councillor Smith closed by saying that any development should start at the barracks, not on the greenfield land further east and that 1,400 houses at Waterbeach early in the Plan made sense but 8,000 to 10,000 from 2026 in her view made no sense at all.

Councillor Alex Riley agreed that this process was not democratic because the Government had decreed that the Council must create capacity for a given number of homes, with failure to do so resulting in planning applications being allowed on appeal as a punishment. With regard to Northstowe, he thought that some rather silly suggestions had been put forward from previous speakers. The Guided Bus already struggled to cope in busy periods. Accelerating 1,500 homes in phase one would result in additional traffic on the B1050 which was already at capacity, and phase two could not proceed until the A14 improvements had taken place. It was therefore unrealistic to expect phase two to start until 2020. He understood the anger and frustration from residents and representatives of Bourn and Waterbeach but pointed out the Northstowe plan had been for 600 homes to be completed per year, from 2006, so Northstowe should have had 5,000 homes by now, whereas nothing had yet been delivered. He added that the Government could lay down whatever targets it liked, but if the demand or infrastructure were not there the homes would not be built.

Councillor Peter Johnson claimed that the proposal set out in the Local Plan would be a disaster for Waterbeach and this Council would have to be prepared to deal with the consequences. He accepted that housing was needed, but not at the volume set out in the Plan, and suggested that Northstowe should be the area to concentrate on. He agreed that the Guided Bus Way should be utilised. In terms of water management at Waterbeach, Councillor Johnson was of the view that the problem of drainage and flooding would simply be moved somewhere else if nothing was done and more houses were built. He said the station had been there since 1841 and there was no reason to move it as a new station would only serve commuters in a dormitory village. As a listening and caring Council, a message should be sent to Government saying no to the number of houses they require be allocated in South Cambridgeshire.

Councillor Clayton Hudson was concerned with the strategic sites section of the Local Plan, specifically with regard to their impact on the Bourn Ward. He was of the view that the Bourn Airfield proposal, consisting of 3,500 houses compared to the 3,300 houses of the original Cambourne master plan on a smaller footprint, was unviable, unsustainable and undeliverable. Councillor Hudson stated that a more sympathetic solution was required regarding the risk of flooding in Bourn Valley, together with mitigation of sewerage capacity issues at Uttons Drove and the transportation limitations of the A428.

(Councillor Neil Davies left the meeting at this stage of proceedings)

Councillor Roger Hall made the point that Bar Hill was now a viable community but that it had taken 21 years to complete. He said he would vote for the Plan rather than leave it to market forces, which would mean being at the whim of developers. He also highlighted that transport infrastructure improvements took a significant amount of time to complete.

Councillor Peter Topping stated that the economy was important and that young people should be able to have choices regarding their future careers. South Cambridgeshire had industries that were creating demand for housing and he stated that the choice was whether to leave the issue of housing to the market or plan for it via the proposal Local Plan.

Councillor Robin Page said he was very worried about the Bourn Valley and was concerned that the monitoring agreement for Cambourne was not being adhered to as no-one was managing the discharge rates to the Bourn Brook. This meant the Section 106 Agreement was being ignored by the Council, which had given the original planning approval. He complained that the Council did not appear to have up-to-date figures about the speed at which the brook rose.

Councillor Pippa Corney referred Councillor Page to page 8 of the report which stated that the Council was in a management agreement with MCA Developments with regard to the discharge of water at Cambourne.

Councillor Mervyn Loynes reported that Bourn Parish Council was against the proposal for Bourn Airfield and supported the petition by the 'Stop BAD' campaign which had consisted of 1728 signatures. Similarly, Caxton Parish Council was against the proposal for West Cambourne. With regard to the A428, Bourn, Croxton, Caxton and Eltisley Parish Councils had concerns regarding the extra traffic that would be generated by both proposals. He added that Huntingdonshire District Council on the A428 corridor had approved another 1,500 houses next to Loves Farm, which already had 1,500 houses, together with a further 7,000 houses on the fields opposite. In addition to this, 450 houses were already being built in Papworth, together with extra houses proposed along the A428 corridor, including 3,000 at Madingley Road, 3,500 at Bourn Airfield and 2,200

at Caxton as part of Cambourne West. Councillor Loynes said that this totalled 17,200 new houses on the A428 which altogether was more than the proposal for Northstowe. He asked what would happen to the single carriageway from Caxton Gibbet to the A1 when there were no plans to make it a dual carriageway for 15 or 20 years.

Concluding debate on that section of the report, Councillor David Bard asked whether a vote should be taken on Chapters 1 to 3 of the Plan to determine whether or not it was necessary to debate the remaining parts with the premise that if the Plan failed at this stage it would not be submitted to the Secretary of State.

With 30 votes in favour, 23 against and 1 abstention, it was **AGREED** that a vote would be held on Chapters 1 to 3 as described above.

Voting on the soundness of Chapters 1 – 3 of the Local Plan, with 32 votes in favour, 19 votes against and 3 abstentions, Council **AGREED** to continue considering the Local Plan at this meeting.

It was agreed that a recorded vote would be held for this item. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors David Bard, Richard Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Nigel Cathcart, Pippa Corney, Kevin Cuffley, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Roger Hickford, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Alex Riley, Neil Scarr, Timothy Scott, Ben Shelton, Peter Topping, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, David Whiteman-Downes, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright.

Against

Councillors Trisha Bear, Jonathan Chatfield, Alison Elcox, Tumi Hawkins, Mark Hersom, James Hockney, Clayton Hudson, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Robin Page, Deborah Roberts, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Jim Stewart, Edd Stonham, Aidan Van De Weyer and John Williams.

Abstention

Councillors Jose Hales, Cicely Murfitt and Susan van de Ven.

(Councillor Edd Stonham left the meeting at this stage of proceedings).

Village Sites (Chapter 7 – Policies H/1 to H/4 and any site specific proposals in Chapters 4 – 10)

Councillor Tony Orgee referred to Policy H/1 in relation to sites at Sawston and made reference to the fact that Ward's Charity owned part of the site and reported that he understood the charity would not allow access over land to the southern part of the site. He acknowledged the housing need and proposed that sites H/1:b and H/1:c be removed from the Plan, as they were outside of the village's framework and located within the greenbelt, and replace them with an increase in allocation at H/1:a from 200 to 230, which developers had indicated was possible. He also suggested including the housing allocation of 53 from the Great and Little Abingdon Parish Council proposals (proposals which he fully supported). He stated that the shortfall could be obtained from windfall sites over the life of the Plan, which equated to about 13 per year over the Plan

period.

Councillor Pippa Corney informed Council that this proposal would constitute a 'major change' and could therefore not be added at this stage without refusing to accept the Plan as a sound document for referral to the Secretary of State.

Councillor Raymond Matthews agreed with Councillor Orgee's comments and stated that there were currently 3042 houses in the village, with 540 new houses proposed. There were three schools in Sawston, together with a village college and they were all at maximum capacity.

Councillor Kevin Cuffley agreed with Councillors Orgee and Matthews. He confirmed that Sawston Parish Council had never said it was totally against development and that it was supportive of H/1:a in respect of Dales Manor and supported development on brownfield sites, but not greenfield sites. He also highlighted the very good farming land in the area and the fact that the site locations were away from the village centre and would therefore encourage more traffic into the village. Councillor Cuffley added that Sawston already had problems with car parking so this would only add to the problem. He stated that schools and the sewerage works were up to capacity and that the health centre already struggled to cope with demand.

Councillor David Bard, speaking from the Chair as local Member for Sawston, questioned the sustainability and soundness of the Local Plan and agreed that additional traffic caused by the proposed developments would cause mayhem. He suggested that a major omission from the Plan was an assessment of capacity at the A505 and A1301 and the A505 and Pampisford Wych junctions. The County Council Transport Strategy envisaged development of an enhanced transport hub at Whittlesford Parkway and encouraged greater use of rail services, but this development would channel more traffic through these junctions which Councillor Bard thought was unacceptable. Councillor Bard also made reference to the minutes of the Portfolio Holder Meeting which stated that the nearest bus stop was 400 metres from the centre of any of the Sawston sites. He confirmed that this was incorrect and thought it was more likely to be 600m by the shortest pedestrian route.

Councillor Alison Elcox said that following the call for sites there were many development sites proposed in a number of South Cambridgeshire's villages, some with Parish Council backing and others without, as part of the first consultation. She felt that the consultation was based around a leading question which she thought was unacceptable and referred to a site proposed by Councillor Loynes that was rejected even though no one locally had objected to it. She also referred to a small development proposal in Bourn designed for active senior citizens, but this was rejected because there was not enough capacity at the school. Councillor Elcox was concerned that by placing large development proposals with only two developers, citing the Marshalls site and Northstowe as examples, developers would be able to maintain or increase house prices at their will. She was worried that they would control the market and called for this to stop.

Councillor Douglas de Lacey reflected on the debate so far and noted the many emphases on communications to Cambridge. Despite the several assurances from the Council's leadership that the Plan proposed building houses for South Cambridgeshire and not for the City, he found those assurances hard to understand or believe.

Councillor Pippa Corney responded by saying that lots of people did work in Cambridge whilst living in South Cambridgeshire and that the proposals in the Local Plan would give people that choice.

Councillor Peter Topping referred to the rural nature of the district and the fact that Sawston as a large village provided a lot of services that neighbouring areas depended upon. He accepted development on brownfield sites but objected to development on greenfield sites and said that it was disappointing that Councillor Orgee's sensible amendment could not be included.

Councillor Timothy Scott suggested a change in status for Comberton, which had been classified as a Minor Rural Centre due to the fact that it had a village college. The village college was actually located in Toft so he felt that the decision to assess Comberton as a Minor Rural Centre was wrong. He said a development of 90 houses represented a 10% growth of the village which he felt was too much and that the site would better lend itself to 60 houses. Councillor Scott also expressed his concerns that Anglian Water said it had capacity in the area, as the last two winters had seen sewerage coming up through the drains. In addition, he made it clear that congestion was already an issue for the village and the health centre was also up to capacity.

Councillor Susan van de Ven referred to the district's relationship with Cambridge and, whilst acknowledging that South Cambridgeshire was a rural area and Members were here to represent villages and their interests, it was unrealistic to not strategically plan for the lives of the people the Council represented without taking the City of Cambridge into account.

Councillor Tumi Hawkins followed up on Councillor Scott's comments and said that it would have been helpful if the number of dwellings could have been reduced to about 60 and clarified that affordable housing would be delivered to villages.

Councillor Kindersley took this opportunity to thank officers for producing the Local Plan and for all the work they had put into it, and the assistance they had provided to Members and parishes throughout the process.

Councillor Pippa Corney reported that Graveley Parish Council was still in the final stages of considering six extra houses as part of proposals for that area. This was classed as a 'minor change', so if the Parish Council agreed then these would be included, but if they disagreed the Plan would continue without them, subject to approval being granted at this meeting.

Development Management Policies (Chapters 4 – 10)

Councillor Alex Riley referred to pages 108 and 109 of the Proposed Submission document and quoted the section on 'protecting and enhancing landscape character' and 'protecting agricultural land'. He referred to paragraph 6.5 in respect of Northstowe where it said that it was designed to ensure the maintenance of the village character of Longstanton. He then quoted Policy NH/1 in terms of the conservation area and green separation at Longstanton and noted that the area would contain only open land users, such as playing fields, allotments and cemeteries. He thought that it would be more helpful if this sentence was deleted. Councillor Corney confirmed that this had been brought forward from the original Plan following an amendment by the Planning Inspector as part of the previous process.

Councillor John Williams referred to page 235 of the Proposed Submission document and Policy TI/9 regarding education facilities. He reflected on what he perceived as an education crisis in the county and said that there was dire need for a new secondary school to service not just East of Cambridge City but Cambridgeshire East. Councillor Williams was worried that there was no reference within this part of the Plan to the provision of additional secondary school places to service those areas and as a result

questioned the soundness of the Local Plan.

Mr Keith Miles, Planning Policy Manager, reported that the County Council had taken time considering this provision, so officers were in the process of exploring ways of doing this outside of the Local Plan process. The submission of a planning application was cited as an appropriate way forward and clarity was given that the Plan could still proceed as being sound due to the fact a planning application was an alternative vehicle for dealing with that specific proposal.

Councillor Tony Orgee referred to Policy H/12 regarding extensions to dwellings in the countryside on page 146 of the Proposed Submission document and thanked officers for the work they had done for the parishes he represented in this respect.

Councillor Bridget Smith referred to chapter 4 of the Proposed Submission document and would have liked to see more aspiration with regard to climate change. She supported the policy relating to sustainable show homes but thought that Policy SC/2 was nonsensical relating to wind turbines and a 2 kilometre gap and assumed that the Planning Inspector would throw it out following recent challenges in court regarding other local authorities.

Councillor Ray Manning referred to Policy HQ/2 regarding public art and new development on page 102 of the Proposed Submission document and proposed an amendment to the second paragraph so that it meant that the provision of public art had to be agreed by the Parish Council. He provided an example where a piece of public art had been installed in a village he represented, which the Parish Council and wider community was opposed to, and felt that this amendment would help prevent such instances occurring in the future.

Councillor Pippa Corney confirmed that this would constitute a 'minor change' to the Plan so could be made if agreed.

Councillor Bridget Smith argued that Parish Councils should not have veto over public art proposals from the wider community. She felt that any amendment should include reference to the Parish Council being involved, but not include reference to public art having to be agreed by the Parish Council.

Councillor Douglas de Lacey agreed with Councillor Smith that there should be a specific reference to Parish Councils but not to having power of veto.

Councillor Mark Howell agreed that the Parish Council needed to be involved as sometimes there was no community in place where a public art installation was to be built.

Councillor Bard, recognising that the Council unanimously agreed to amend paragraph 2 of Policy HQ/2 to include reference to Parish Councils, asked Members to vote on two forms of words that had been proposed and seconded as follows:

Councillor Ray Manning and Councillor Alex Riley respectively proposed and seconded the following:

"The provision of public art must *be agreed by the relevant Parish Council* and the local community and could be community-led and have regard to the local circumstances of the site and/or local aspirations."

Councillor Bridget Smith and Councillor Douglas de Lacey respectively proposed and seconded the following:

“The provision of public art must involve *the relevant Parish Council and the local community and could be community-led and have regard to the local circumstances of the site and/or local aspirations.*”

With 20 Members voting in favour of Councillor Manning’s proposed amendment, 31 Members voting in favour of Councillor Smith’s proposed amendment and there being 2 abstentions, Council **AGREED** Councillor Smith’s amendment as outlined above.

Closing statement

Councillor Francis Burkitt, as seconder to the original motion, took this opportunity to make a closing statement on the debate. He quoted the Cambridge News, saying that South Cambridgeshire was the ninth least affordable area to buy a house in the country and said that there was a housing need in the district with it being so economically active. He said a plan was needed to address this, and that the Council had a plan in the shape of the draft proposal that was before Members at this meeting, which had taken three years to come to fruition. He emphasised the work that had gone into producing it and said that all Members should praise Jo Mills, Director of Planning and New Communities, Keith Miles, Planning Policy Manager, Caroline Hunt, Local Development Framework Team Leader, and their respective teams for their enormous amount of work. Councillor Burkitt understood that some Members were unhappy with some aspects of the Local Plan but emphasised that this Council had produced it and was determining it, so it was the Council’s Plan. He was of the opinion that development was not necessarily a bad thing and would be good for South Cambridgeshire’s economic prosperity. He feared the alternative of not having an approved Local Plan, thinking it would bring chaos and a loss of control to the district, but sympathised enormously with those people who did not want development in their areas.

Voting on the substantive motion, consisting of the recommendations contained within the report and Councillor Bridget Smith’s amendment in relation to Policy HQ/2, with 27 votes in favour, 21 against and 5 abstentions, Council **RESOLVED** that:

- (a) the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: Proposed Submission document and Proposed Policies Map be ‘submitted’ for examination in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, together with the sustainability appraisal and associated evidence documents in support of the Plan, with proposed Major Modifications (as contained in Appendix A of the Portfolio Holder Meeting report) and proposed Minor Changes (as contained in Appendix B of the Portfolio Holder Meeting report), subject to a minor amendment to paragraph 2 of Policy HQ/2: Public Art and New Development so that it reads:

“The provision of public art must involve the relevant Parish Council and the local community and could be community-led and have regard to the local circumstances of the site and/or local aspirations.”

- (b) the following updated and additional evidence base documents be submitted with the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (as appended to the Portfolio Holder Meeting report):

- Key Issues and Assessment (Update to the Audit Trail at Annex A of the Sustainability Appraisal Report);
 - Statement of Consultation Update;
 - Duty to Co-operate Statement Update;
 - Great and Little Abington Parish Council Proposals: including consultation leaflet and results of consultation;
 - Graveley Parish Council Proposals: including consultation leaflet;
 - Sawston Transport Modelling;
 - Development Frameworks evidence paper update;
 - Sustainability Appraisal – update for Parish Council led proposals for The Abingtons;
 - Habitats Regulations Assessment update;
 - Cambourne Retail and Employment Study - Explores retail and employment development in the village and opportunities to support future development;
 - Strategic Spatial Priorities: Addressing the Duty to Co-operate across Cambridgeshire & Peterborough;
 - Services and Facilities Study Update – once finalised;
 - Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.
- (c) delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning and New Communities to make further additions to the schedules of changes during the course of the examination (except where changes would be of such significance as to substantially alter the meaning of a policy or allocation) and that the exercise of this delegation be reported back to Planning Policy and Localism Portfolio Holder through the course of the examination process.
- (d) the Director of Planning and New Communities is authorised to prepare and submit reports, proofs of evidence, technical papers, statements of common ground and other such documents required in the presentation of the Local Plan through the examination process, reflecting the Council's agreed position on these matters and to take such other steps as are conducive or incidental to the submission and examination of the local plan.
- (e) supplementary changes be made to the Local Plan as contained in Appendix 2 of the report.
- (f) the following updated and additional evidence base documents be submitted with the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan:
- Key Issues and Assessment (Update to the Audit Trail at Annex A of the Sustainability Appraisal Report), as set out in Appendix C of the Portfolio Holder Meeting report and addendum to include four missing sites reported orally to the Portfolio Holder Meeting as reflected in Appendix 3 of the report;
 - the Graveley Parish Council Proposals: including the consultation leaflet, as set out in Appendix G of the Portfolio Holder Meeting report, be updated to include consultation results reflected in Appendix 4 of the report;

- the Sustainability Appraisal – update for Parish Council led proposals, as set out in Appendix J of the Portfolio Holder Meeting report, be updated to include Graveley Parish Council proposals as reflected in Appendix 5 of the report;
 - the Habitats Regulations Assessment update, as set out in Appendix K of the Portfolio Holder Meeting report, be updated to include Graveley Parish Council proposals, and a supporting letter from Natural England as reflected in Appendix 6 of the report.
- (g) delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning and New Communities to make further minor revisions as necessary in preparing the submission documents in consultation with the Planning Policy and Localism Portfolio Holder.

It was agreed that a recorded vote would be held for this item. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors Richard Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Nigel Cathcart, Pippa Corney, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Roger Hickford, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Alex Riley, Neil Scarr, Timothy Scott, Ben Shelton, Peter Topping, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, David Whiteman-Downes, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright.

Against

Councillors Trisha Bear, Jonathan Chatfield, Kevin Cuffley, Alison Elcox, Tumi Hawkins, Mark Hersom, James Hockney, Clayton Hudson, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Janet Lockwood, Mervyn Loynes, Raymond Matthews, Tony Orgee, Robin Page, Deborah Roberts, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Jim Stewart, Aidan Van De Weyer and John Williams.

Abstention

Councillors David Bard, Jose Hales, Douglas de Lacey, Cicely Murfitt and Susan van de Ven.

The Meeting ended at 2.30 p.m.
