

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee held on  
Wednesday, 29 July 2015 at 10.00 a.m.

**PRESENT:** Cllr Tim Wotherspoon (South Cambridgeshire District Council) – Chairman

**Councillors:** Ian Bates (Cambridgeshire County Council), Brian Burling (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Douglas de Lacey (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Lynda Harford (Cambridgeshire County Council), David Jenkins (Cambridgeshire County Council), Alex Riley (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Hazel Smith (South Cambridgeshire District Council) and Nick Wright (South Cambridgeshire District Council)

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

Ian Howes	Principal Urban Designer
Jo Mills	Planning and New Communities Director
Tam Parry	Northstowe Transport Planning Officer
Stephen Reid	Senior Planning Lawyer
Juliet Richardson	Business Manager (Growth and Development)
Ian Senior	Democratic Services Officer
Tanya Sheridan	Head of Growth and Economy
James Stone	Principal Planning Officer

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor Peter Hudson sent apologies for absence. No substitute was available.

With the Committee's consent, the Chairman appointed Councillor Ian Bates as Vice-Chairman of the meeting.

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Ian Bates declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Cambridgeshire County Council's Economy and Environment Committee and present at the meeting on 14 July 2015 at which the Section 106 Heads of Terms had been discussed.

Councillor David Jenkins, while currently no longer a member of the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee, had been a member of that committee on 14 July and had proposed an amendment to the recommendation in the officers' report to that meeting (though it had fallen in the subsequent vote).

Councillor Lynda Harford declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Cambridgeshire County Council's Economy and Environment Committee and present at the meeting on 14 July 2015 at which the Section 106 Heads of Terms had been discussed.

Councillor Alex Riley reiterated that he had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest by reason of the proximity of his domestic property to Northstowe, but that he had been granted a dispensation allowing him to speak and vote.

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest because he had attended meetings of Oakington & Westwick Parish Council and Rampton Parish Council in order to

provide factual information upon request. Councillor Wotherspoon is not an elected or co-opted member of either Parish Council and did not contribute to the debates. Councillor Wotherspoon also declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of South Cambridgeshire District Council's Cabinet and present at the meeting on 9 July 2015 at which the Section 106 Heads of Terms and the Civic Hub had been discussed.

Councillor Nick Wright declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest by virtue of owning land over which the A14 would be re-routed and which could therefore be the subject of a Compulsory Purchase Order. He declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Governor at Swavesey Village College. Councillor Wright also declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of South Cambridgeshire District Council's Cabinet and present at the meeting on 9 July 2015 at which the Section 106 Heads of Terms and the Civic Hub had been discussed.

Committee members reiterated that they were coming to this meeting afresh.

### 3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2015, subject to the following:

#### **Minute 6 - S/2011/14/OL - Longstanton and Oakington & Westwick (Land to the east of Longstanton and west of the guided busway occupying the northern part of the site used by the former Oakington barracks)**

Councillor Alex Riley objected to the wording "for South Cambridgeshire District Council, as Local Planning Authority, to issue a Decision Notice subject to those Conditions." It was clarified that while Cambridgeshire County Council was the local planning authority for (among other things) schools, highways, minerals and waste, and South Cambridgeshire District Council was the local planning authority for most other development management matters, including commercial and residential development, the NJDCC was a joint committee established under Section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972 to which both councils had delegated determination of planning applications and associated matters. Decision notices, however, were issued in the name of one or other of the councils. For the complete avoidance of doubt, the paragraph would be extended as follows:

"Members raised the following:

Implications should the Committee reject the draft Conditions

Answer: there are 90 or so Conditions. It is for the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee to agree what form those Conditions should take, and for South Cambridgeshire District Council, as Local Planning Authority, to issue a Decision Notice subject to those Conditions, as agreed by the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee."

In the paragraph beginning "The Principal Planner introduced..." after the words "...Committee meeting on 25 March 2015" add a comma followed by "...and to the responses thereto".

In the section headed "Movement and Access", delete the sentence "The Northstowe Transport Planning Officer referred Members to draft Condition 70."

Delete the word "Drift" from the sentence beginning "Rampton Drift should be included..."

Members also raised some minor typographical errors.

#### 4. REVIEW OF LESSONS FROM ORCHARD PARK

The Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee considered a report setting out the interim recommendations from the South Cambridgeshire District Council Scrutiny and Overview Committee Working Group set up to review the lessons learned from Orchard Park.

Councillor Lynda Harford, chairman of the Working Group, summarised the history of Scrutiny and Overview Committee reviews of Orchard Park over the years, and said that the Working Group was intending to submit its formal findings to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee meeting on 3 September 2015. In the meantime, the Committee had received the Working Group's interim recommendations, and South Cambridgeshire District Council's Cabinet had since responded to those interim recommendations. Councillor Harford expressed her gratitude to officers and Members both at South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council for their help and support. There was one significant group of stakeholders still to be interviewed, and that was the developers.

Councillor Harford said that the local authorities had generally taken account of the recommendations of the original Arbury Park Task and Finish Group, and taken on board many of the ways of improved working that had been suggested in 2008. She then drew attention to Recommendation 5. "New Town Blues" had first been described in the medical literature in the 1930s. She informed members that Cambridgeshire County Council had embarked on reviewing the New Communities Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) and compiling a New Communities Strategy. A scoping workshop on the JSNA had been held the previous day. The County Council team was currently examining referral rates to social services and mental health services in new communities, in order to assess financial implications for councils and other public services and to look at preventative strategies that may be applicable.

**County Councillor Ed Cearns** addressed the meeting as a public speaker. Welcoming the report, he said it was important to reflect on past experiences, and to learn lessons where necessary. He said that the Working Group's third recommendation ("More consideration should be given to a greater variety of opportunities for social interaction for early occupants of new developments") was of crucial importance, and in his opinion reflected concern that there had been too much focus on the planning process and a lack of member involvement in its outcomes. Councillor Cearns highlighted the importance of early discussions about governance of Northstowe, an area that was critical if the town was to have "a fighting chance."

In response to a question, Cllr Cearns said that he had not attended any meetings of the Northstowe Parish Forum, the Northstowe Community Forum or the Northstowe Community Working Group. The Chairman observed that these three, together with the Northstowe Transport Working Group, existed specifically to engage district and county councillors with Parish Councils, organisations and local people on Northstowe issues of importance to them. The NJDCC was a development control committee, whereas delivery, management and governance were more appropriately dealt with at these other meetings.

Opening the Committee debate, Councillor Douglas de Lacey echoed the concerns raised by Councillor Cearns. Councillor de Lacey referred to the Working Group's second recommendation ("The good practice of school provision concurrent with first occupations should be continued"). He welcomed the approach in relation to primary schools, but

wondered why it had not been replicated in terms of secondary education. In reply, Councillor Harford said it simply was not practical to require secondary schools to be concurrent with first occupations, but took his point about the importance of secondary education provision.

For Councillor David Jenkins, the Working Group's first recommendation was the most important ("The decision to require a road adoption strategy for Northstowe should be replicated on all future developments"). He observed that some roads at Orchard Park had still not been adopted and that, although there was generally a high level of satisfaction among residents, there remained dissatisfaction surrounding broken promises from the developers. Councillor Jenkins voiced concern about car parking provision at Orchard Park, the withdrawal of bus services, the absence of post boxes and the late delivery of shops. With reference to health provision, he looked forward to the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee Chairman attending a meeting of Cambridgeshire County Council's Health Committee. The Chairman responded that he had not received an invitation, and Cllr Jenkins said that he would receive an invitation next year. Cllr Jenkins also said that he looked forward to contributing to the Scrutiny Committee working group. Cllr Harford expressed surprise that Cllr Jenkins had not been invited to the meeting of local representatives, and would be pleased to re-visit this.

Councillor Harford explained that the Working Group's remit was not to "resolve all ills" but rather to fulfil the requirement to review the Arbury Park recommendations as made in 2008. She went on to say that enforcement action had been taken at Orchard Park over recent months to resolve outstanding issues about roads and car parking areas. Cllr Riley asked if the parking at Orchard Park was policy compliant. The Northstowe Transport Planning Officer said that, as far as he was aware, car parking at Orchard Park was policy compliant. He went on to suggest that, rather than parking standards, the real issue was *how* and *where* people parked vehicles. Councillor Riley requested that it be minuted that policy compliance did not prevent something from being a complete disaster.

Referring to Recommendation 5 ("Consideration should be given to further work being carried out on 'New Town Blues' and the referral rates to social services and their impacts on costs for councils and other public services"), Cllr Riley asked Councillor Harford what the Northstowe committee should do today in order to give effect to the recommendation. Cllr Harford said that Cambridgeshire County Council officers were already addressing the issues concerned, and that the JSNA workshop was very well attended. It was important first to assess impacts of existing developments to inform how we tackle new ones.

Councillor Hazel Smith wanted to be sure that the work being done by the Public Service and Community-Led Support Working Group (reporting to the Northstowe Project Board) was being properly fed into the decision-making process. The County Council Head of Growth and Economy cited Councillor Harford's reference to the New Communities team's work on referrals to support services. Tanya Sheridan went on to inform the committee that the New Communities Strategy would be presented to the County Council's General Purposes Committee, and also that the County Council's New Communities team had worked very closely with District Council officers. These exchanges had informed the recommended requirements for the S106 Agreement.

Members were very anxious that the lessons from Orchard Park be applied to Northstowe. Recommendation 1 was critical, and it was deemed essential that developers must recognise that, until adopted by Cambridgeshire County Council, roads and street lights remained their responsibility. Similarly, until developers have secured transfer of public open space, they must continue to maintain such spaces, such maintenance to include the emptying of litter bins.

The Vice Chairman thanked South Cambridgeshire District Council members for this work, and thought that, because the work had implications for all new developments, it would be useful to share the output with other districts. He also said that the County Council was supportive of Recommendation 5, and that public health information was relevant. In response, Councillor Harford thanked the Vice Chairman for the support of the County Council, and paid tribute to the high level of collaboration between South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council.

The Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee unanimously **endorsed** the interim recommendations from the Working Group (at paragraph 16 of the report).

## **5. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

For the benefit of those in the public gallery, and with regard to a confidential appendix, the Chairman explained the circumstances under which the Committee would be obliged to exclude members of the Press, other media and public from the meeting room, and continue in private session. However, he hoped that Members would be able to consider the following item without making specific reference to the details contained within Appendix 6. In this way, it would not be necessary to rely on Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

## **6. PHASE 2 - CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT PLANNING CONDITIONS AND SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT**

The Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee considered a report seeking its approval of the wording of proposed Planning Conditions included in Appendix 4 of this report subject to completion of detailed drafting by officers, and delegated authority for officers, along the lines set out in Appendix 2, to complete, with the HCA, a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, securing the sum of £73 million required to make acceptable, in planning terms, the Phase 2 development of Northstowe, which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms, and, on that basis, to grant outline planning permission for the development of Phase 2 of Northstowe with details of scale, appearance, landscaping, layout and access reserved, and full planning permission for the Southern Access Road (West) subject to Conditions.

The Principal Planner reminded the Committee about its resolution on 24 June 2015. The draft Conditions and list of Section 106 requirements had been revised since then, and the new package of Section 106 requirements before Members today had been endorsed by South Cambridgeshire District Council's Cabinet on 9 July and by Cambridgeshire County Council's Economy and Environment Committee on 14 July. He referred Members to a number of significant changes, including

- The library would be delivered by 1,500 dwellings across phases 1 and 2, to bring forward health and community facilities, with the full community hub provided by 4,200 occupations altogether.
- Improvements would be funded to the Northstowe to Cambridge cycle route via Oakington and Girton.
- At the Northstowe Drainage and Flooding Technical Liaison Group meeting on 15 July agreement had been reached between the district council's Drainage Manager and the Swavesey Internal Drainage Board's consultant on an engineering solution to maintenance of the Mare Fen flood bank. The Homes and Communities Agency had also agreed to commit to funding flood mitigation measures to attenuate flows through Oakington Brook, including bringing forward balancing ponds along Dry Drayton Road.

- The requirement for a Household Waste Recycling Centre proposal had been removed in the light of a decision of Cambridgeshire County Council's Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee to change its strategy for new household recycling centres in the area.

While the council's viability consultant GVA had advised that £70m would be an appropriate contribution in terms of the total of planning obligations, officers had secured £73m. The proportion of "affordable housing" would be a minimum of 20% across phase 2, with a review mechanism being built into the agreement.

The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) had agreed to the latest wording of all the Conditions. The Principal Planner recited the tests that planning conditions had to meet, as laid down in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

The Chairman introduced the public speaking element of the meeting.

**District Councillor Bridget Smith** (speaking in the capacity of her involvement with the Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service) began by expressing the hope that she, and Committee members, might still be able to influence proposed trigger points for the delivery of key infrastructure. Councillor Smith sought clarification as to who would build, and who would run, the Phase 1 community building. She asked whether there was sufficient money to build it, and said that a new community would have higher needs than an established community. She sought, and received, clarification that the Community Hub for Phase 2, including a Children's Centre, would be required by the 4,200<sup>th</sup> occupation across Phases 1 and 2, and not the 4,500<sup>th</sup> occupation as printed in paragraph 32 of the report. Councillor Smith said that best practice dictated that community facilities be provided as early as possible in order to avoid creating social problems. She urged the committee to be absolutely sure that the triggers would not condemn residents of Northstowe to living in an "isolated rural ghetto".

Picking up on the trigger point issue, a Committee member checked whether the new joint trajectory figures would cover Phase 1 as well. It was confirmed that joint trajectory meant the number of occupations across phases 1 and 2, and that, subject to approval, these triggers would be reflected in the Phase 2 Section 106 Agreement.

**County Councillor Ed Cearns** (speaking as a member of the public) welcomed the extent of the Section 106 contributions and that the total sum had increased to £73m, but had concerns that the briefing for Committee members on viability information had literally been at the last minute before the start of this meeting. He also regretted that the financial data underpinning the viability assessment had been redacted. How could members possibly make an informed decision on this basis? He also said that sufficient resources should be available, for example in terms of community engagement, to consider and, discharge Conditions. Members of the committee had no questions for Councillor Cearns.

**Ian Hunter**, a local resident of Longstanton (and living on an unadopted road), welcomed the proposals as helping to lay the foundations for a community that people would want to live and work in – an example of what the Germans might call *Lebendige Nachbarschaften*, or neighbourhoods with a soul. He recommended a book by the late Peter Hall, entitled *Good Lives, Better Cities*. He would welcome a higher proportion of rental properties, counterbalancing the risk that mortgage rate rises might stall house building in the private sale sector. This would help the "triggers" to be reached sooner rather than later. Excellent public facilities, such as schools and libraries, would encourage sales and rentals, both in phase 1 and in phase 2. Public buildings generally were built to high levels of sustainability and energy efficiency, thus setting an example to house builders, both volume and self-build, in the rented and sales sectors. The

Cambridgeshire Guided Busway, already a great success, would attract more renters and buyers, as the Section 106 money was used to build the route through Northstowe. The support of the military heritage, through the S106 contribution, would add to the sense of place. Mr Hunter expressed a hope that some of the Section 106 money would be used to establish house building competitions, such as those in Letchworth Garden City's 1905 and 1907 Cheap Cottages Exhibitions. Those competitions had saved Letchworth from collapse during a recession, he said. He urged the Committee to support the proposals so as to avoid central government stepping in to create a *New Town Development Corporation* – which they could do by invoking statutory provisions, he added, waving a copy of the legislation.

Councillor Alex Riley offered “living neighbourhoods” as a more literal translation of the German phrase. He teased out the sources of Mr Hunter's enthusiasm for the private rented sector. Councillor Hazel Smith was interested in the idea of design competitions, and Mr Hunter observed that one beneficial effect they had was to raise the profile of a new development, as had happened at Letchworth.

**Keith Wilderspin** (Swavesey Parish Council and Internal Drainage Board) addressed the Committee about drainage and flood risk. He said that he was pleased to see the revised condition and welcomed delivery by the district council, but had concerns about the enforceability of the condition as drafted. He asked if there would be a legal agreement. Regarding paragraph 62, Mr Wilderspin commented that the IDB drainage consultant could comment on the technical aspects, but was not authorised to comment on the legal enforceability of the wording of the condition.

The Planning and New Communities Director confirmed that the applicant and South Cambridgeshire District Council would enter into a Legal Agreement, and the Planning Lawyer said that such Agreement would help secure enforceability of the Conditions. Mr Wilderspin clarified that while the Board was disappointed that Mare Fen was not being done exactly as they had requested, they felt the proposal as now agreed was acceptable and the berm was not necessary any more. However, he asked the Planning Lawyer to liaise with the clerk and chief executive of the IDB regarding the wording of the Agreement and for liaison with the IDB regarding the engineering. In answer to queries from Councillor Alex Riley and Councillor Douglas de Lacey as to what precisely had prompted him to appear again before the committee, Mr Wilderspin repeated that the IDB had agreed to the engineering solution but just wanted to reach agreement on the wording. The Chairman suggested that the committee ought to hear directly from the district council's drainage manager.

**Councillor Gill Ashby** (Chairman of Longstanton Parish Council) was keen to see Northstowe provide an exemplary experience, and endorsed the third recommendation made by the Orchard Park Task and Finish Group (“More consideration should be given to a greater variety of opportunities for social interaction for early occupants of new developments”). She reiterated Longstanton Parish Council's view that it had a duty of care towards the early residents of Northstowe. With reference to paragraph 4 “appropriate provision of services and infrastructure”, she welcomed the increase in parking requirements across the development but would prefer to see the average car parking provision per dwelling further increased to two. It was also good to note the reduction in height of buildings around Rampton Drift, and the progress regarding Oakington Ponds and a burial ground. She asked if the provision of the burial ground could be brought forward. Allowance must be made for future expansion of the Town Park and Square, and there should be changing room facilities near the junior pitches. Councillor Ashby observed that there would be at least 3,000 people living in Northstowe before health facilities and a library appeared there, and there was still no mention of a dental surgery. This implied that village facilities in Longstanton, Willingham, Over and so

on would have to meet Northstowe needs in the interim. There were likely to be 9,000 people living in Northstowe before the town had a community centre. She was reassured that SCDC would run the community buildings. Councillor Ashby noted that funding for the community hub had decreased by about £5.5 million because of revision of its specification. She said that some of that saving should be passed on to Longstanton Parish Council so that it could replace its existing Pavilion with a new and purpose-built community facility. Northstowe was being built in the parish of Longstanton – but the parish needed finance in order to meet its duty of care. Councillor Ashby said she felt a contribution of £1.5m for a new pavilion for Longstanton would meet the Section 106 tests of being necessary, relevant and reasonable.

Councillor Alex Riley noted a contrast between the words coming out of the Task and Finish Review of Orchard Park and the realities being faced at Northstowe. He was worried that there might be a community three times the size of Longstanton with nothing to do, and asked the Chairman of Longstanton Parish Council what she would propose in these circumstances. Councillor Ashby responded by saying the answer was for the Section 106 Agreement to provide money for Longstanton Parish Council to enable an upgrade to its community facilities. She did not want to see a large number of people in the locality with nothing to do and nowhere to go. The Vice-Chairman asked if she was fully aware of the facilities to be provided on Phase 1, adding that new residents would not be interested in which phase they lived in, just that there were facilities available. Cllr Ashby replied that there was no clarity on Phase 1.

The Chairman introduced **Pat Matthews** to the Committee, South Cambridgeshire District Council's Drainage Manager.

The Drainage Manager said that South Cambridgeshire District Council had discussed the Land Drainage Solution with the Environment Agency. He confirmed that agreement had been reached by which all requirements of Swavesey Internal Drainage Board could be met at comparatively low cost, and that this would be included in the Section 106 agreement. He said that the ongoing maintenance could be done by SCDC or the IDB. Councillor Brian Burling thanked the Drainage Manager for his help in reaching this agreement. Replying to members' questions about the wording of the condition, the Planning and New Communities Director referred the Committee to Appendix 2 which showed that the developer would be contributing £400,000 towards the capital and maintenance costs for Dry Drayton Road ponds and off-site land drainage and flood attenuation. In response to concern that £400,000 might not be enough, the Drainage Manager said that works at Mare Fen were likely to cost about £5,000 with compensation amounting to around £15,000. The Planning and New Communities Director added that the sum of £400,000 also included a contribution towards a commitment to develop the Dry Drayton Road ponds along Oakington Brook.

In response to the point that had been raised by Cllr Ashby in connection with parking standards, the Principal Planner said that the developer was now proposing an average of 1.75 spaces per dwelling in Northstowe. This compared with an average of 1.6 in Longstanton, and 1.55 across South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The Northstowe Transport Planning Officer added that these figures were drawn from the most recent census data from 2011.

With reference to Cllr Ashby's request for funding towards a new pavilion for Longstanton, the Principal Planning Officer said that Section 106 obligations had to go towards mitigating the scheme, and Sport England had agreed that the Sports Strategy was adequate to mitigate phase 2.

The Planning and New Communities Director said the developer was proposing to locate



the burial ground on Phase 3 land, but begin construction before phase 2 had been completed. She went on to say that, until Northstowe got its own health centre, the one in Longstanton would provide medical services to residents of the new town. She guided Members through Appendix 1 to the report setting out an indicative timeline for the delivery of community resources. (This came with a 'health warning' that it was heavily contingent on the A14 upgrade programme, and buildout would depend on market uptake and so on.) The timeline indicated that the Health Centre would be built by the end of 2022. Until then, facilities additional to those in Longstanton would be provided from the primary school and accessed via a separate access. Once the Health Centre was available by the completion of 1500 homes, space at the school, previously used for the community health team, would revert to school use. The Community Centre on Phase 1 would be required by the 900<sup>th</sup> occupation, and built either by Gallagher or by South Cambridgeshire District Council. Good design of the Library and Health Centre at phase 2 would be crucial in order to ensure effective space for community use. Central to this would be consultation with members of the community itself to ensure, so far as was possible, that the facilities met the needs and aspirations of that community. Formal shared use agreements would be put in place, and the Head of Growth and Economy confirmed that the library would be a "flexible space" catering for community need.

The Chairman recalled Councillor Bridget Smith to address the committee again briefly. She urged caution about placing too much reliance on schools and the library in providing community facilities. Waiting for input from residents as they arrived was too reactive for her comfort. She strongly believed we ought to be more proactive.

Councillor David Jenkins said that there must be a process for promoting the town's evolution. He said that the important thing would be to create the kind of conditions that would encourage people to become their own community. The Councils should take steps now to get a commitment to operate buses throughout Northstowe and to deliver commercial facilities. The Planning and New Communities Director said that the council had been granted capacity funding that would be used to take forward the employment and economic strategy in an integrated way.

Members proceeded to comment on the proposed Conditions.

**Conditions 2, 3 and 4** – Councillor de Lacey asked why some words were in square brackets. Officers said they represented figures with which Members needed to be comfortable. They were not all standard periods, as evidenced by Condition 4. The brackets would fall away when permission was granted.

**Condition 8** – Councillor de Lacey sought assurance that a proportionate number of allotments would be required on each development parcel. Officers said that the provision of allotments appropriate to a particular parcel on Phase 2 would mirror the requirement on Phase 1, and that details would be required for the phasing plan in Condition 8. Orchards and allotments were also shown on the parameter plans.

Cllr Riley asked again about the use of the term Local Planning Authority and when the discharge of conditions would involve Members. The Chairman responded that discharge of conditions for Phase 2 would be treated in a similar manner to Phase 1. Strategically significant conditions such as the Design Code would be brought to committee for approval. Cllr Smith asked if the Definitions could include more terms, such as "Local Planning Authority", to aid understanding. It was agreed this would be considered outside the meeting.

**Condition 10** – Cllr Riley considered waiting for a fire service strategy until the 2000<sup>th</sup> dwelling in phase 2 to be woefully inadequate. The Principal Planner reported that the

Fire and Rescue Service had said that the condition was acceptable. The Fire and Rescue Service had four levels. This trigger was the point at which Northstowe would cross from level 2 (rural) to level 3 (urban), and was currently expected to occur some time between 2022 and 2024. Cllr Riley asked about Condition 10b, and was informed that this condition was just to make sure that there were fire hydrants on the site. Condition 10a was about fire engines. Cllr Smith asked if anyone had talked to a Registered Provider about the potential use of sprinklers in affordable homes, and was informed that this had occurred although the matter was still under discussion.

**Condition 29** – Farmland Bird Mitigation. The Principal Planner explained how mitigation would be provided off-site, initially on Phase 3 land. He said that areas of mitigation could be moved from site to site as work spread across the development. Councillor Nick Wright suggested that final mitigation could be to the Dry Drayton ponds on Oakington Brook.

**Condition 33** – Longstanton Conservation Area. Councillor Riley felt another condition was needed preventing the very rustic road known locally as the horseshoe from becoming a parking lot. He suggested an equivalent of the French sign of “*sauf riverains*” might be the sort of thing required. The Northstowe Transport Planning Officer said that if such a problem were to materialise it could be dealt with through a Traffic Regulation Order, which was entirely in the control of the county council.

**Conditions 34, 35 and 36** – Councillor Hazel Smith wondered about monitoring actual performance against environmental standards. The Principal Planner explained that we had to rely on Building Regulations. Our sustainability consultant had advised us that the most we could press for was lower CO2 emissions. However, exemplar expectations had led to a few conditions exceeding requirements, for example BREEAM ‘Excellent’ for non-residential buildings over 1000m2 and 105 litres per person per day compared with the Building Regulations requirement for 125. Cllr de Lacey asked whether Condition 35 could say percentages (of on-site renewable energy generation, for example). The Principal Planner reported that this condition had been altered in the last few weeks following recent government announcements that such figures should not be stipulated.

**Condition 40** – Cllr de Lacey asked what “no development/property” meant. The answer given was that there would be no occupations until the unexploded ordnance had been dealt with.

**Condition 49** – Cllr Riley highlighted that this condition linked to Condition 63 and that both conditions were to ensure that there would be no occupations until the A14 and Southern Access Road (West) were completed, unless agreed by the Local Planning Authority and the Local Highway Authority. With reference to paragraph 63 of the report, the Planning and New Communities Director said that the housing trajectory figures stated in Appendix 1 had been provided by Gallagher and the Homes and Communities Agency.

**Condition 55** – Cllr de Lacey asked about cycle parking within the Parking Management Strategy. The Transport Officer replied that cycling was covered in Condition 59 (Cycle Parking) and Condition 14 (Town Centre Strategy) as well as Condition 55.

**Condition 61** - Cllr de Lacey was not satisfied with this one because it made no specific reference to off-site cycle ways. Officers said that paragraph 37 of the report covered this aspect. The Chairman commented that off-site cycle ways would be governed by the Section 106 Legal Agreement. The Northstowe Transport Planning Officer confirmed that Cambridgeshire County Council's Cycle Officer was satisfied with the provision, for the cycle network, of £450,000 capital within the Section 106 Agreement. In response to a question, the Head of Growth and Economy said the path to Rampton was not covered by

Condition 61 as the upgrade was not needed for phase 2. The Chairman added that it might be improved in the future, but not as part of Phase 2.

In response to a question, the Principal Planner said that the issue of room sizes could not be re-visited so long as there was neither a local policy to support it nor the evidence base on which to engage the national technical standard.

Members then discussed requirements in the Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Councillor Lynda Harford wondered whether there should be a further review of affordable housing requirements near the end of the development. The Planning and New Communities Director agreed that there should be such a review.

Cllr de Lacey asked about the funding for Placemaking and Community Building. The Head of Growth and Economy responded that this largely referred to a team of people working across the councils to put the right services and support in place. It had been carefully costed, and picked up the Orchard Park recommendation discussed earlier in the meeting.

While he had no problem with the location of a burial ground on Phase 3 land, Councillor Riley had requested a condition requiring it to be ready by the 1,000<sup>th</sup> occupation on Phase 2. After conferring with the applicants, the Planning and New Communities Director said that the Homes and Communities Agency was willing to meet the Section 106 requirement for a Burial Ground by the 1500<sup>th</sup> occupation of Phase 2, bringing it about a year earlier than they had previously indicated. The Chairman expressed his gratitude, calling this a generous concession. Cllr Riley felt that no burial ground for up to 3,000 houses was still inadequate but said he would reluctantly accept it.

In response to a suggestion by Councillor de Lacey that the figure for the cycle network needed to be multiplied by a factor of three, the Northstowe Transport Planning Officer reiterated that Cambridgeshire County Council's Cycling Officer considered that £450,000 was sufficient and related to a specific costed scheme. The bridge would be a wooden structure. The Vice-Chairman advised Members to accept the advice of professional officers.

Cllr Riley asked if there would still be a Household Waste Recycling Centre at the Park and Ride. Officers said that a contribution was no longer being sought from Northstowe Phase 2 towards a Household Recycling Centre as, under new Section 106 rules, the pooling limit had been reached. With regard to the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment, the Chairman suggested that the impact of this change on trip generation might be neutral, as people would no longer be travelling to Northstowe if there was not to be a Household Recycling Centre there. The Head of Growth and Economy said that the decision had been taken in the light of all relevant assessments.

Referring to paragraph 7 of the report, Councillor Jenkins noted that there had been a reduction of £14 million in Section 106 contributions since the Committee's meeting on 24 June 2015. This was a substantial figure, and he expressed concern that this could have a severe impact on the extent of community infrastructure that could now be provided. The Head of Growth and Economy responded by saying that revised cost estimates had been provided with a Letter of Assurance and this had reduced the sum required for the Civic Hub. Also, in May, the Public Services working group had reduced the required area for the Civic Hub from 6200 to 4500 square metres. The cost of the dual use sports facilities had been reduced in the light of the new Sports Strategy, where it had been agreed that four courts would be provided in Phase 2. The cost of community making had

reduced as there had previously been some duplication, and there had been a number of other smaller changes. Delivery of the library had been brought forward. The cycleway between Northstowe and Cambridge via Oakington and Girton had been given priority because of its key value.

Councillor Jenkins had calculated that the difference between the policy requirement for 40% of homes to be affordable, and the offer of 20%, amounted to 700 dwellings, or £35 million. The Chairman referred Members to Government proposals outlined in the Summer Budget, and said the entire affordable housing landscape had changed. It was agreed that all avenues should be explored to make homes more affordable, including those in the checklist in a recent publication by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Councillor Jenkins said "Let's continue to work hard at this."

Concerns remained about the timing of delivery of the Community Hub, learning lessons from previous new communities, and overcoming the "New Town Blues". The Head of Growth and Economy commented that there would be provision for community use in the library/health centre to be provided at 1,500 homes across phases 1 and 2, that the placemaking team would help to combat "New Town Blues", and that Northstowe residents could be directly involved in shaping the community hub to be provided by 4,200 homes altogether.

Picking up the suggestion from Longstanton Parish Council, Councillor Riley, seconded by Councillor de Lacey, proposed that the sum of £1.5 million be added to the Section 106 Agreement to pay for the upgrade of community facilities in Longstanton. The Planning and New Communities Director commented that this would require cuts elsewhere in the Section 106 Agreement or would increase the gap between the level of funding provided and the cost of requirements. Councillor Wright reiterated that it had been made clear that £73 million was the limit for financial contributions under the Section 106 Agreement for Phase 2.

The Planning Lawyer said that South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council considered the planning obligations outlined in Appendix 2 to the report to be essential. It would be inappropriate therefore to delete an item from that list, or reduce financial requirements. Funding for facilities in Longstanton was not material to the Phase 2 application. The Planning Lawyer said Members could seek to increase the financial contribution being offered by the HCA, refuse the application should the HCA not increase its contribution, and then defend their decision at an Appeal. However, the Planning Lawyer's advice to the Committee was not to refuse the Phase 2 application on that ground.

Councillor Jenkins said he was picking up anxiety among the existing community that community facilities would not be delivered early enough in the new development. The Head of Growth and Economy explained, again, that the Phase 1 community facility would be ready for Phase 2 residents to use. Additional community facilities would be temporarily located in schools until their permanent buildings were open. Councillor Jenkins welcomed this approach. The Business Manager (Growth and Development) said the Primary School on Phase 1 was due to be open in time for the first occupations on site, and would be available for community use. The community would use spare classrooms until the school required them, whereupon community use would transfer to the proposed community centre.

The Vice-Chairman said he was not unsympathetic to Longstanton's plight, and offered to discuss the matter further, in another forum, with Longstanton Parish Council, Councillors Riley and Hudson (the local Members), and Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council officers. Following this discussion, Councillor Riley and

Councillor de Lacey withdrew their proposal.

Councillor Wright paid tribute to the impressive effort made by officers and the HCA, and moved the recommendation. He was particularly pleased with the way in which issues of concern to Swavesey Internal Drainage Board and the burial ground question had been resolved during the meeting. His proposal was seconded by Councillor Ian Bates.

Councillor de Lacey expressed disappointment that funding was being cut back to such an extent that Northstowe was no longer going to be exemplar. He could not even be sure that Northstowe would be viable for those people living there.

Councillor Smith and Councillor Harford, in conjunction with the Planning Lawyer, clarified the wording of the three reviews of the affordable housing proportion.

With one vote against and one abstention, the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee

1. **Approved** the wording of proposed Planning Conditions included in Appendix 4 of this report from the Planning and New Communities Director, subject to detailed drafting by officers
2. **Approved**
  - (i) the essential Section 106 items (including contingency) as set out in Appendix 2 of the report totalling £75,533,681 and with Public Open Space maintenance sum to be calculated dependent upon the agreed housing mix, and the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) contributing £73 million of such sum; and
  - (ii) 20% affordable housing with reviews of the affordable housing percentage taking place
    - at the expiry of 3 years from the date of the grant of the outline planning permission if substantive development has not commenced within such period
    - prior to occupation of the 1,750<sup>th</sup> residential unit at Phase 2
    - during the period commencing with the occupation of the 2,500<sup>th</sup> residential unit and before the occupation of the 3,000<sup>th</sup> residential unit at Phase 2

in order to make acceptable in planning terms what would otherwise be unacceptable, and authorised officers to complete a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with the Homes and Communities Agency, and on this basis grant

- (a) Outline planning permission for the development of Phase 2 of Northstowe with details of scale, appearance, landscaping, layout and access reserved subject to the set of conditions as in (1) above; and
  - (b) Full planning permission for the Southern Access Road (West) subject to the set of conditions as in (1) above.
3. **Noted** that any savings achieved against particular items within the Section 106 Agreement would be re-apportioned within the overall envelope of requirements.

**7. DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS**

Members noted that the next two Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee meetings had been scheduled for Wednesday 26 August 2015 and Wednesday 30 September 2015. The Chairman commented that the August meeting was unlikely to go ahead, but asked Members to keep it in their diaries for the time being.

---

**The Meeting ended at 4.30 p.m.**

---