

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a special meeting of the Council held on
Tuesday, 22 November 2005 at 9.30 a.m.

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

Councillors: Dr DR Bard, RE Barrett, RF Bryant, SM Edwards, Mrs A Elsby, R Hall,
Mrs SA Hatton, Mrs JM Healey, Mrs CA Hunt, Mrs HF Kember,
SGM Kindersley, RB Martlew, Dr JPR Orme, NJ Scarr, Mrs GJ Smith,
Mrs HM Smith, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, RT Summerfield and Dr JR Williamson

Officers: Caroline Hunt Principal Planning Policy Officer
Keith Miles Planning Policy Manager

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors BR Burling, Mrs PS Corney,
Mrs SJO Doggett, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs EM Heazell, JA Hockney, MP Howell, HC Hurrell,
RMA Manning, MJ Mason, DC McCraith, JA Quinlan, A Riley, RJ Turner, Dr SEK van de Ven,
Mrs BE Waters, DALG Wherrell, JF Williams and NIC Wright.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor SGM Kindersley declared a personal interest as an elected County Councillor,
Cambridgeshire County Council.

2. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: CAMBRIDGE EAST AREA ACTION PLAN: PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS AND PROPOSED CHANGES

The Principal Planning Policy Officer asked members to note that that the Cambridge
East Area Action Plan (AAP) had been prepared jointly with Cambridge City Council.
Because of this, targets and policy standards had been listed within the AAP rather than
reference made to the Core Strategy DPD and Development Control Policies DPD, to
provide a consistent approach across the boundaries between Cambridge City and the
South Cambridgeshire District.

The Cambridge East AAP would need to be approved by both Cambridge City Council
and South Cambridgeshire District Council. To assist with this process, the Cambridge
East Member Reference Group (CEMRG) had been established. Comprising members
and officers from the City, District and County, its aim was to obtain consensus on
issues. The CEMRG had met on 4 November 2005 and considered the schedule of
response to representations and the draft AAP with changes incorporated. The CEMRG
had endorsed the majority of responses to representations and proposed changes.
There were 2 issues where the CEMRG had recommended changes to Cambridge City
and South Cambridgeshire District Councils. These were Water Conservation and
Waste. Both would be dealt with during the meeting.

At a meeting on 8th November 2005, Cambridge City Council Environment & Scrutiny
Committee agreed the documents (subject to the CEMRG proposed changes).
Cambridge City Council would consider the draft AAP and any issues raised at this
meeting today on 8th December 2005. SCDC would consider the draft AAP together with
any issues raised by the City on the 9th December 2005. It was anticipated that these
Council meetings would result in a joint agreement to be taken forward.

Around 450 representations to the Cambridge East AAP had been received during the Pre-Submission public participation period. This was less than a third of the number received at the Preferred Options Stage. Of these, approaching 30% were in support. This was quite different from the level of representations for each of the Preferred Options stage, which numbered 1515, a significant number of which were objections to any proposal to relocate Marshall Airport to Duxford. That option had since been ruled out.

Appendix A – Responses To Representations

Appendix B – South Cambridgeshire LDF – Submission Draft Cambridge East Area Action Plan

Appendices A and B were considered concurrently. Key points raised during discussion, and additional changes to those highlighted in the draft submission are noted below.

A – Introduction

B – Vision and Development Principles

The Principal Planning Policy Officer noted that a representation queried the ability to deliver the number of dwellings stated by 2016, due to potential delays in release of land and uncertainty about the feasibility of relocating the airport. The response was that notwithstanding progress on airport relocation, the only parts of Cambridge East assumed by the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy DPD to come forward by 2016 were Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road and the land north of Cherry Hinton; neither Council was relying on Cambridge Airport yielding dwellings by 2016.

In response to a representation concerning the high number of dwellings, the Principal Planning Policy Officer noted that the indicative capacity was 10-12,000 dwellings and that there were policies about density and infrastructure to ensure the community was sustainable and would be developed following a design-led approach.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer noted that it was not appropriate to refer to specific projects such as the Bridge of Reeds in the development principles section, particularly where they were outside the scope of the development and not yet firmly agreed schemes. The Bridge of Reeds and its relationship with the new urban quarter was addressed at paragraph D11.26 and its role in linking with the Wicken Fen vision in Policy CE/25.

Policy CE/2 Development Principles

13. The words 'well used' to be reconsidered to reflect that the AAP can't require footpaths and cycleways to be well used.

28. 'Health facilities' had been added. 'Education' which had been deleted in error would be reinstated.

It was noted that all the area reports would be looked at before submission to ensure that the wording of same principals was consistent.

Council **AGREED Chapter A** – Introduction and **Chapter B** – Vision and Development Principles.

C – The Site and Its Setting

The Principal Planning Policy Officer noted that Marshall now proposed to relocate the

car showrooms to the western end of the undeveloped frontage, to help provide a suitable environment in the longer term for the Phase 1 development.

Paragraph C1.9 – at the end of the paragraph, the words ‘or their relocation to an alternative accessible location within the Cambridge East development’ would be added.

Paragraph C1.15 would be reworded to highlight the potential relocation.

It was noted that the desired retention of the mature trees located on roadside verges by the current car showroom was captured under Section D8 CE/16 point g which would be revised to say ‘existing tree and hedge resources *both within and* as a setting for the development’. The supporting text would be amended to mention specifically the trees that formed the avenue near the car showrooms.

Paragraph C2 Point 6 Green Corridor. Councillor Mrs CA Hunt noted that she assumed the road crossings would run from North to south; any road running east/west would severely impact on the Green Corridor and the Green Separation with Teversham Village on Airport Way. The Planning Policy Manager agreed but cautioned keeping options for public transport open until the long-term transport strategy and the detailed transport plan for Cambridge East had been published. The Principal Planning Policy Officer advised that crossings would be sensitively designed to reduce visual impact; the detailed work on transport for Cambridge East would be looking at the links between the development areas across Newmarket Road.

It was suggested that there should be limited tunnelling due to public safety issues.

C4 – Green Separation from Teversham. Teversham Parish Council had objected to the 200m Green Separation as inadequate. The Planning Policy Manager informed the meeting that there was a requirement to ensure there should be as much development as viable on future land releases, otherwise future development would encroach further into the South Cambs area. Councillor Mrs CA Hunt stated her support for Teversham Parish Council on the green separation issue, noting that the Foxgloves Estate would have no protection. The Planning Policy Manager responded that most of Teversham village would have separation in excess of 200m and that the Foxgloves Estate lay within the built up area of Cambridge, although it lay within Teversham Parish. It would be made clear that the Green Separation with Teversham Village should not be fragmented or otherwise adversely affected.

Paragraph C4.3. It was noted that the width of 200m proposed in the work for the Northstowe AAP had been arrived at after considering the factors when looking at green separation for Fen Ditton and that this connection would be made explicit.

Council **AGREED Chapter C** – The Site and Its Setting.

D – The Urban Quarter at Cambridge East

D2 – The District Centre

It was noted that the amendment to paragraph D2.8 ‘Opportunities for shared use of car parking in the District Centre should be explored with applicants for planning permission for buildings and uses which include proposals for car parking ‘ would be considered under demand management.

The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that no decision had been made on the principle of congestion charges within Cambridge City Centre and any implications had not yet been considered for the large District Centre. These would be considered later in the process.

It was suggested that anything considered for the City Centre should also be applied to the District Centre, as there were considerable implications for such issues as access.

D3 – Local Centres

Council was asked to note the proposed revision to the number of Primary Schools at paragraph D3.1 (5 to 6 instead of 6 to 7).

D4 Housing

Policy CE/10 Cambridge East Housing. Affordable Housing Paragraph 6. It was agreed that this should be amended as follows: 1st sentence, insert full stop after 'need. 2nd sentence to read 'Affordable Housing within the development must be available over the long term'.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that whilst all properties would not be built as 'Lifetime' homes, developers would be encouraged to provide a certain percentage (to be agreed later in the process).

Internal plans for properties (for Lifetime Homes requirements) would be considered thorough building regulations at the appropriate planning stage, but were not for consideration at this stage of the LDF process.

D5 – Employment

Objective D5/a

Members were referred to Representation 10909, made by Cambridgeshire County Council. The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that concern had been raised at the CEMRG about the proposed officer response to the objection from the County Council concerning waste. The concern had been that the response could be interpreted as giving a negative view on the principle of whether major waste management facilities would be appropriate in Cambridge East as a whole, and may also give too much comfort to the developers of other urban extensions to resist waste management proposals. Officers clarified that the response sought to explain that there were no suitable land use allocations at Cambridge East where a district level AAP could reasonably make reference to waste matters, and that identifying any suitable site would be a matter for the Minerals and Waste LDF being prepared by the County Council as waste planning authority.

It was proposed that the response be amended as follows:

2nd paragraph. Add final sentence ' There is no equivalent general employment area proposed at Cambridge East as most of the employment will be located within the district centre or the local centres as part of high density, mixed use developments'.

The 3rd paragraph should be deleted in total.

D5/a – it was **AGREED** to remove the word 'some' from the proposed amendment.

D5/b – it was confirmed that this would be amended to reflect the wording contained in the Northstowe AAP.

D6 Community Facilities, Leisure, Arts and Culture including Community Development

CE/12 – Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Arts and Culture

Representation 9541 – Objection to the proposed development of Cambridge East on the Cambridge Airport site. It was **AGREED** to split the first sentence of the final paragraph of the response as follows: 'Finally, the provision of health care is taken into account in this AAP. In terms of Addenbrooke's ... (remainder as written)'

D7 – Transport.

Paragraph D7.35, final sentence. It was **AGREED** that the words ‘and allotments’ should be removed and the sentence amended to read ‘The development will be linked to the Jubilee Cycle Road and the Cemetery’.

Appendix 1 – Car Parking Standards

Members raised concern about car parking design and allocation, particularly in regard to the statement that garages would be counted as parking spaces. It was noted that residents frequently used garages for storage and any additional reduction in allocated spaces would cause considerable parking problems within residential areas.

Council was informed that this would be a matter of consideration through the master planning and planning application process; additional wording on the design of car parking would be brought to the LDF Submission Special Council meeting on 9 December 2005.

D11 Meeting Recreational Needs**CE/24 Public Open Space and Sports Provision.**

Paragraph 7m. The distance of 60m had been deleted and replaced with 100m. Members had asked for this to be reconsidered in relation to the Northstowe AAP and it would be brought back to the 9 December 2005 Council meeting.

D12 An Integrated Water Strategy.

Council was informed that it had been the intention of Officers to delete paragraph 5 of Policy CE/26: Land Drainage, Water Conservation, Foul Drainage & Sewage Disposal in response to an objection from GO-East. However, Officers had reconsidered and felt that it would be appropriate to retain the principle of requiring water conservation in view of the importance of this issue to achieving sustainable development, whilst deleting the specific target in response to GO-East’s representation. There it was proposed to reinstate parts of Paragraph 5; this was endorsed by the CEMRG. It was **AGREED** that Paragraph 5 should be amended to read as follows:

‘5. All development in Cambridge East will incorporate water conservation measures including water saving devices, rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling whilst managing the recycling of water, to ensure no adverse impact on the water environment and biodiversity.’

A consequent change was necessary to Paragraph D12.11 of the AAP in Appendix B. It was **AGREED** that the last sentence be amended to read:

‘...This important issue should be considered as part of the Cambridge East proposals.’

CE/26 Paragraph 4, first sentence. It was **AGREED** that the words ‘be occupied’ should be deleted and replaced with ‘commence’.

Subject to the amendments above, Council **AGREED Chapter D – The Urban Quarter at Cambridge East.**

Council **AGREED Chapter E – Delivering Cambridge East.**

Council **NOTED** the **Glossary of Terms.**

Council **NOTED** the Index of Representors at **Appendix C.**

Council **AGREED** the following recommendations as listed in the LDF: Cambridge East

AAP: Pre-submission draft response to representations and proposed changes:

1. **AGREED** the responses to representations to the Pre-Submission draft Cambridge East Area Action Plan (AAP) as contained in Appendix A
2. **AGREED** the proposed changes to the draft AAP as contained in Appendix A and incorporated into Appendix B (with additional changes as noted above) and that it be **SUBMITTED** to the Secretary of state in January 2006.
3. **DELEGATED** further minor editing changes to the DPDs to the Planning Portfolio Holder where they involved matters of policy and to the Development Services Director where they were technical matters.

The Meeting ended at 12.45 p.m.
