

Northstowe Area Action Plan – Issues to be brought back to Council

Relates to Agenda Item 4 / Appendix B of report to Council meeting 18 November 2005

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
266	NS/6 (4)	Council was minded to extend the village framework to include St Michael's Mount and identify the grounds as a PVAA. Officers were asked to consult with the Parish Council and report back to Council on 9 December.	<p>The Parish Council does not formally meet until 12th December but the Parish Councillor responsible for liaison on Northstowe has consulted his fellow councillors and advises that the Parish Council is expected to endorse the proposed extension of the Village Framework and PVAA designation.</p> <p>The following amendments are recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Amend the Village Framework to include St Michael's Mount and identify the grounds as a Protected Village Amenity Area, as shown on the map in Agenda Item 8. (2) Delete the first sentence of Policy NS/6 (4) which will now read: "The landscape character of a series of paddocks and small copses will be maintained and enhanced adjoining St Michael's Mount. (3) Delete the first sentence of paragraph C4.5 and amend the second sentence to read: "That part of the Green Separation which lies within Oakington Airfield will be landscaped as a series of paddocks and hedgerows as is typical of the setting of Longstanton St Michael's."

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
276	NS/8 (1b)	<p>Members were minded to amend clause to say that the town centre should be located at least 200m to the east of Rampton Drift and no further south than buildings at Oakington Barracks. Officers to consider implications and bring back proposal to Council on 9 December.</p>	<p>Amend policy NS/8 (1) (b) concerning the location of the town centre to read:</p> <p>“Within rather than on the edge of Northstowe and at least 200 metres to the east of Rampton Drift.”</p> <p>The reasons for recommending this change and not to recommend that change concerning the southernmost buildings at Oakington Barracks are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Locating the town centre no closer than 200 metres to Rampton Drift would still ensure that the town centre could be located in a relatively central location within the proposed new town site. It would also allow for landscaping on the edge of Rampton Drift and some intervening uses within the town to mitigate the impact of town centre uses/activity on the residents of Rampton Drift. (2) Locating the town centre no closer to Oakington than the southernmost building at the existing Barracks/Airfield complex would mean that the town centre would be 900 metres from the nearest house at Church View in Oakington and over a kilometre from the main body of the village. In addition to the green separation on the edge of Oakington which already includes a substantial tree belt, there would be approximately 700 metres of other intervening new town development. It is therefore unlikely that any of the town centre would be visible from any part of Oakington. In any event, the proposed site of Northstowe as a whole is only visible from less than 50 properties on the northern edge of the village which screen the site from the rest of Oakington. Restricting the location of the town centre in this way

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
			<p>does not appear to serve any planning purpose.</p> <p>(3) The requirement in policy NS/8 for a location close to the geographical centre of the town will ensure that the town centre is located well away from Oakington.</p>
304	NS/13 (2)	<p>Council agreed that officers develop a form of words to ensure that the AAP makes clear that specific requirements will be needed on the A14 for certain levels of Northstowe development to come forward. The reference to “appropriate” improvements would be revised to “necessary”.</p>	<p>On further consideration a revised wording is proposed to provide clarification on what is required in relation to the A14.</p> <p>Amend policy NS/13 (2) to read:</p> <p>“Planning permission for Northstowe will be subject to conditions requiring that sufficient highway capacity is available in the A14 corridor between Bar Hill and Cambridge throughout the development of Northstowe for the traffic forecast to be generated by each phase of new town development and ultimately for 8,000 dwellings. Such conditions (which may include ‘Grampian’ style conditions) will link the start and phased development of the new town to the opening of any necessary improvements to the A14 corridor. The improvements that will be necessary for each phase of development will be identified once the A14 improvement scheme has been agreed by Government.”</p>
330	NS/22 (8n)	<p>Members asked for the proposed change to the access standard to Local Areas of Play (LAPs) from 60m to 100m to be brought back to Council on 9 December with further explanation for the change.</p>	<p>Early joint working with the South Cambridgeshire Community Services team on a Recreation and Community SPD for the district has been undertaken to examine delivery of play spaces. It has become apparent that the 60m requirement would result in a large number of individual small LAPs. The slightly higher distance threshold proposed would provide the same amount of recreation space overall but in the form of slightly fewer but larger, more usable areas, and have consequential benefits for future management and maintenance,</p>

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
			whist the impact on accessibility is limited.
341	NS/24 (e)	The local Member advocated a preferred approach to drainage at Oakington of a two pronged attack with balancing ponds and drainage ditch bypassing the village. In addition, a pipe rather than a channel is potentially preferred because of the anticipated size of such a channel and the environmental impact it would have on the area of Green Separation.	<p>The proposed wording agreed by the local member would read:</p> <p>"e. A new channel or underground pipe between Oakington and Northstowe which will divert flood water away from Oakington Brook and Oakington village."</p> <p>Paragraph D12.5 will also need to be changed to include reference to a pipe. Replace the last sentence with the following as Council appears to have decided that it wants this channel/pipe regardless of the findings of the Environment Agency.</p> <p>"Should the environmental impact of such a channel prove unacceptable because of the depth and width of the cut through green separation, an underground pipe will be required."</p>
341	NS/24 (7) (i)	Members questioned why, in connection with the managing organisation for management and maintenance of watercourses, which will be funded "in perpetuity", it was proposed to delete the clause "at the cost of the development".	<p>Retain the reference in policy NS/27 (7) (i) to funding in perpetuity "at the cost of the development".</p> <p>This proposed change appears to be a mistake as there is no linking reference in the consideration of objections in the Appendix A papers. Indeed, the new Planning Obligations Circular (05/2005) makes it clear that maintenance costs may be required in perpetuity when the obligation relates to facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development.</p>