

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Cambridge East Member Reference Group held on
Friday, 4 November 2005

Councillors: Dr DR Bard, Mrs CA Hunt, Mrs HM Smith, Ms J Bailey (Cambridge City Council),
B Bradnack (Cambridge City Council), J Durrant (Cambridge City Council),
Ms S Reid (Cambridge City Council) and N Harrison (Cambridgeshire County
Council)

Officers:	Kathy Baldwin	Sustainable Communities Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council
	David Roberts	Planning Policy Manager, Cambridge City Council
	David Hussell	Development Services Director
	Caroline Hunt	Principal Planning Policy Officer
	Frances Fry	Senior Planning Assistant

and John Onslow (Director for Development, Infrastructure Partnership).

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

On the proposal of Councillor Ms J Bailey and Seconded by Councillor Mrs CA Hunt, it
was
RESOLVED that Councillor Dr DR Bard be elected Chairman of this meeting.

2. INTRODUCTIONS AND APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Mrs SJO Doggett South Cambridgeshire District
Council, Councillor Dr JPR Orme South Cambridgeshire County Council, Councillor J
Reynolds Cambridgeshire County Council and Councillor R Turner Cambridgeshire
County Council.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5 April 2005 were agreed as a correct record.

5. CAMBRIDGE EAST AREA ACTION PLAN: PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS AND PROPOSED CHANGES

The Principal Planning Policy Officer SCDC introduced the report 'Cambridge East Area
Action Plan: Pre-Submission Draft Response to Representations and Proposed Changes',
reminding the meeting that the purpose of the report was to advise Members of the
representations and proposed responses to the Pre-Submission draft Area Action Plan
(AAP) and to consider the proposed changes to the draft AAP for submission to the
Secretary of State.

Around 450 representations had been received during the Pre-Submission public
participation period. Of these about 30% were in support; the others were mainly
refinements. It was noted that at the earlier preferred options stage, representations were
much higher.

Key Issues for Consideration were summarised in Paragraphs 10 and 11.

Paragraph 10 detailed some of the main changes recommended by Officers arising from the representations to the Draft Area Action Plan as follows:

1. Marshall proposed that the AAP facilitated the relocation of the car showrooms to the eastern end of the development north of Newmarket Road. The response highlighted that this was a significant change to the representations made by the Company at the preferred options stage but proposed a change to the supporting text which indicated that relocation elsewhere in the site could be an option to be considered in the Masterplanning of the development.
2. A new standard for Strategic Open Space had been included in the response to a representation from the County Council, in order to maintain consistency.
3. The requirement for a single body to manage watercourses had been amended to set the requirements for any body or bodies, such as the need for public accountability and sufficient powers, funding, resources, expertise and integrated management to be secured by legal agreement.
4. It had been reluctantly recommended that the requirement for 25% water conservation measures should be deleted from the Policy in response to a GO-East representation that such measures lay outside the scope of the planning system. However it had been decided that the policy should be retained with the final decision left to the Inspector, as it was such an important issue and that only the specific target should be deleted. In response to a question from a Member who asked if the water concentration would be enough to cope with sewerage, it was agreed that Paragraph D12.2.5 (Water Conservation) would read 'All development in Cambridge East will incorporate water conservation measures including water saving devices, rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling, whilst managing the recycling of water to ensure no adverse impact on the water environment and biodiversity'.
5. The scope of the energy conservation policy had been amended to delete aspects, which GO-East advised were outside the scope of the planning system. These referred to insulation and room layout in buildings. References to 'internal' and 'and the use of improved insulation' had been removed from POLICY CE/28 Energy, Energy Efficiency paragraph 1, and Paragraph D14.4.
6. Two new paragraphs had been introduced which placed a stronger emphasis on the monitoring and delivery of developments. Chapter E3 (delivery of the AAP) included a housing trajectory, a requirement of the new plan making system, which predicted the delivery of the development in broad terms. It was noted that the trajectory at paragraph E3.13 had been prepared with regard to a number of factors including the landowners stated intentions in terms of submitting planning applications and a reasonable build rate for the development, agreed with the landowner/developer.

It was noted that there was potential for development of the land North of Cherry Hinton to be brought forward before the airport relocated, although for this to happen, there would have to be certainty that the airport would relocate.

No completions were projected to take place on Cambridge Airport itself by 2016, although it remained a priority for development should it become available within that period. Marshall had suggested that houses might be viable on the site during 2015/16.

In response to a Members question regarding the practical implication of the trajectory, the Principal Planning Policy Officer informed the meeting that it's inclusion was in compliance with a government directive. However, the

assumptions were heavily caveated as there were many issues that could potentially impact on delivery which were well beyond the control of the local planning authority or the developers. The trajectory was a not a plan but a projection, and the annual monitoring report would identify and report on any problems around delivery.

Paragraph 11 listed some of the main themes of representation where no changes were proposed. The meeting commented on some themes as follows:

Affordable Housing

- The affordable housing target (of 50%) had been challenged as being unviable; concerns had also been expressed about the social structure of the development. The response clarified the high level of housing need in the Cambridge area and the wide range of tenure mix included within affordable housing. GO East had concluded that the concerns had not been justified in detail. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (SCDC) informed the meeting that work was underway on an Affordable Housing toolkit. Information would be entered into the toolkit jointly with the developers at the planning stage, when it would assist with the issue of viability and the determination of appropriate affordable housing provision.
- The need to keep all options open was highlighted. The Director of Development Services SCDC stated that whilst the provision of affordable housing was policy driven, it was up to the Developers to show why the target was not viable.

Transport

- Various questions surrounding the transport provisions for the development had been raised. The responses highlighted the role of the emerging Long Term Transport Strategy (LLTS) and the current Cambridge East Transport Strategy work that had been commissioned to work up the transport issues at Cambridge East. The Planning Policy Manager Cambridge City Council stated that there was no reason to believe that these initiatives would not support the long-term requirements for the AAP.
 - It was suggested that this Group meet to discuss the Transport Strategy before public examination commenced. The Sustainable Communities Manager Cambridgeshire County Council informed the meeting that it was anticipated that the Consultants working on the Transport Strategy would consult with local Members during December/January and the results fed into the strategy. No final decisions on dates and process had been taken yet as the Consultants were looking at the work resulting from the stakeholder meeting earlier in the year, in order to prevent repetition of work already carried out. However, the interest of this Group would be reported back to Group responsible for the Transport Strategy.
 - It was agreed that there must be a firm timetable for consultation. The LLTS, which would inform the Cambridge East policy, was due to be completed by the end of 2005. Therefore it was suggested that a meeting be held during December/January to allow Members to report their concerns to the Consultants. It was expected the Consultants would report back during May/June 2006.
 - **Post meeting Note:** The Consultants will be asked to participate in a Transport Workshop, to which Members of this Group and other Members interested in transport issues would be invited to participate. The date will be promulgated in due course, but is likely to be early 2006.
- Action: Kathy Baldwin/Carol Tyrrell**
- Marshall sought the inclusion of an additional access to Airport Way to the north Teversham; the County Council suggested that such a link could not be ruled out. The response stated that local planning authorities could not support this proposal without proper justification because of concerns at the impacts on Teversham

village and the impacts on separating the development from the proposed country park. Objections raised by both Marshall and Teversham Parish Council were not accepted; it was noted that the transport strategies in preparation would address the issue raised, which would be a matter at the public examination.

Waste

- The County Council had proposed that a major waste management facility be provided on Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road. The response highlighted that this was a matter for the emerging Minerals and Waste LDF and refuted the suitability of Phase 1 for this type and scale of waste facility.
- The Sustainable Communities Manager Cambridgeshire County Council informed the Meeting that the main driver for the proposal was Waste Local Plan. The main policy of the plan stated the requirement for waste management provision within major development areas in the Cambridge sub-region. Waste Management was moving away from landfill sites with limited options, to recycling with plants where waste was treated and sorted situated in close proximity to where people lived.
- Guidance on what form facilities should take was awaited but they would be different to those currently in use.
- In response to concerns raised, the Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that it was not within the remit of the local Planning Authorities to include waste policy within the LDF. They were uncomfortable about including any wording within the AAP to suggest that land North of Newmarket Road was suitable for a major waste management site; instead this should come through the Mineral and Waste LDF.
- It was also noted that the response was in regard to land north of Newmarket Road only, and the intention had been to stress that the Waste Local Plan made the waste policy, not the area LDFs.
- Some Members were dismayed at the negativity of the response, which they believed to be too strong. They also stated that no possibilities concerning waste management should be excluded at this stage.
- It was agreed that the local Planning Authorities would produce a revised response that would be presented to upcoming Cambridge East LDF meetings.

Action: Caroline Hunt (SCDC) and David Roberts (Cambridge City Council).

Conclusion

Members endorsed the representations and responses to the Pre-Submission draft Area Action Plan (AAP) and the proposed changes to the draft AAP (subject to amendments as above) for consideration by the two Councils for Submission to the Secretary of State. These would be recommended to the subsequent meetings of the two Councils.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

The Meeting ended at 12.05 p.m.
