

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning and New Communities Joint Portfolio Holders' Meeting held  
on  
Thursday, 10 December 2009 at 2.00 p.m.

Portfolio Holders: David Bard, Tom Bygott, Sue Ellington and Nick Wright

**Councillors in attendance:**

Scrutiny and Overview Committee monitors: Val Barrett and Mike Mason

Opposition spokesmen: Trisha Bear, Anthony Berent and Hazel Smith

Also in attendance: Douglas de Lacey

**Officers:**

David Bevan	Conservation Manager
Jonathan Dixon	Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport)
Greg Kearney	Environmental Health Officer (Planning Specialist)
Pat Matthews	Drainage Manager
Keith Miles	Planning Policy Manager
Jennifer Nuttycombe	Planning Policy Officer
Ian Senior	Democratic Services Officer
Susan Walford	Health Protection Team Leader

### **43. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Douglas de Lacey declared a personal interest as a resident of Girton affected by the A14 proposals.

Councillor Nick Wright declared a personal and prejudicial interest as the owner of Marshalls Farm, Conington.

### **44. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The New Communities Portfolio Holder agreed that the minutes of the Special meeting held on 5 November 2009 were a correct record, and signed them accordingly.

### **45. A14 ELLINGTON TO FEN DITTON IMPROVEMENT SCHEME - RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT ORDERS**

The Planning Portfolio Holder and New Communities Portfolio Holder considered a report setting out a proposed response to the Highways Agency on the draft Orders for the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement Scheme.

In connection with paragraph 20, Councillor Mike Mason sought clarification about how Minerals and Waste extraction would be dealt with. In reply, the Planning Policy Manager explained that the draft Orders made by the Highways Agency did not address such extraction and that instead, Cambridgeshire County Council, as the appropriate Authority, would consider planning applications as and when submitted.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder referred to paragraph 24, and emphasised the importance of the A14 improvement scheme to the future development and prosperity of South Cambridgeshire.

In connection with paragraph 29 (Construction traffic), Councillor Mason urged the Portfolio Holder to convey to the Highways Agency the concern that South Cambridgeshire District Council and parish councils along the route should be included in the preparation of a "construction management plan". Councillor Sue Ellington sought an assurance that, during construction, the Highways Agency would implement measures aimed at "discouraging unnecessary traffic" through local villages.

In connection with paragraphs 32 to 38 (Route alignment), the New Communities Portfolio Holder said that, in the interests of sustainability, the distance covered in transporting materials to the construction site should be kept to a minimum. Paragraph 33 related to Conington. By virtue of paragraph 12(2) of the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor Nick Wright (who had previously declared a personal and prejudicial interest) addressed those present, both as Planning Portfolio Holder and local Member. While accepting the improvements in principle, he noted that the A14 would be closer to Conington as a result. He said that public money should be spent effectively, especially in dealing with the question of local flooding. Councillor Wright left the room during the discussion surrounding paragraph 33, which included a contribution from Lynda Minshull, Chairman of Conington Parish Meeting. Mrs Minshull endorsed what Councillor Wright had said, and regretted the adverse impact the A14 improvements would have on the quality of life of those living in Conington. It would also be necessary to divert Public Footpath 1 (Conington). Councillor Mark Howell, the other local Member, had not been able to attend the meeting but had made it known that he endorsed the objections raised by both the Parish of Conington and by Councillor Wright. Officers informed those present that the increase in noise levels as a result of moving the A14 closer to Conington was negligible, and within acceptable limits. The New Communities Portfolio Holder noted the concerns expressed, and reminded Conington Parish Meeting that it would be entitled to make its own representations, should there be a need for a public inquiry.

Councillor Nick Wright was invited back into the room.

At paragraph 39 (Fen Drayton and Trinity Foot), Swavesey Parish Council had expressed concern at the implications for those working at Buckingham Business Park of the proposed junction arrangements. In response to Councillor Ellington's suggestion that the Highways Agency consider the need for a footbridge between the Business Park and Cambridge Services, the Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) questioned the cost benefit, but agreed to explore the idea with the Highways Agency.

In connection with paragraphs 41 to 46 (Girton Interchange), the New Communities Portfolio Holder agreed reluctantly that, given evidence from the Highways Agency, the District Council could not justify continued pressure for an all movement interchange at Girton.

In connection with paragraphs 47 to 53 (Cambridge Northern Bypass), Councillor Mike Mason regretted the detriment that would be caused to local roads. Councillor Douglas de Lacey said that the traffic generation model adopted by the Highways Agency should be examined to establish its compliance with the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework.

In connection with paragraphs 54 to 56 (NIAB Extra), Councillor de Lacey questioned the quality and robustness of the proposed noise barrier design. Councillor Mason was concerned that the officer recommendation of reserving the Council's position was not strong enough. Instead, he said the Council should object on the basis of inappropriate noise barrier design. In response, the Planning Policy Manager said that this was properly an issue for consideration at the detailed design stage. The Interim Environmental Services Portfolio Holder said that an innovative approach was needed in order to address

the issues of noise from the A14 and urbanisation of the countryside.

In connection with paragraphs 57 and 58 (Blackwell Travellers Site), the New Communities Portfolio Holder agreed that noise barriers should be built to the highest possible international standards.

In connection with paragraph 59 (Milton Country Park), Councillor Hazel Smith accepted the Highways Agency's reasons for not installing noise barriers, but argued that some kind of noise mitigation was needed for those enjoying the Country Park: bunding and extra landscaping might be sufficient. In addition, care would be needed in designing an appropriately sympathetic bridge across the River Cam.

At paragraphs 64 to 68 (Assessment of likely impacts), Councillor Mason asked the New Communities Portfolio Holder to make sure that South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council had a unified approach to the question of improving air quality along the A14 corridor.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder accepted paragraphs 69 to 126 (Noise and vibration) subject to the first part of the recommendation being revised so as to read, " No objection to the Scheme on the grounds of noise impact providing *that adequate* mitigation measures are fully implemented and maintained...".

In connection with paragraphs 127 to 132 (Drainage), Councillor Mason noted the anticipated impact on the Council's Awarded Watercourses and, in particular, on no. 164 at Histon.

In connection with paragraphs 137 to 145 (Landscape and Cultural Heritage), Councillor Bygott sought to promote greater tranquillity in the countryside by introducing more screening of the A14.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder **resolved**

1. that the Highways Agency be informed that South Cambridgeshire District Council
  - a) **supports** the A14 improvement scheme in principle. However, there may be matters of detail, or alternative proposals, that could prompt it into making representations at the public inquiry, particularly as Local Planning Authority and Local Environmental Health Authority. Such details could include treatments or designs intended to address the impact on existing or planned development, noise mitigation, air quality, landscape, ecology, drainage issues and so on. The Council **reserves the right** to make such representations should it be necessary in the light of submissions yet to be made by other parties and assessed by South Cambridgeshire District Council.
  - b) **urges** the delivery of the scheme as soon as possible. The improvements are necessary in order to deliver the Growth Agenda, and improve journey times and road safety for the travelling public.
  - c) **urges** the Highways Agency to work with Cambridgeshire County Council (as Local Highways Authority), South Cambridgeshire District Council and those parish councils along the route, in preparing a construction management plan and minimise general traffic rat-running through villages during the A14 improvement works.
  - d) **seeks commitment** from the Highways Agency to engage and consult with the

local authority on the detailed design stage of the whole route, in particular regarding the following issues:

- a. Barriers and other mitigation measures and their installation.
  - b. Construction Environmental Management Plan.
  - c. Construction Noise & Vibration Management Plan to agree noise and vibration mitigation measures.
  - d. Landscape measures, including schemes for off-site planting.
  - e. Ecology Matters
- e) **Urges** the Highways Agency to explore opportunities for the recycling of waste materials from the Northstowe development site.
- f) **supports** the revised route alignment to the north of Conington, which increases the separation between the village and the new A14.
- g) **supports** the provision of an A1198 junction with west-facing slips and emergency only east-facing slips.
- h) **supports** the revised junction arrangement at Fen Drayton and Trinity Foot allowing direct access to the Cambridge Services from both the A14 and Local Access Road, and **urges** the Highways Agency to consider the need for a footbridge allowing direct pedestrian access between Buckingham Business Park and Cambridge Services.
- i) **supports** the retention of the existing over bridge at the Bar Hill junction as a segregated route for non-motorised users.
- j) **accepts** that an all movement interchange at Girton is not currently justified, given the evidence provided by the Highways Agency.
- k) **requests** public scrutiny of the Highway Agency's modelling data to make sure that it complies with the Council's Local Development Framework and, in particular, revisions to allocations for development.
- l) **reserves its position** and **seeks commitment** from the Highways Agency to include it in discussions at detailed design stage to make sure that noise attenuation barriers at Orchard Park are provided to the highest international standards.
- m) **supports** and **seeks commitment** from the Highways Agency to include it in discussions at detailed design stage and provide, to the highest international standards, a noise attenuation barrier adjacent to the Blackwell Traveller Site, as well as additional planting there, which should improve the environment of the site.
- n) **accepts** that the forecast changes in air quality will mean that national air quality objectives would be met. As part of its duties in Local Air Quality Management (LAQM), the District Council's Health and Environmental Service will continue to monitor air quality at strategic points along the A14. Should the predictions made in the modelling, such as improvements in fleet emissions, pollutant background concentrations, traffic figures and so on. not be achieved and, as a result, the air quality objectives are not met, then the Highways Agency will be required to engage with the local authority to investigate potential mitigation measures (which could include speed limits and traffic light phasing at junctions

to reduce queuing). These may be based on long term emissions reduction measures at the detailed design stage, should information come to light before this stage, or at any point in the future as part of the LAQM process.

- o) **does not object** to the Scheme on the grounds of noise impact provided that adequate mitigation measures are fully implemented and maintained.
  - p) **supports** the landscape measures proposed as part of the scheme and **seeks confirmation** that it will be consulted at the detailed design stage on landscape measures, including schemes for off-site planting. The Highways Agency is requested to provide further information on aspects of the Environmental Statement regarding the impact of the scheme on the setting of Cambridge and surrounding countryside.
  - q) **objects** to the lack of provision of a mammal pass for water voles on watercourse 18 (Washpit Brook), and would encourage the Highways Agency to provide mammal passes on culverts as standard.
  - r) **objects** to the lack of provision for the protection of the bat flight path in the Hilton area where large numbers have been observed.
  - s) **seeks a commitment** from the Highways Agency to monitor newly created habitats every second year over a ten-year period, and to include it in discussions during the detailed design stage on ecology matters, particularly in investigating the provision of safety fencing for livestock and wildlife, where appropriate.
  - t) **supports the general provision** made for non-motorised users. However, **objects in principle** to the lack of consideration of crossings over the A14 along the Cambridge Northern Bypass at the Histon and Impington and Fen Ditton junctions, pending the outcome of the A14 Cycle Crossing Study. The Council **seeks commitment** from the Highways Agency to include it in discussions during the detailed design of the NIAB bridge to ensure its suitability for non-motorised users.
  - u) **supports** the provision of lay-bys, which should help deal with the current shortage of lorry parking along the route, and **urges** the Highways Agency to consider off-site provision for lorry parking to discourage unauthorised lorry parking in villages along the route of the A14.
2. that authority to make any detailed changes to the objections, and negotiate any withdrawal of objections, be delegated to the Corporate Manager (Planning and Sustainable Communities) in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder or Portfolio Holders

#### 46. ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT

The Planning Portfolio Holder and New Communities Portfolio Holder considered the fifth Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report for submission to the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG).

Referring to paragraph 18 of the report, the Planning Policy Manager said that the Council had received Housing and Planning Delivery Grant money as follows:

- Demonstrating sufficient land for housing in None

line with PPS3	
• Delivery of Core Strategies and Development Plan Documents allocating more than 2,000 dwellings	£362,000
• Joint working	£27,000
• Publication of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment	£10,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£399,000</b>

The Planning Portfolio Holder and New Communities Portfolio Holder

1. **agreed**, for submission to the Department for Communities and Local Government, the contents of the Annual Monitoring Report; and
2. **delegated** further minor editing changes to the Annual Monitoring Report to the New Communities Portfolio Holder, where they involve matters of substance, and to the Corporate Manager (Planning and Sustainable Communities) where they relate to technical matters.

**47. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled Planning and New Communities Portfolio Holders' meeting was on Tuesday 26 January 2010, starting at 10.00am.

---

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

---