

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a special meeting of the Council held on  
Tuesday, 8 March 2005 at 9.30 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor RF Bryant – Chairman  
Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Dr DR Bard, RE Barrett, JD Batchelor, EW Bullman, Mrs SJO Doggett,  
SM Edwards, Mrs A Elsby, R Hall, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs SA Hatton,  
Dr JA Heap, Mrs EM Heazell, JA Hockney, Mrs CA Hunt, Mrs HF Kember,  
SGM Kindersley, RMA Manning, RB Martlew, MJ Mason, DC McCraith,  
Mrs DP Roberts, NJ Scarr, Mrs GJ Smith, Mrs HM Smith, Mrs DSK Spink MBE,  
JH Stewart, RT Summerfield, Dr SEK van de Ven, JF Williams,  
Dr JR Williamson and NIC Wright

Officers: Caroline Hunt Principal Planning Officer (Housing)  
David Hussell Development Services Director  
Michael Monk Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs J Dixon, Mrs JM Healey,  
CR Nightingale, Dr JPR Orme, RJ Turner, Mrs BE Waters and TJ Wotherspoon.

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor DC McCraith declared a personal interest as an owner of a property situated  
to the SW of the airport in Brooke Road.

### **4. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - CAMBRIDGE EAST ACTION PLAN: RESULTS OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON PREFERRED OPTIONS AND DIRECTION OF WAY FORWARD**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) presented the report informing  
members on the results of the public participation on the Preferred Options Report for  
Cambridge East.

Members were reminded that the Cambridge East Area Action Plan (AAP) was being  
prepared jointly with Cambridge City Council as this major new urban quarter for  
Cambridge would include land in both Councils' areas. Members attention was drawn  
to the Minutes of the Cambridge East Member Reference Group meeting held on 21  
February 2005 (at Appendix 1), and the Event Record of the Stakeholders Workshop (at  
Appendix 2) which would inform the draft AAP.

The report identified key issues raised and recommended the general approach to be  
taken in drafting the document for submission to the Secretary of State.

The key strategic issues arising as a result of the participation process were considered  
to be as follows:

#### **The Vision for Cambridge East.**

CE1 Vision – The Preferred Approach was that Cambridge East would be a modern,  
vibrant and distinctive new urban quarter for Cambridge, which would complement and  
enhance the character of the City and protect and enhance the environmental qualities  
of the surrounding area.

CE2 Development Principles – The Preferred Approach was that in order to achieve the overall vision, the new urban quarter would develop consistent with the following development principles:

- Be physically separate from the nearby villages, especially Fen Ditton and Teversham, to maintain their character and the character of Cambridge as a city surrounded by a necklace of villages.
- Connect the green spaces of Cambridge through the countryside with a green corridor linking through to Coldhams Common and a new country park.
- Link the new development with the urban fabric of eastern Cambridge and include facilities, which can help serve the existing as well as new community
- Be a compact and sustainable urban area with a low car dependency and with a well-developed network of paths, cycleways and public transport to connect locations within the urban quarter and also to link to the rest of the City, its open spaces and the surrounding countryside.
- Be socially inclusive with a well-developed sense of community
- Be a place where people can live a healthy lifestyle, in a safe environment and where most of their learning needs can be met.
- Achieve a net increase in biodiversity across the site
- Be of the highest quality of built form and open spaces throughout, but particularly in the District centre, fronting Newmarket Road and facing the green corridor, including retained and new landmark buildings and public art to give a sense of place
- Use green spaces and water features to contribute to the character of the area, provide a recreational resource and enhance biodiversity
- Be a place with a mix of uses which has its own district centre which may include civic uses, a conference centre, concert hall, arts centre, leisure facilities and other uses consistent with local and sub regional roles.
- Include local centres to serve neighbourhoods, in particular the early development north of Newmarket Road
- Have an emphasis on housing which achieves an overall high density with a wide variety of types, sizes and tenure (including affordable housing) that is well designed, of high quality and energy efficient.
- Offer local employment to create a balanced community rather than a dormitory but which ensures that the urban quarter also addresses the current lack of housing close to Cambridge.

It was noted that Marshall's had recently concluded that a possible relocation of the aerospace division to Duxford was no longer feasible. Whilst South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) was working with other authorities to consider alternative locations, it was not an issue for the AAP.

Members voiced concerns about transport and the possibility of high car dependency unless the entire transport infrastructure was put in place during Phase 1. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) informed Council that benefits of the transport scheme would only be realised when Cambridge East was fully developed. Phase 1 transport framework would be appropriate to the scale of that development.

It was agreed that in option CE2 Bullet 4 additional words be inserted to read 'with a well developed, **highly accessible** network of paths...'

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) cautioned against the insertion addition of the words 'self contained' after 'vibrant' in CE1as Cambridge East needed to connect with the rest of the City as a new urban quarter. The Structure Plan required more

houses than jobs, in order to redress the balance of housing availability in the Cambridge area.

A member was concerned that if Marshall's moved beyond commutable distance, jobs lost should be replaced by employment opportunities of a suitable skill type and salary.

Council **AGREED** that CE1 and CE2 (as amended) be taken forward into the AAP.

### **Green Belt, Green Corridor and Separation from the villages.**

Green Belt, the Green Corridor and village separation were intertwined and were therefore drawn together to assist Members' consideration of the issues raised. As they also had implications for the site definition, they were dealt ahead of that issue.

- CE9 – CE11 were the options for alternative procedures for dealing with the definition of the Green Belt.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) reported that there was general agreement with CE9, which would allow boundaries to be refined at a later date. This would give confidence to local residents that Green Belt would be retained and confidence to developers that land would be released.

CE64 Green Corridor – The Preferred Option was that Green Corridor through the development should have landscaping and biodiversity value and also perform a recreational function for both informal recreation and children's play.

- The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) advised that there was a general consensus on the key attributes of the Green Corridor.

A key decision would be the appropriate extent of separation from Teversham village. Detailed work at Northstowe concluded that a minimum of 200m was required in order to provide suitable landscape solutions to retain village identity and separation. The 300m width for the Green Corridor was based on analysis of current Green Corridors in Cambridge. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) also stated that whilst playing fields were an acceptable Green Belt use, the participation results indicated concern that it would adversely affect local character and should therefore be excluded.

CE12 Phase 1 – North of Newmarket Road Green Belt Review – The Preferred Approach was to remove from the Green Belt the field to the north of the North Works site, as defined by a strong tree belt along the disused railway, High Ditch Road and down to the Park & Ride site.

It would follow the railway rather than the tree belt, as a clear, firm boundary on the ground, because it was the intention to extend the tree belt.

Members made the following key points:

- Assurance was sought that public transport links were not excluded from the Green Corridor.
- High quality maintenance of open spaces was crucial.
- The Green Corridor might not be suitable for grazing.
- Playing fields should be situated on the edge of the Green Corridor. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) stated that there might be opportunities to do so but that the Master Plan would also need to ensure that playfields would be accessible
- Teversham Residents were concerned at the loss of existing Green Belt. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) advised that the current view was

the result of a strategic direction from Regional Planning Guidance and the Structural Plan on exceptional basis would protect Teversham.

- A member suggested that that the Green Corridor would be suitable for equine use and facilities. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) stated that bridleways would not be excluded although care would need to be taken about proposals for stables and other buildings in order to retain the openness of the Green Belt.

It was suggested that the Green Corridor might be a suitable site for a City Farm. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) stated that whilst the AAP was at a high level and therefore specific uses could not be stipulated, a City Farm may not be incompatible with intended use and was a suggestion that merited further investigation.

#### Council **AGREED**

1. That the procedure set out in CE9 be adopted as the approach in the AAP. In determining which areas should be retained in Green Belt, the boundary should take account of the need to protect the setting of the City. The site boundary shown in option CE3 should form the basis of the Green Belt review, with the exception of:
  - Including the Green Corridor from Teversham to Coldhams Common within the Green Belt.
  - Including the Green Separation in the Green Belt.
  - The eastern boundary of the Green Belt north of Newmarket Road be defined to follow the hedge and ditch field boundary running south from Honey Hill to the Newmarket Road/Airport Way junction.
2. That the points set out in the Assessment be used to guide the policy approach to the definition of the boundaries of the Green Corridor and separation from Teversham village. These included that it should:
  - Have a minimum width of 300m
  - Open up to a greater width at the Teversham end to maintain the setting and individual identity of the village.
  - Only include informal recreation and children's play areas.
3. In view of the recommendation to define the Green Belt boundary for the whole of the site in this AAP, it was not necessary to pursue CE12 in isolation.

#### **Site**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) introduced this section.

#### **Cambridge East site**

CE-3: The Preferred Option proposed boundaries for the site along the disused railway line and High Ditch Road, Airport Way (with a line extended north to High Ditch Road), the urban framework at Cherry Hinton and at Barnwell Road.

Council **AGREED**: that the preferred site in CE3 be included in the draft AAP but amended to exclude existing residential development on Newmarket Road, and to take account of recommendations in relation to the Green Belt boundary to include only the proposed built- up area (which will be coincidental with the Green Belt boundary on its outer edge and either side of the green corridor) and therefore, to:

- Revise the eastern boundary north of Newmarket Road to follow the ditch/hedge line to west of Airport Way roundabout, consistent with the Green Belt boundary
- Exclude the Green Corridor
- Exclude existing housing south of Newmarket Road

**North of Newmarket Road site**

CE5: The Preferred Approach defined the site by High Ditch Road and the disused railway line, a tree belt and the Park and Ride boundary, the edge of the Fisons housing estate and Newmarket Road.

Council **AGREED** that CE5 be taken forward into the draft AAP.

**North Works**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) reported that Marshall's had made it very clear that they would not promote a scheme that involved the demolition of the car show rooms as the Motor Group was an important section of the company. Therefore it was important to achieve a high quality frontage on the land, which was available to provide an entrance to the new residential neighbourhood behind the car showrooms.

Addressing members' concerns as to the possible relocation of the car showrooms, the Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) advised that the long-term policy aspiration was for redevelopment of the buildings in a more appropriate form and not the relocation of the business.

Council **AGREED** that the last sentence of Paragraph 61 of the Public Participation Report should be removed as being too prescriptive.

Council **AGREED** that CE6:Option 1 should be taken forward into the draft AAP, with amplification (as amended) as set out in the Public Participation report.

**Employment Uses Adjacent to the Park & Ride site**

CE8 –The Preferred Approach was to redevelop these uses as part of the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road to ensure a high quality frontage was achieved for the development and the use of previously developed land was maximised.

It was recommended that the Petrol filling Station be retained throughout the development.

Council **AGREED** that CE8 should be taken forward into the draft AAP with amplification as set out in the Public Participation report.

**District Centre Location and Form**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) introduced this section.

CE13: Location – The Preferred Approach was to locate the District Centre broadly at the geographical centre of the urban quarter at the heart of the development and on the dedicated public transport route to maximise accessibility to residents.

The Centre would need to provide facilities appropriate to the size of development. Decisions would have to be made as to what these facilities would be as they should complement and not compete with Cambridge City centre.

Concerns were raised that the state of the transport system in the City was inadequate to support the new development and that the City Centre would not be able to cope with a large influx of additional people. Some members suggested that the district centre should provide maximum facilities and provide an alternative to the City Centre.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) advised that the District Centre would be the largest in Cambridge outside the City Centre but if it was allowed to become too

large and become a second city centre, it could be argued that there should be even more development to the east of Cambridge. He noted that the AAP was at a high level at this stage but would incorporate more detail later, including a retail study.

Council **AGREED** that CE13 and CE14 should be taken forward into the draft AAP.

### **Local Centres**

CE15 Local Centres: Employment – The preferred approach was for local centres to act as a focus for small-scale local employment uses.

More clarity would be provided by the AAP review when a decision was made on the number and location of local centres in Cambridge East as a whole.

CE16 Local Centre North of Newmarket Road – The preferred approach was that a local centre would be provided in the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, which would provide a community focus and location for services and facilities, and local employment.

Council **AGREED** that preferred approaches CE15 and CE16 should be taken forward into the draft AAP.

### **Housing**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) introduced this section.

#### **Density**

CE17 – Option 1 was to have a target average density of at least 50 dwellings per hectare (dph) with higher densities in and around the District centre, Local Centres and public transport stops.

CE18 – Option 2 would have a target average density of up to 75 dph, again with higher densities in and around the district centre, local centres and public transport stops. The actual figure would be determined following further study.

Council **AGREED** that a combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the draft AAP with a target for 'average density in the order of 75 dph' but requiring 'at least 50 dph' across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.

#### **Affordable Housing**

CE20 – the preferred approach was to apply the district wide affordable housing targets for Cambridge East. Any issue over viability would be addressed as part of the consideration of a planning application alongside the other calls on the development. The types of affordable housing would be determined at a time of a planning application but would include social rented housing as well as significant proportion of intermediate tenure.

It was considered that an appropriate indicative tenure mix would be that given 50% affordable housing overall, approximately 30% would be social rented and 20% intermediate housing. The actual mix would be determined at the time of an application having regard to identified need and other material considerations.

A member expressed concern at the level of affordable housing, which might result in an unbalanced community.

The same member also expressed concern that there was no assessment of the need for Travellers sites and that SCDC could be seen to be excluding Travellers requirements from policy.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) responded that a study into balanced communities was being commissioned by Cambridgeshire Horizons. Also, a sub regional survey of Travellers needs was currently underway which would inform a new Development Plan Document on Travellers.

It was confirmed that low cost housing would be spread throughout the development.

Council **AGREED** that CE20 be taken forward in the draft AAP, but with a single policy in the AAP combining those in the City Redeposit Local Plan and South Cambs draft Core Strategy. This would include an indicative tenure mix for affordable housing in Cambridge East, that with 50% affordable housing overall, approximately 30% would be social rented and 20% intermediate housing, the actual mix to be determined at the time of an application having regard to identified need and other material considerations.

### **Employment**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) introduced this section.

CE21 Employment – The Preferred Approach was that employment provision allocated for Cambridge East should be limited to ensure that adequate provision was made for jobs whilst not undermining the objective for the new urban quarter to be housing led in order to rectify the current imbalance in the Cambridge area.

CE23 – Employment Provision – the Preferred Option was that the employment requirement be expressed as a gross jobs requirement of 4-5,000 jobs using a conversion rate of 1,000 jobs per 5ha employment land to reflect the nature of employment provision in this high-density development and to ensure that the policies do not result in an overprovision of jobs.

The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) stated that a broad strategy for new jobs needed to be taken forward; included in this would be the anticipated type of employment. It was noted that Marshall's intended retaining a number of jobs within the Cambridge East Area.

Council **AGREED** that CE21 and CE23 should be taken forward in the draft AAP.

### **Community Services, facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture, including Community Development**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) introduced this item.

CE24 Publicly Provided Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture. The preferred approach to securing the provision of the full range of publicly provided services and facilities that will be required at Cambridge East was that they would be the subject of a consultative approach with residents in neighbouring parts of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and funded in full by the development.

CE25 – Commercially Provided Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture. The preferred approach to the provision of commercially provided services and facilities was that the development would make provision for all the commercial services and facilities that an urban quarter with a population of around 29,000 people would require.

CE26 Education: Preference for Community Schools. The Preferred Approach was for education facilities at Cambridge east to be community schools, which focus on the family and could include other associated facilities such as early years provision, health and out of school clubs.

CE28 Education: Playing Fields as Contributions to Open Space Requirements. The Preferred Option was that School playing fields would not count towards the public open space standards because of uncertainty that they would be widely available for community use in the long term, although dual use would be welcomed.

CE29 Faith. The Preferred Approach was that the AAP would include a requirement for the provision of buildings for worship if consultation confirmed a need for it.

CE30 Emergency Services. The Preferred Approach was that Cambridge East would include provision for emergency services as specified by the service providers.

CE31 Leisure, Art and Culture. The referred Option was to provide for facilities for leisure, art and culture to meet the needs of the City and Sub –Region where this would be complementary to, and not compete with, the City Centre. This was supported provided facilities were in highly accessible locations.

It was noted that the list of services and facilities for the development as a whole was indicative and would be revised when the AAP was reviewed.

Council **AGREED** that CE29 would not be pursued and should be removed. Faiths should be responsible for funding buildings for worship themselves.

Council **AGREED** that CE 24, 25, 26, 28, 30 and 31 (as amended) should be taken forward within the draft AAP.

### **Addressing Transport Needs**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) introduced this item.

#### **North of Newmarket Road**

CE33: The Preferred Approach set out the requirements for the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, including a single road access onto Newmarket Road, a separate public transport only access onto Newmarket Road, improved bus priority on Newmarket Road and provision for cycles and pedestrians, and car parking at PPG13 standards.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) stated that in response to concerns about emergency access, there was scope to make the second access point access for emergency vehicles as well as public transport.

Members were informed that Cambridgeshire County Council was appointing consultants to produce a Long Term Transport Strategy for Cambridgeshire, which would inform the review of the AAP.

It was suggested that direct cycle access from Cambridge East to the Science Park across the river should be considered. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) agreed that consideration should be given to the links between the Cambridge East and the Northern Fringe.

Council **AGREED** that CE 33 be included in the draft AAP subject to the following amendments:

- Two-road access points to Newmarket Road, the second one for emergency vehicles and public transport only.
- Car parking standards at Redeposit Draft Cambridge Local Plan levels
- Design should not prevent future provision of a public transport only access onto



High Ditch Road.  
Councillor MJ Mason recorded his opposition to the decision.

### **Road Access**

CE34: The Preferred Approach for the Airport site was to provide road access to Cambridge East onto Newmarket Road (at two points), Airport Way, Coldhams Lane and Barnwell Road.

Council **AGREED** that CE34 be included in the draft AAP subject to the following amendments:

- Access to Airport Way to be only at the Gazelle Way roundabout
- Access to Barnwell Road to avoid crossing the Local Nature Reserve and to minimise the impact on the reserve.

Councillor MJ Mason recorded his opposition to the decision.

### **Orbital Movements**

Three options were included in the Preferred Options report, with no preference stated. CE35 involved improving orbital capacity on existing routes for all traffic. CE36 involved building additional orbital roads for all traffic. CE37 was to develop orbital routes open to public transport only.

Council **AGREED** that CE35 be included in the draft AAP, and that the issue be a subject for further examination upon the review of the AAP.  
Councillor MJ Mason recorded his opposition to the decision.

### **A14 Access**

Four options were included in the Preferred Options Report with no preference stated. CE38 proposed a new interchange onto the A14 in the vicinity of Honey Hill to replace the existing junctions at Ditton Lane and Quy. CE39 proposed that Ditton Lane would be restricted to public transport. CE40 proposed that there would be junction improvements only. CE41 proposed a new half interchange with west facing slip roads in the vicinity of Honey Hill and retaining Quy in its present form (whilst it was not explicit, this option intended that the Ditton Lane junction would be closed and replaced by the new Honey Hill junction)

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) stated that Council could not make Phase 1 dependant on the A14 improvements, but it would be assumed that these would be in place before the airport site was completed (2016). However, it was possible to state that there should be no airport site development until the A14 improvements were in place.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) also pointed out that Cambridgeshire County Council was concerned that the closure of the Quy interchange would adversely affect access to Newmarket.

The Council **AGREED** that the Preferred Approach to the A14 access for inclusion in the draft AAP be as follows:

- No change to current junctions at Ditton Lane and Quy in relation to development north of Newmarket Road
- That development of the Airport site south of Newmarket Road be dependent upon provision of improved and satisfactory access arrangements to the A14 through junction improvements at Ditton Lane and Quy, or the provision of a new junction onto the A14.
- That the design of the development north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and

Ditton Lane junctions, as a **replacement** for the Ditton Lane junction.  
Councillor MJ Mason recorded his opposition to the decision.

### **External Public Transport**

CE42: The Preferred Approach was bus based with the requirement for further research to examine scope for guided bus access. Routes to be based on Newmarket road (City Centre and West Cambridge), a northern link (Science Park, Cambridge Northern Fringe, Guided Bus connection), a southern link (Addenbrooke's Hospital), an additional guided bus link to the City Centre and examination of need for orbital public transport links.

Council **AGREED** that CE42 be included in the draft AAP subject to the inclusion of a statement concerning the need to minimise and mitigate the environmental impacts of the public transport routes.

### **Park and Ride**

CE43: The Preferred Approach was to identify a new Park and Ride site to replace the existing one north of Newmarket Road. This could be to the south of Newmarket Road and east of Airport Way.

Council **AGREED** that CE43 be included in the draft AAP.  
Councillor MJ Mason recorded his opposition to the decision.

### **Car Parking**

The Preferred Option in CE48 was for car parking standards in Cambridge East to be as in the City Council's Local Plan. An alternative option CE49 proposed that in the District centre, the maximum car parking standards would be those used in the City Local Plan for the CPZ.

Council **AGREED** that CE48 be included in the draft AAP and that no more restrictive standard be applied to developments in the District Centre as proposed by CE49.  
Councillor MJ Mason recorded his opposition to the decision.

Councillor MJ Mason stated that he opposed all Transport recommendations, as he believed all transport infrastructure should be in place before the development was started.

### **Landscape and Biodiversity**

CE50: The Preferred Approach was for a landscape strategy which would set criteria for the strategic landscaping of the site, including along Airport Way and in areas of Green Separation from villages, and give consideration to requiring key aspects of strategic landscaping e.g. within the Green Separation, at the beginning of each major phase of development.

CE51 Biodiversity: Habitat Creation. The Preferred Approach was that the biodiversity of the green spaces that either remain or were created as a result of the development would be maximised, taking into account the other functions for these areas.

CE52 Biodiversity: Water Features. The Preferred Approach was that extensive water features on the site would be managed as a wetland habitat to maximise biodiversity value.

CE53 Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan. The Preferred Approach was that an appropriate single management strategy should be drawn up and agreed, to include both landscape and biodiversity.

Council **AGREED** that CE50, 51, 52 and 53 should be taken forward in the draft AAP.

### **Archaeology and Heritage**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) introduced this item CE54 Archaeology. The Preferred Approach was that a detailed, fully analytical assessment of the known and suspected sites or features of archaeological importance would be undertaken to assess the archaeological implications prior to undertaking any development of the site.

It was noted that English Heritage had requested some word changes to CE54, in particular to seek an archaeological assessment as part of any planning application, rather than to require it before development of the site in order that any findings could influence the form of the development. This would be included in any policy drafted.

CE 55 Built Heritage. The Preferred Option was that listed buildings in Cambridge East should be retained together with other significant airport buildings and structures that were representative of a significant chapter in Cambridge's history e.g. early hangers and the control tower, and had potential to be retained and reused as positive features and landmarks in the future development.

It was noted that significant buildings would be identified following a detailed assessment.

Council **AGREED** that CE54 (amended as proposed) and CE 55 should be taken forward in the draft AAP.

### **Meeting Recreation Needs**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Housing) introduced this item.

### **Public Open Space**

CE57 Public Open Space. The Preferred Option was that the Cambridge City Local Plan outdoor play space and informal open space minimum standards would apply to the whole of Cambridge East.

Council **AGREED** that CE57 should be taken forward in the draft AAP

### **Formal Sports Provision**

CE59 Distance to Formal Sport. The Preferred Approach was that all homes should be within 1,000m (10-15 min walking time) of formal sports provision.

Council **AGREED** that the words 'with flexibility above that distance' should be removed from the third sentence of Paragraph 151 of the Public Participation Results report.

It was confirmed that the facilities listed in paragraph 12.10 of the Preferred options Report did not include facilities provided at schools. These would be considered separately.

It was also confirmed that any area of water would be outside usable space and would not count towards provisions agreed.

CE60 Formal Sports provision. The Preferred Approach required the preparation of a strategy for Formal Sport. Although there had been representations for it to include children's play, it was recommended that a separate Play strategy be prepared under CE57.

CE61 Dual Use Sports Provision. The Preferred Approach was that the main indoor sports facility would be based at the secondary school.

Council **AGREED** that CE 56, 60 and 61 be taken forward into the draft AAP (as amended).

#### **Urban Park**

Council **AGREED** that the Preferred Approach set out in CE63, that an urban park should be developed in the Newmarket Road area be taken forward into the draft AAP.

#### **The Country Park**

Council **AGREED** that the Preferred Option set out in CE71 for a country park north of Teversham, be taken forward in the draft AAP.

#### **Crossing the Green Corridor**

Council **AGREED** that the Preferred Approach set out in CE66, that road and bus crossings across the green corridor should be well designed to limit any safety implications and be low key in character or designed as a landscape feature in order to limit adverse effects on the landscape, should be pursued as sensitively as possible and taken forward into the draft AAP.

#### **Other Recreation Issues**

Council **AGREED** that the Preferred Approach set out in CE67 that surface water drainage features be used, as key design features in the development should be taken forward into the draft AAP.

Council **AGREED** that the Preferred Approach for management of Open Space set out in CE69, that all public open space and incidental space should be in a single ownership and that a robust management plan be in place before construction work commenced be taken forward in the draft AAP. It further **AGREED** to allow greater flexibility in the AAP through a criteria based policy on the exact method of management and funding pending further assessment.

#### **Land Drainage and Water Conservation**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) introduced this item.

CE75 Surface Water Drainage. The Preferred Option would be to control surface water drainage by means of a series of underground cells and pipes and surface water channels.

CE77 Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal. The Preferred Approach for sewage disposal would be by means of Cambridge Sewage Treatment Works.

CE78 Management and Maintenance of Watercourses. The Preferred Option would be that all water bodies and watercourses would be maintained and managed by a specific trust, which would be publicly accountable. This trust would be funded in perpetuity by taking ownership of commercial property developed as part of the urban extension.

CE81 Water Conservation. The Preferred Approach would be that all development in Cambridge East would incorporate water conservation measures or water saving devices in order to minimise water use. A strategy would be required for water recycling, including rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) stated that it was his understanding that there would be separate drainage systems for roof water and sewage but that this would be confirmed.

Concerns were expressed at the long-term maintenance for the drainage system.

Members were informed that as part of the site was within Cambridge City, the Drainage Committee would need to consider this issue.

Council **AGREED** that CE 75, 77, 78 and 81 should be taken forward into the draft AAP.

### **Telecommunications**

Council **AGREED** that the Preferred Approach as set out in CE82, that all telecommunications infrastructure, including provision for broadband, should be capable of responding to changes in technology requirements over the period of development, and designed and installed as an integral part of the development, which minimises visual impact and future disturbance during maintenance, should be taken forward into the draft AAP.

### **Energy**

CE83 Energy Provision. The Preferred Approach was that the general policies for renewable energy in the Cambridge City Redeposit Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire's Core Strategy Preferred Options Report (that new developments include technology for renewable energy to provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements) should apply to Cambridge East.

CE84 Energy Conservation. The Preferred Approach was that South Cambridgeshire's Core Strategy preferred approach and Cambridge City Redeposit Local Plan policies for energy conservation should apply to Cambridge East as a whole.

CE85 Energy Conservation: Exemplar Projects. The Preferred Approach was that Cambridge East should be required to include within the development exemplar projects in energy efficient developments. This could be achieved by building a proportion of the development to advanced practice, which fully addresses sustainability issues and minimised any environmental impact by pushing at the boundaries.

It was suggested that the policies for Cambridge East should require a higher target than 10% for of energy requirements to be provided by renewable energy. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) cautioned members not to be too prescriptive as the policy was currently high level and technology may have moved on by the time of policy implementation.

It was further suggested that the wording of CE85 on Exemplar Projects reflect that of the Northstowe Preferred Option. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) agreed that exemplar projects would be relevant to the whole development and he further agreed to revise the wording.

Local Members sought assurance that the green belt would protect surrounding villages from renewable energy schemes such as wind farms.

It was noted that provision of a Heat and Water Plant for Phase 1 had not been ruled out.

Council **AGREED** that CE 83, 84 and 85 (as revised by the Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport)) should be taken forward into the draft AAP.

### **Waste**

The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) introduced this item.

Members were informed that the AAP could not make policies for waste. This was a matter for the County Council as Waste Planning Authority, which had policies relating to major developments in its adopted Waste Local Plan 2003.

Concern was expressed about the possibility of the siting of a waste management plant near a residential area.

Council **AGREED** the recommendation that officers of the City, South Cambs and County Councils discuss how to take forward the issue of waste at Cambridge East and

bring back their findings to the Member Reference Group meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2005 and any relevant issues for the AAP to the meeting of Council on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2005.

### **Noise**

The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) introduced this item.

CE86. The Preferred Approach was that proposals for the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road would only be approved where a noise assessment was provided and any mitigation measures necessary secured, to ensure a satisfactory living environment for new residents in terms of both indoor and outdoor environments.

The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) confirmed that the noise assessment would take into account aviation activity. She also confirmed that Marshall's would be responsible for funding any relocation of the engine-testing bay.

Council was reminded that the first phase of development would only be brought forward if a suitable environment, including noise abatement could be assured. If not, the first phase would be delayed until the start of development on the airport site.

Council **AGREED** that CE86 should be taken forward into the draft AAP.

### **Phasing and Implementation**

The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) introduced this item, stating that it was inevitable that the development of a large new urban quarter on the scale of Cambridge East would be phased over a lengthy period. The relocation of Cambridge airport was an additional factor influencing the phased approach.

In addition to the opportunity to bring forward an early first phase north of Newmarket Road, there was a further consideration as to whether there was scope to bring forward a second phase of development north of Cherry Hinton. Of the 1,700-2,500 potential dwellings that could take place without affecting the operation of the airport, 250-350 would be in South Cambs. However, before the relocation of the Airport was resolved, only limited development could take place, both to ensure housing was at a sufficient distance from the runway to protect amenity and also so that it was a scale that could relate to, and be served by, existing development to the south. This would be in the order of 800 dwellings in total, around 60 of which would be in South Cambs.

Members expressed concern that the phasing (1 and potentially 2) of the development could see homes built without any or only a few facilities being provided. It was suggested that the trigger points mentioned in CE95 needed to be clearly stipulated. The Principal Planning Officer (Housing) stated that she would ensure that policies within the AAP would include community facility provision. The AAP would set out facilities required for the development as a whole and the requirements for individual phases.

Council **AGREED** the recommendation that there were significant issues that could not be resolved for the first version of the AAP. It was suggested that the Plan highlight the potential for a second phase of development north of Cherry Hinton, identify the issues of health impact, noise and air quality as key issues to be resolved ahead of any decision on timing of that area and make clear this would be addressed in the review of the AAP.

The Chairman moved a vote of thanks to the Officers for the detailed reports presented to Council.

---

**The Meeting ended at 5.35 p.m.**

---