

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a special meeting of the Council held on  
Friday, 11 February 2005 at 9.30 a.m.

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

Councillors: RE Barrett, JD Batchelor, BR Burling, NN Cathcart, Mrs SJO Doggett,  
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, CR Nightingale,  
Dr JPR Orme, Mrs DP Roberts, NJ Scarr, Mrs HM Smith, Mrs DSK Spink MBE,  
RT Summerfield, JF Williams, Dr JR Williamson and NIC Wright

Mr Glen Richardson and Councillor Jenny Bailey from Cambridge City Council attended the meeting by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dr DR Bard, JP Chatfield, SM Edwards, Mrs JM Healey, MP Howell, DH Morgan, Mrs JA Muncey, EJ Pateman, JA Quinlan, A Riley, J Shepperson, Mrs GJ Smith, JH Stewart, Dr SEK van de Ven, Mrs BE Waters and TJ Wotherspoon.

### **1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Lesley Dickinson, Landscape and Design Officer, declared a personal interest as a resident of Trumpington potentially affected by the proposed link road to Addenbrookes Hospital, Cambridge.

Councillor R Hall declared a personal interest because his wife and daughter work at Addenbrookes Hospital, Cambridge.

Councillor Mrs EM Heazell declared a personal interest because her husband works at Addenbrookes Hospital, Cambridge.

### **2. LDF - CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE (RESULTS OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION)**

The Planning Policy Manager presented a detailed report informing Members about the results of the public participation on the Preferred Options Report for the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan.

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

Members noted that, while the bulk of development along the Cambridge Southern Fringe would fall within the administrative area of Cambridge City Council, there was a significant opportunity for South Cambridgeshire District Council to enhance the Green Belt by developing the Brownfield site formerly occupied by Monsanto. It was also important to protect the city edge, and ecological corridors such as the River Cam.

Members identified the following issues as important:

- The need clearly to identify development parameters and to agree, with the developers, on a scheme that would achieve landscape enhancements either side of the M11 in an area where the Council could not require such improvements to

be made without development taking place. Members noted that this would entail taking some additional land out of the Green Belt.

- The likely increase in the amount of traffic along the A10. In the view of one Member, the success of the proposed new link road to Addenbrookes would depend on the amount and cost of parking available at the Hospital site. If such provision was inadequate, then there was a possibility that the extra traffic would go through Great Shelford village to the Babraham Park and Ride site. To this end, the link road should be completed and in use prior to any other major development being undertaken along the Southern Fringe.
- Protection of views, including that of Trumpington church.
- Location of the Haul roads for Clay Farm, Showground and Addenbrookes all of which lie within Cambridge City.

On the second point, the Planning Policy Manager indicated that Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City Council were exploring options for using alternative accesses until the new link road had been completed. Although the Southern Fringe represented the least complex and controversial element of the proposed Local Development Framework, it was essential that rapid progress be made in order that the required major increase in development could be met.

A Member expressed concern that the current proposal for Trumpington West was "identical" to the one previously rejected by the District Council. He suspected that there might be a temptation to accept the developers' proposals simply because they were now offering significant Green Belt enhancements. The Planning Policy Manager explained that further public participation would be conducted in June 2005, and representations then dealt with by the Inspector.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that an important element in progressing this development would be to draw up, and enforce, an appropriate Masterplan, which would address details such as views, height of buildings and the use of perspective in using landscaping to minimise any adverse impact of development.

Members were concerned that infrastructure should be in place prior to the commencement of any development. They requested officers to convey this view to Cambridgeshire County Council in its capacity as Local Highways Authority.

Representatives from Cambridge City Council commented that:

- The Southern Fringe was a sustainable site in the context of public transport
- Traffic impact would be acceptable
- The site was large enough to be able to accommodate a lot of its own construction traffic
- The development of the Cambridge Southern Fringe had the backing of Cambridge City Council
- The partner Councils had already agreed to 2 ½ storey buildings being on the development edge, with a four-storey "feature" building being located so as to face the M11 motorway.

Members raised the following concerns:

- Access
- Transport and traffic, particularly along the A10
- The apparent tendency for landscaping to follow and, perhaps, conflict with the proposed route of the Guided Bus

- Traffic modelling
- Protection of the quality of life within villages in South Cambridgeshire potentially affected by this proposal
- Land levels
- Protection of views
- Aesthetic considerations in defining the development edge

The Planning Policy Manager reiterated the Council's view that, regardless of whether or not the Guided Busway was in operation by 2007, Trumpington nevertheless represented the most sustainable option for development of this type. In the context of the Government's requirement for housing along the M11 corridor, the only viable alternative to Trumpington would be to distribute the proposed development there among the various South Cambridgeshire villages in that corridor. The District Council was seeking to minimise any adverse impact of development. He reminded Members that the Green Belt around Cambridge served two purposes, namely to protect the character of the city, and also its setting. By allowing a strategic release of Green Belt land to the north-west, south and east of Cambridge, it would be possible to construct 20,000 homes on the edge of the city without damaging its character. The alternative was to build those homes further away from Cambridge but, because the bulk of employment opportunities were in the city, this would have the serious negative traffic impact that members feared most.

Following further debate on a number of points arising from the report, it was **RESOLVED** that

the recommendations set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, and Appendix 1 be endorsed as the basis for developing the policies to be set out in the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan, subject to

1. CSF34 (Noise) – Preferred Approach being expanded to cover noise mitigation from motorways and other roads, and the issue of air quality.
2. The Link road to Addenbrookes Hospital being completed and in use prior to any further development commencing on the Cambridge Southern Fringe, members having been advised that 90% of the development in the Cambridge Southern Fringe lies within Cambridge City).
3. The land either side of the M11 being included in the landscape enhancement scheme and made accessible to the public
4. A review of Public Rights of Way in the area

Council gave the Director of Development Services delegated authority to make any minor editing changes necessary to the responses set out in Appendix 1, with any which involve a material change being delegated to the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder.

Council would receive this draft AAP at the special meeting arranged for 8<sup>th</sup> April 2005.

---

**The Meeting ended at 1.04 p.m.**

---