

Appendix 1

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Draft Minutes of the Planning Policy and Localism Portfolio Holder's Meeting held on Tuesday, 11 February 2014 at 10.00 a.m.

Note: The minutes will be agreed as a correct record at the Portfolio Holder's next meeting.

Portfolio Holder: Pippa Corney

Councillors in attendance:

Scrutiny and Overview Committee monitors: Bridget Smith

Opposition spokesmen: Janet Lockwood

Also in attendance: David Bard, Richard Barrett, Val Barrett, Trisha Bear, Jonathan Chatfield, Kevin Cuffley, Alison Elcox, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Jose Hales, Roger Hall, Tumi Hawkins, Roger Hickford, James Hockney, Mark Howell, Clayton Hudson, Caroline Hunt, Peter Johnson, Douglas de Lacey, Mervyn Loynes, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Robin Page, Alex Riley, Deborah Roberts, Tim Scott, Hazel Smith, Peter Topping, Susan van de Ven, Aidan Van de Weyer, David Whiteman-Downes, John Williams and Nick Wright

Officers:

Jonathan Dixon	Principal Planning Policy Officer
Caroline Hunt	Local Development Framework Team Leader
Fiona McMillan	Legal & Democratic Services Manager and Monitoring Officer
Keith Miles	Planning Policy Manager
Jo Mills	Planning and New Communities Director
Jennifer Nuttycombe	Planning Policy Officer
David Roberts	Principal Planning Officer
Ian Senior	Democratic Services Officer
Claire Spencer	Senior Planning Policy Officer
Alison Talkington	Senior Planning Policy Officer

15. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Legal and Democratic Services Manager advised that, as the Portfolio Holder was making the decision at this meeting, there was no need for other Members of the Council to declare any interests.

16. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Planning Policy & Localism Portfolio Holder signed, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2013.

17. SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN - CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND CONSIDERATION ON WHETHER TO SUBMIT FOR EXAMINATION

The Planning Policy & Localism Portfolio Holder considered the responses to consultation on the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: Proposed Submission 2013, and a covering report from officers proposing that she recommend to a special Council meeting on 13 March 2014 that the Local Plan be submitted to the Secretary of State for public examination.

The Planning and New Communities Director introduced the report as representing a key stage in the Plan-making process. Consultation had taken place in 2012 and 2013 on two rounds of Issues and Options for the new Local Plan. The Council had received about 30,000 representations to those consultations, informing the preparation of the Proposed Submission Local Plan, which had itself been subjected to consultation between 19 July and 14 October 2013. The Planning Policy Manager referred the Planning Policy & Localism Portfolio Holder and other Members present to paragraph 26 of the report, which gave a high level summary and assessment of the 7,400 representations received as a result of this final consultation. He said the Council had made sure that it followed the plan making process, and complied with the duty to co-operate placed on local authorities by the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Local Development Framework Team Leader guided the Planning Policy & Localism Portfolio Holder and other Members present through the other elements of the report, namely:

- How much development?
- Where should it go?
- When is it needed?
- Strategic sites in the Plan
- Strategic sites not in the Plan
- Village housing sites in the Plan
- Parish Council proposals
- Village sites not in the Plan
- Climate Change
- Design
- Protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment
- Housing
- Building a strong and competitive economy
- Promoting successful communities
- Promoting and delivering sustainable transport and infrastructure

How much development?

Cllr Page commented that it needed to be clear who the new homes were for, and why.

Cllr Hawkins said housing needs should be assessed objectively to identify, where possible, how many of the new dwellings in South Cambridgeshire would be for people working within the District and how many would in effect be supporting employment in neighbouring local authority areas.

Cllr Bridget Smith said that there was already affordable need in the district so there needed to be a robust policy to deliver affordable housing.

Cllr Roberts commented that a previous Planning Director had stated that South Cambridgeshire was full. She added that the quality of life of residents was being chipped away and the only people benefitting from growth were the developers and landowners. Cllr Roberts asked where was the infrastructure going to come from?

Officers commented that the Council had followed accepted national practice in developing the Local Plan, and had analysed all appropriate trends and economic models to make sure that it was able to support the continuing success of Cambridge and the surrounding area. They confirmed that the 22,000 jobs that the Plan had been designed to create were all located within South Cambridgeshire. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) had been prepared following national practice and tells us the housing needs for all districts in the Cambridge housing market area. It has been used to determine the extent of housing needs, which are 19,000 for South Cambridgeshire and 14,000 for Cambridge and have been reflected in the respective Local Plans. In response to criticism that statements made in the 1990s that South Cambridgeshire should not accommodate more growth, these had been proven wrong even during the tenure of the Planning Director who commissioned a study about village development at the time and who oversaw the new settlement of Northstowe.

Where should it go?

Cllr de Lacey said that recent changes in service provision in the village made it inappropriate that Girton should be upgraded from Group Village to Minor Rural Centre.

Cllr Hawkins made points on the following:

- The relationship between the Local Plan and Cambridgeshire County Council's Transport Strategy.
- The differential between South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City in the number of houses proposed, and relationship to employment.
- Implications for traffic flow.
- The Transport Strategy. She said it addressed public transport, cycling and walking but not cars.

Cllr Roberts made the following points:

- The need for rail links as the most realistic form of public transport to support larger scale development.
- Evidence was needed as to the sustainability of a new village on Bourn Airfield.

Cllr van der Ven commented that Cambridgeshire County Council had a lack of powers and funds to promote effective bus services in South Cambridgeshire.

Cllr Page questioned the accuracy of transport modelling.

Cllr Elcox asked that the delivery of the City Deal should be a pre-requisite of development taking place at Bourn Airfield or Cambourne West.

Cllr Hockney said that the A10 was already congested and asked how the transport strategy dealt with this.

Cllr Hickford said that developments should be self-funding – City Deal money should not be relied upon but viewed instead as an additional source of funding.

Officers commented that the majority of respondents to consultations had favoured development taking place in new communities rather than being dispersed among

established smaller villages. The need to demonstrate a five-year land supply demanded that the Plan should be both robust and flexible. Transport modelling had been carried out throughout the Plan-making process. With regard to Girton, circumstances were constantly changing and, although it was still considered appropriate to upgrade the village on the basis of the latest survey, the Inspector would make a final decision based on the evidence. The Transport Strategy had informed the Local Plan, and new settlements were considered more likely to attract the necessary funding for public transport enhancements. The SHMA had been tested against the national Toolkit, and had been judged to be robust. South Cambs and Cambridge City were both planning to meet in full their respective needs as identified in the SHMA.

The Planning Policy & Localism Portfolio Holder assured Members that everything possible would be done to make sure that the development proposals in the Local Plan would proceed in a co-ordinated way. The detail of the proposed new settlements would be addressed in Area Action Plans. She highlighted Northstowe as an example, pointing out that A14 improvements had always been a condition of the new town being built out in full.

When is it needed?

The Local Development Framework Team Leader said that 14,000 of the 19,000 dwellings proposed were already accounted for by virtue of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007 - 2010.

Strategic Sites in the Plan

There were no comments about NIAB 3.

- **Cambridge East**

The Local Development Framework Team Leader explained why a safeguarding policy was proposed for Cambridge East.

Cllr Hunt said that the site should be returned to the Green Belt.

Cllr Bridget Smith said that not to return it to Green Belt would give preferential treatment to Marshalls, the land owners.

Cllr Williams said that as Cambridge East was no longer available, other new development sites e.g. at Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West had been found, therefore the site may not be required and so should be put back in the Green Belt. Whether or not the site would be needed for development after 2031 should be a decision to be made in a future local plan process and not at the present time.

Cllr Martin said that if we were able to justify its release from the Green Belt in the past, we should be able to do this again in the future if it was needed.

The Local Development Framework Team Leader said that Cambridge Airport had been removed from the Green Belt through the adopted plan. There were no exceptional circumstances to change the boundary, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encouraged land in those circumstances to be safeguarded as proposed in the Local Plan.

- **Cambridge Northern Fringe East**

Cllr Hazel Smith welcomed agreement as to the boundary of the Area Action Plan (AAP) and protection for the Chesterton Fen Travellers sites. She would like the AAP to consider better access to Chesterton Fen Road.

Rob Hopwood (Bidwells, representing landowners) spoke at the end of the meeting and referred to following:

- Most sustainable location in district (urban and brownfield).
- Poor planning not to allow housing, jobs and transport in same location.
- No environmental evidence as to why housing is not suitable on the site.
- Questioned why an AAP would be needed (rather than a masterplan) as it would delay the process.

- **Waterbeach**

Barbara Bull (Waterbeach Parish Council) addressed the Portfolio Holder. She referred to the following:

- Waterbeach New Town opposed.
- Support 900 new dwellings on former Barracks site.
- Building on high grade agricultural land.
- Concern about flooding, water supply, contaminated land and sewerage disposal.
- Concern about transport infrastructure – neither road or rail issues have been properly addressed.
- Concern that issues raised in representations were not recorded accurately.

John Halfpenny (Landbeach Parish Council) addressed the Portfolio Holder. He referred to the following:

- Fears about Waterbeach becoming a commuter town.
- Implications for the A10.
- Railway issues
- Transport Strategy does not include detail or costings and ignores Waterbeach to Ely section of A10.
- Financial risk – need for a properly costed plan. Concern that Section 106 will shrink, as happened at Northstowe.

Officers referred to the extensive consultation that had been carried out and that those making representations had been advised that if they were not happy with how their representations had been registered they could let the Council know. The main issues raised were pulled out in more detail in the representation summaries appended to the committee report. In some areas it was difficult to avoid building on agricultural land. Policies require that the new town would be designed so as not to increase flood risk or sewerage problems – a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) would be used. The Infrastructure Delivery Study supports the Local Plan and includes a viability study. The Council had complied with its duty to take account of local housing needs but could not prohibit commuting. An Area Action Plan would be drawn up to examine and address detailed concerns.

Cllr Hockney welcomed the proposed extension to the Green Belt but expressed opposition to building on agricultural land. He questioned the methodology used in the report. He stated that the report disproportionately pulled out issues from representations in support rather than objections, and did not include comments from key stakeholders. There was a lack of information to make a decision. He questioned the longer term need for a new town at Waterbeach. He suggested that the Council could be acting ultra vires (beyond its powers) in seeking to bind future local plans covering periods beyond 2031. He accepted in principle plans to build houses on the previously developed part of the former barracks site and suggested bringing forward 1,400 houses on the barracks brownfield land to meet objectors' concerns.

The Local Development Framework Team Leader said that lots of work had been done in getting to this point, including documents produced in earlier rounds of consultation. The Council had gone beyond what we are required to do in summarising main issues. New settlements inevitably go beyond the plan period because of the timescales bringing forward infrastructure, as was the case with Northstowe.

Cllr Johnson said current flood and sewerage issues had to be resolved before anything else happened. He said that agricultural land was needed for food production, and should not be built upon. He raised concerns about increased traffic and about proposals to address that issue and concerns with Northstowe taking longer than planned. He urged plans for Waterbeach to be deleted from the Local Plan.

The Local Development Framework Team Leader assured Members that the Council's primary objective was to make sure that new developments did not make conditions worse for existing communities.

Cllr Wright commented that commuters flowed in many directions e.g. live in London, work in Cambridge. It was easier to move between jobs if there was good public transport than move house.

Cllr Page asked why had there been no formal analysis of commuting patterns? He also commented that biodiversity was not mentioned.

Cllr Roberts said that the Council had a duty to get this right. Members and the public had different feelings to officers, and they were the ones that knew and lived in the villages.

Cllr Elcox commented that it seemed that if there were detailed issues, the response was to leave it to the AAP.

Cllr Hawkins said it seemed the Local Plan was being driven by a tight timescale that this Council did not want to jeopardise at any cost.

In reply, the Local Development Framework Team Leader said that the SHMA did consider commuting patterns. Consultees had not raised any objections on biodiversity grounds, but the SHLAA considered impact on ecology. She stressed the important role of Area Action Plans, which would examine the details of proposals once the principle had been established.

- **Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West**

The Local Development Framework Team Leader said that the critical mass offered by larger communities made further development there more sustainable than elsewhere. Such tipping points, for example, had led to a secondary school being built in Cambourne. Bourn Airfield and an extension to Cambourne had been rejected in the past because other sites had been deemed preferable. However, the role of the draft Local Plan was to identify the best sites that were currently available. Viability at Bourn Airfield could be achieved with a density of 30-35 dwellings per hectare. As with other proposals, transport infrastructure was key, and a number of funding options would be considered, including City Deal.

Similar comments applied to Cambourne, one of the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire. Cambourne West should reflect the character of the existing three linked villages of Lower, Great and Upper Cambourne. It might include the buildings at Swansley Farm as a minor change to the Plan. The developer's proposals for a larger site abutting the A1198 had been rejected on the grounds of landscape and size. Caxton Parish Council had raised the issue of governance as the proposed site of Cambourne West was situated mainly in Caxton Parish. A minor change was proposed in the report to clarify this.

Paul Beskeen (Stop the Bourn Airfield Development (StopBAD)) addressed the Portfolio Holder. He referred to the following:

- Profound impacts.
- Development at Bourn Airfield could lead to an over-supply of dwellings by 2031 and Northstowe, Bourn Airfield and Waterbeach New Town all partially built.
- Deliverability of 3 new settlements and local authority's ability to oversee several major developments at the same time.
- Capacity – highlighted concerns relating to over-estimate of number of dwellings but no changes and not captured in the summary of representations. Expect a response to their calculations.
- Four times as many representations had been made to Bourn Airfield than any other site.
- It was anticipated that Northstowe would have delivered 4000 homes by now but not yet delivered any.
- Delete Bourn Airfield from the Local Plan and commence other developments earlier.

Roger Hume addressed the Portfolio Holder regarding Cambourne West. He referred to the following:

- Comments made over the past ten years about the extent to which Cambourne could expand are being departed from. Previously said that Cambourne is in the wrong place.
- Decrease during the past few years in buses serving Cambourne.

In connection with the concern about the summary of representations, the Local Development Framework Team Leader explained that a more detailed summary of main issues was available in the Appendices to the report. The large number of representations on Bourn Airfield was only exceeded by the Green Belt petition. In connection with the concern about local authority capacity to oversee development, the Local Development Framework Team Leader repeated that such detail would be explored as part of an Area Action Plan. South Cambridgeshire District Council already had a number of specialist teams experienced in meeting

the challenge of dealing with concurrent major developments. Northstowe was delayed by factors beyond the Council's control; the delays to delivering the A14 improvements and economic recession. As to over-supply, there had to be a reasonable lead-in time, and this required flexibility. Capacity had been tested and would be considered in more detail in the AAP.

In connection with comments made over the past ten years about the extent to which Cambourne could expand, the Planning Policy & Localism Portfolio Holder commented that it was not in the gift of any Councillors to make promises of that nature.

Steven Kosky (Barton Wilmore) addressed the Portfolio Holder: He referred to the following:

- Disappointment that Cambourne West had been restricted to 970 dwellings, with the balance of 230 dwellings being built on the Business Park.
- Commendation of MCA's proposal for a larger development up to the A1198, helping with the five-year land supply and not being constrained by landscape features.
- Preparing a planning application for 2,200 homes.
- Comment that Cambourne needs to achieve its full potential in order to become fully sustainable.
- Proposals at Bourn Airfield are unsustainable and unviable, and should be scrapped: Cambourne West should be allowed to absorb some of the proposed dwellings.

Cllr Loynes would prefer to see development dispersed throughout the District as opposed to it being concentrated into a few areas as new developments. In particular, he opposed both Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West. Including development on the edge of Cambridge, in Huntingdonshire, Papworth Everard and elsewhere, Cllr Loynes calculated that Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West would contribute to about 17,200 new dwellings proposed to be built along the A428 corridor, more than Northstowe, but there were no plans to dual the A428 to the A1.

Cllr Elcox described Cambourne as a housing estate. She said it was unsustainable on employment grounds. Existing infrastructure was struggling to cope with the demands of present-day Cambourne. The marketing of employment sites had been too narrow. Houses should be located closer to jobs. Infrastructure must come first. Harbourne (north of Cambourne) was a more suitable site but it had not been considered properly.

The Local Development Framework Team Leader pointed out that Cambourne was one of the most sustainable communities in the District. Expansion plans would create a challenge and it was important to reflect the linked villages approach to Cambourne. The site north of the A428 had been rejected after a thorough assessment and had been resoundingly rejected by the Inspectors who examined the Local Development Framework.

A discussion ensued relating to the following:

- The cost of required infrastructure.
- Funding, including the City Deal.
- Road capacity.
- Coalescence and green separation.
- Drainage.

- Flooding in the Bourn valley.
- Bourn Airfield is the wrong place to site 3,500 dwellings.

Cllr Hawkins raised the following concerns:

- Funding and adequacy of transport infrastructure
- Coalescence
- Drainage and flooding

Cllr Hudson described the Bourn Airfield Development as a “BAD idea”. He said a village of 3,500 homes would not be viable (even though Bourn Airfield was a suitable site) – in evidence, he pointed to the originally-sized Cambourne and the pressure first of all for a further 950 dwellings, and now for a fourth linked village. There was insufficient infrastructure to mitigate the risk of flooding along the Bourn Valley. Measures were also needed to mitigate flood risk downstream at Uttons Drove. Foul sewerage issues needed to be addressed. Cllr Hudson described Cambourne as a fantastic place. He stated a preference for a smaller site of 1,000 houses on the north west corner of Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West to be on the larger footprint proposed by MCA.

Cllr Page raised the following:

- Flows into Bourn Brook and the section 106 for Cambourne were not being adhered to.
- Biodiversity along the Bourn valley.
- Officers were making decisions – planners were in conversation with developers ahead of Member workshops. Members said no to Bourn Airfield.

Cllr Hudson commented that the balancing ponds and the maintenance liability had been transferred to the Wildlife Trust.

Cllr Hall commented that it took time for new communities to become sustainable.

Cllr Riley said that in terms of green separation, the Council needed to learn lessons from the experience of Longstanton and Northstowe.

Cllr Williams said that there were uncertainties about the long-term viability of bus services in Cambridgeshire.

Cllr Roberts expressed concerns that Cambourne must be responsible for downstream flooding.

Cllr Hawkins asked to see previous Inspector’s reports that considered a new village at Bourn Airfield.

Cllr De Lacey said that if there is no monitoring of the flows, then the Council needs to know why. Real data should be available and be used to inform decisions now being made.

Strategic sites not in the Plan

Cllr Martin queried whether the Council was aware of any planning applications for the rejected sites and that if we were not careful it would become a free for all.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that there was an application pending for Cambourne West and applications in Waterbeach have gone to appeal.

Village Housing sites in the Plan

- **Sawston**

The three local Members (Cllrs Bard, Matthews and Cuffley) raised concerns about the proposals not being consistent with the principles of the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth. The schools, surgery and sewerage works were already at full capacity. 400 metres to bus stop from middle of new site. Although the bus service from the village is good (20 minute service) it takes a long route so people prefer to use the car - creating a car based development. Pressure on car parking was also an issue at the health centre and in the centre of the village. Wards Charity owns part of site but may not allow access to land to south which would impact on viability/deliverability.

Cllr Orgee, whose County Council Electoral Division included Sawston, said there was a need for more affordable housing in the area, and stated that one site was within Babraham parish. He also stated that the transport assessment is too Cambridge focused and does not consider trips to the south of the district.

- **Histon & Impington**

There were no comments.

- **Melbourn**

Cllr Hales expressed satisfaction with proposals for Melbourn.

- **Gamlingay**

Cllr Bridget Smith supported the assessment in principle, but was concerned the policy was too specific by mentioning light industrial and office uses and it should also provide for some general employment. It was important to maintain current levels of employment on the site, compatible with nearby houses. Officers agreed to consider a minor change to clarify that the reference in the plan to Use Class B1 and B2 included general employment.

- **Willingham**

There were no comments.

- **Comberton**

Cllr Scott asked for as much affordable housing as possible. Parish Council concerns include traffic impact, sewage, surface water issues, doctors at capacity. Section 106 monies would go to Toft parish. Queried whether there should be an Area Action Plan for site.

Cllr Hawkins argued that 60 new dwellings would be more sustainable. Affordable housing should be for both Toft and Comberton. Toft Parish Council was happy not to have playing fields, would prefer a small play area with monies for other measures.

Parish Council Proposals

Cllr Orgee supported inclusion of the Great and Little Abington proposals. Much support locally. Proposals for additional housing sites at Great and Little Abington had been subject to local consultation and proposed as major modifications.

Officers commented that a local consultation was taking place at Graveley, and the outcome would be considered in the report to Council.

Village sites not in the Plan

The Local Development Framework Team Leader stated that variations on four sites in Appendix C Part 2 Annex B had not been included in error, and would be added to the report to the Special meeting of Council on 13 March 2014.

Cllr Stewart considered there was local support for a development in Hardwick which was not included in the plan. There was a housing need within village. The Local Development Framework Team Leader said it could potentially be considered as an exception site or in future Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Climate Change

There were no comments

Design

There were no comments

Protecting and Enhancing the natural and historic environment

Cllr Williams supported policies on Green Belt within this chapter.

Housing

It was suggested that minimum room sizes would affect density levels. In reply, it was stated that these had been based on standards already enforced in affordable housing, and were unlikely to have a significant impact.

Building a strong and competitive economy

Cllr Williams expressed concern if the employment site in Fulbourn Road were to be developed it would impact on the landscape, and in particular views of the Gog Magogs. The landowners of the site do not intend to release land for development.

Promoting successful communities

There were no comments.

Promoting and delivering sustainable transport and infrastructure

There were no comments.

The Planning Policy & Localism Portfolio Holder **recommended** to a Special meeting of Full Council that:

- (a) the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: Proposed Submission document and Proposed Policies Map be 'submitted' for examination in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, together with the sustainability appraisal and associated evidence documents in support of the plan, with proposed Major Modifications (as contained in Appendix A) and proposed Minor Changes (as contained in Appendix B).
- (b) the following updated and additional evidence base documents be submitted with the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan:
- Key Issues and Assessment (Update to the Audit Trail at Annex A of the Sustainability Appraisal Report) - Appendix C
 - Statement of Consultation Update – Appendix D
 - Duty to Co-operate Statement Update – Appendix E
 - Great and Little Abington Parish Council Proposals: including consultation leaflet and results of consultation – Appendix F
 - Graveley Parish Council Proposals: including consultation leaflet (if supported by local consultation – update to be provided to Council meeting on 13 March 2014) – Appendix G
 - Sawston Transport Modelling – Appendix H
 - Development Frameworks evidence paper update – Appendix I
 - Sustainability Appraisal – update for Parish Council led proposals for The Abingtons – Appendix J
 - Habitats Regulations Assessment update – Appendix K.
 - Cambourne Retail and Employment Study- Explores retail and employment development in the village and opportunities to support future development – Appendix L.
 - Strategic Spatial Priorities: Addressing the Duty to Co-operate across Cambridgeshire & Peterborough – Appendix M
 - Services and Facilities Study Update – once finalised.
 - Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire – to be considered by the County Council's Cabinet for agreement on 4 March.
- (c) delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning and New Communities to make further additions to the schedules of changes during the course of the examination (except where changes would be of such significance as to substantially alter the meaning of a policy or allocation). The exercise of this delegation to be reported back to Planning Policy and Localism Portfolio Holder through the course of the examination process.
- (d) the Director of Planning and New Communities is authorised to prepare and submit reports, proofs of evidence, technical papers, statements of common ground and other such documents required in the presentation of the local plan through the examination process, reflecting the Council's agreed position on these matters and to take such other steps as are conducive or incidental to the submission and examination of the local plan.

18. UPDATE OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LDS)

The Planning Policy & Localism Portfolio Holder considered a report updating the Local Development Scheme for South Cambridgeshire which sets out the timetable for plan-making within the district. It included the timetable for the completion of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and work on new Area Action Plans for major areas of change

proposed in the draft Local Plan.

The Planning Policy & Localism Portfolio Holder **approved** the updated Local Development Scheme attached to the report as Appendix A, and **noted**

- (a) The inclusion of the revised timetable for the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, so long as the Special meeting of Council on 13 March 2014 agreed it for submission to the Secretary of State, and
- (b) the preparation, dependent as in (a) above, of Area Action Plans for Cambridge Northern Fringe East (in conjunction with Cambridge City Council), a new town at Waterbeach and a new village at Bourn Airfield.

19. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2012-2013

The Planning Policy & Localism Portfolio Holder considered a report about the Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report 2012-2013 for publication on the Council's website.

The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) included the Council's updated housing trajectory setting out predicted completions each year up to 2031, and its five-year housing land supply position.

The Planning Policy & Localism Portfolio Holder

- (e) **approved** the contents of the Annual Monitoring Report 2012-2013 for publication; and
- (f) **delegated** to the Planning and New Communities Director the responsibility to make any further minor editing changes to the Annual Monitoring Report where they are of a technical nature.

20. WORK PROGRAMME

This item was not considered.

21. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

This item was not considered.

The Meeting ended at 4.55 p.m.
