

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a special meeting of the Council held on  
Thursday, 21 April 2005 at 9.30 a.m.

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

Councillors: Dr DR Bard, EW Bullman, NN Cathcart, Mrs A Elsby, R Hall, Mrs SA Hatton, Mrs JM Healey, Dr JA Heap, Mrs CA Hunt, HC Hurrell, Mrs HF Kember, SGM Kindersley, RMA Manning, MJ Mason, CR Nightingale, Mrs DP Roberts, J Shepperson, Mrs HM Smith, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, Dr SEK van de Ven, JF Williams and Dr JR Williamson

Officer: Keith Miles Planning Policy Manager

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors JD Batchelor, BR Burling, JP Chatfield, SM Edwards, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs EM Heazell, Mrs JA Muncey, Dr JPR Orme, Mrs GJ Smith, JH Stewart, RT Summerfield, RJ Turner, Mrs BE Waters, TJ Wotherspoon, NIC Wright and SS Ziaian-Gillan.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

### **2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Members authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2005 (Cambridge Southern Fringe Results and Approach).

### **3. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE (DRAFT AREA ACTION PLAN)**

Members considered the emerging content of the draft Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan, noting that a final version would be presented to them at the Council meeting scheduled for 9<sup>th</sup> May 2005 in order to adopt the plan for publication.

In presenting his report, the Planning Policy Manager corrected an error on page 51 of the draft Area Action Plan. In Policy CSF/15, paragraph 1(a), the reference in line three to Haverhill Road should have been to Granhams Road. Members considered the Area Action Plan as follows:

#### **A. Introduction**

In response to a Member's question, the Planning Policy Manager informed Members that the development would consist of about 1,200 dwellings in total, of which about 600 would be in South Cambridgeshire at a density of approximately 50 to the hectare. Plans for landscaping around the Bell School had been published by Cambridge City Council, and South Cambridgeshire District Council would be developing a strategy for addressing that issue in due course.

#### **B. Vision and Development Principles**

In response to a Member's question, the Planning Policy Manager said that

Cambridgeshire County Council had the long-term objective of improving the public Rights of Way network around Cambridge. South Cambridgeshire District Council would be consulted about the proposals in due course. Among other things, the District Council will be eager to secure unbroken public access between the Cambridge Southern Fringe and Wandlebury and the Gog Magog hills. This envisaged the development of a golf course (with its associated rights of way) in Great Shelford: if this project did not come to fruition, the County Council would have to reassess the situation. The Planning Policy Manager undertook to place copies of the Rights of Way proposals in the Members' lounge.

The issue of cycle paths was discussed, and Members noted that the County Council's aspirations in this regard had not been updated since their discussion document published 18 months' ago.

### **C. Trumpington West and the southern setting of Cambridge**

Members noted this part of the Area Action Plan.

#### **D1. The Structure of Trumpington West**

Members noted Policy CSF/6 covering the physical structure of Trumpington West and the Concept Plan showing the distribution of its key components. This addressed the main land uses, services, facilities and infrastructure, the character, design and landscaping with particular reference to the importance of this approach to Cambridge and its relationship with the River Cam valley. It sought to provide the basis for subsequent masterplans required by the AAP, which could be prepared by developers or by the Council to show in more detail how the principles of the Structural Policy should be interpreted for the development of the area.

In response to concern about the buildings fronting onto the M11 motorway being of up to four storeys, the Planning Policy Manager reminded Members that they had addressed this issue, and accepted it in principle, at the meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2005. He commented that substantial landmark buildings on the city edge were characteristic of Cambridge, but acknowledged that such buildings hitherto had been other than residential. There would be landscaping beyond these buildings in any event to soften their impact.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that, while the Council's aspirations might, at first glance, appear ambitious, some of them related only to Trumpington West while others to the Cambridge Southern Fringe as a whole. They reflected the scale of the proposed development. He added that mitigation of the visual impact of buildings was a significant element of the funding package to be negotiated, and all relevant parties would be required to contribute to such mitigation.

Members endorsed Policies CSF/1 to CSF/6 inclusive.

#### **D2. Housing (CSF/7)**

In response to a Member's question, the Planning Policy Manager confirmed that the development of the Cambridge Southern Fringe would be carried out seamlessly between those parts in the administrative areas of South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council. There would not be any physical separation.

Stressing the importance of this southern approach to Cambridge, Members insisted that good design and high quality would be essential considerations in finalising house types

in what amounted to an urban area. Sensitively-designed buildings comprising three or four storeys could be built without causing any adverse impact on the character of the area.

In response to a Member's question, the Planning Policy Manager said that paragraph D2.8 did not intend restricting the definition of Key Workers to that only of employees of Addenbrookes Hospital. Members reiterated their view that the general definition of Key Workers was in need of review by central Government. While Cambridgeshire Horizons were currently drawing up their own proposals, it was suggested that the District Council should prepare a separate submission reflecting the specific needs of workers living in South Cambridgeshire.

The Planning Policy Manager acknowledged the desirability of making some provision in the Cambridge Southern Fringe for Travellers.

### **D3. Employment (CSF/8)**

In the light of employment issues in recent years at such places as Monsanto, Bayer Crop Sciences and Hexel at Duxford, Members decided that the employment at Trumpington West would not include any reference to high technology research and development. Justifying the Council's approved policy, the Planning Policy Manager explained that the employment provisions in the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan, as in all the AAPs, had been designed to meet the needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region as a whole. South Cambridgeshire was already one of the fastest growing districts in the country. He added that growth is jobs-led and additional encouragement for job growth would result in even higher levels of housing growth.

A Member stressed the importance of ensuring, as far as possible, that the supply and type of housing should reflect and support the supply and type of employment opportunities in the area. Another Member argued that, on sustainability and economic viability grounds, employment on this site should not be seen as a priority, as most residents would work at existing places of employment.

Councillor RMA Manning proposed and Councillor JF Williams seconded, that Policy CSF/8 (Employment) be amended so as to exclude, from paragraph D3.3, all words after the words "Cambridge Sub-Region".

By 11 votes to seven, with three Members registering their presence but not voting, it was **RESOLVED** that paragraph D3.3 of the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan be amended to read as follows:

"Employment development at Trumpington West will be subject to Policy EM/1 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD that reserves employment land for development that can demonstrate a clear need to be located in the area, to serve local needs, or contribute to the continued success of the Cambridge Sub-Region."

### **D4. Community facilities, leisure, arts and culture, including community development (CSF/9)**

Members noted the positive stance adopted by the existing residents in Trumpington, who had expressed a desire to be engaged fully in developing future community facilities within the proposed development. The Planning Policy Manager clarified that Trumpington West would not be developed as a

standalone community, but rather as an expansion of the existing village, whose centre would therefore need to expand in order to reflect the nature of the new community.

In response to concerns expressed by Members, the Planning Policy Manager stated that Cambridge City Council was taking the lead in developing a framework for the future management of community and leisure facilities within the proposed development. The Community Development section of South Cambridgeshire District Council had been instrumental in the preparation of the South Cambridgeshire Area Action Plan.

In response to a further question, the Planning Policy Manager confirmed that negotiations with the South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge Primary Care Trusts were ongoing in an effort to secure appropriate health facilities, to be funded by the development.

Members endorsed Policies CSF/7 (subject to further consideration being given to Key Workers and Travellers as referred to in D2 above), CSF/8, and CSF/9 (subject to the conclusion of satisfactory negotiations relating to health facilities as referred to in D4 above).

## **D5. Transport**

Referring to Appendix B Map 1 of the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan, the Planning Policy Manager reminded Members that the District Council would have an opportunity to respond to consultation on details relating to the proposed road layout in due course. In response to a Member's concerns that road infrastructure must be in place before any further development takes place, he quoted from Cambridge City Council's Local Plan, which indicated that transport capacity must be adequate relevant to each successive stage of development.

The Planning Policy Manager reminded Members that Appendix C Map 2 was a Concept Map only.

In response to grave concerns from a Member regarding the timing of provision of the Addenbrookes' Link Road in the context of the rest of the development, the Planning Policy Manager said that it would be a County Road from the outset (as opposed to a developer's road that would be adopted as a County road) and that the District, City and County Councils were working in partnership to ensure a satisfactory outcome.

The Leader of the Council requested that officers write to Cambridgeshire Horizons, highlighting the District Council's deep concern that infrastructure should be in place prior to any other development taking place.

In relation to paragraph D5.6 (Cycling and Pedestrians), a Member questioned the reference to cycling being a substitute for short car journeys, particularly those of less than five kilometres (three miles). The opportunity should be taken to promote cycling beyond that distance, from the development area to the southern villages in the District. Quality of cycleways was also important. The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that the development would provide a cycle route that negated the need to cross the slip roads onto and from the M11, but said there was a limit to what the Council could require the developer to provide in relation to cycle routes elsewhere.

The Leader of the Council urged Members to bear in mind that planning obligations tended to increase the market price of new houses. The Planning Policy Manager

added that Section 106 Agreements should be restricted to what a development *needs* in order to make a scheme acceptable in planning terms rather than what individuals or groups might *want*.

Councillor Dr S van de Ven proposed and Councillor Mrs SA Hatton seconded that cycle routes be provided from the development site to the southern villages in the District, and that existing cycle routes to those villages be upgraded as appropriate.

By 13 votes to nine, with one Member registering a presence but not voting), the proposal was **DEFEATED**.

**D6. Landscape**

**D7. Biodiversity (CSF/15)**

A Member suggested that the issues of water features and land/water contamination should be core strategies.

Responsibility for maintaining water features must be established at the outset.

Construction spoil would contribute to noise attenuation alongside the M11 motorway.

In response to a Member's question, the Planning Policy Manager explained that the Green Finger linking to Gog Magog Down was to provide public access to the area.

Members endorsed Policies CSF/10 to CSF/15 inclusive, subject to Policy CSF/15-4 (Connecting Green Fingers and the Countryside) being reworded to emphasise the purpose behind the Green Fingers.

**D8. Archaeology and Heritage**

Members accepted this Chapter without debate.

**D9. Meeting Recreational Needs**

In response to a Member's question, the Planning Policy Manager reported that negotiations with Cambridge City Council were ongoing in relation to responsibility for the future maintenance of Public Open Space within the development in the absence of a Parish Council.

He added that a number of organisations had expressed an interest in assuming management responsibility for countryside aspects of the development.

**D10. Land Drainage, Water Conservation, Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal**

Water quality was of paramount importance.

A Member stated that surface water drainage from roads must be by means of appropriate interceptors, thus preventing pollution from fuel.

Members endorsed Policies CSF/16 to CSF/19 inclusive.

- D11 Telecommunications**
- D12. An Exemplar in Sustainability**
- D13. Waste**

Members accepted these Chapters without debate.

#### **E1. Phasing and Implementation**

A Member said that appropriate landscaping and noise attenuation measures should be put in place as soon as possible so as to minimise disruption to local residents resulting from construction traffic using the Haul Road. The Planning Policy Manager undertook to amend Policy CSF/22 (Construction Strategy) to reflect this wish.

Officers from the District Council's Environmental Health section would be assisting the Development Services Department in formulating suitable noise attenuation measures.

#### **E2. Planning Obligations and Conditions**

Members accepted this Chapter without debate.

Members endorsed Policies CSF/20 to CSF/26 inclusive, and reiterated their endorsement of Policy DP/4 of the Core Strategy.

Subject to the comments and amendments referred to above, Council **RESOLVED**

- (1) To authorise the Director of Development Services to subject the emerging policy approach for the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan to independent sustainability / strategic environmental assessment; and
- (2) To delegate to the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder authority to make any material changes deemed necessary as a result of further information, and to the Director of Development Services authority to approve minor editing changes.

---

**The Meeting ended at 12.45 p.m.**

---