



SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING
THURSDAY, 23 JUNE 2005

REPORTS AND MINUTES

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne, Cambridge
CB3 6ES

If the press and public are likely to be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item on the grounds that exempt information is to be considered, it will be necessary to pass the following resolution: "That under Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph (quoting relevant paragraph) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act."

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

TO: The Chairman and Members of the
South Cambridgeshire District Council

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the next meeting of the **COUNCIL** will be held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER** at **2.00 P.M.** on

THURSDAY, 23 JUNE 2005

and I am, therefore to summon you to attend accordingly for the transaction of the business specified below.

DATED this 15 June 2005 date

GJ HARLOCK
Finance and Resources Director

AGENDA

1. **MINUTES**
To authorise the Chairman to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2005 as a correct record.

(Pages 1 - 10)
2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
To receive any declarations of interest from Members on matters arising in this agenda.
3. **Chairman's Announcements**
4. **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**
None received to date.
5. **PETITIONS**
To note all petitions received since the last Council meeting. None received to date.
6. **TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Cabinet 9 June 2005
The Plans recommended to Council for approval are available on the Intranet/Web Site attached to this agenda: www.scambs.gov.uk.....
Would any Member requiring a paper copy please contact Democratic Services by 21 June.
- 6 (a) **Workforce Plan 2005/6 to 2008/9**
Cabinet **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL** that the Workforce Plan (including the Action Plan) be approved as submitted to Cabinet.

6 (b) Food Safety Service Plan 2005/06
Cabinet **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL** that the Food Service Plan 2005/06 be approved as submitted to Cabinet.

6 (c) Health and Safety Service Plan 2005-2006
Cabinet **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL** that the Health and Safety Service Plan 2005-2006 be approved as submitted to Cabinet.

7. PERFORMANCE PLAN 2005

To consider the draft Performance Plan for 2005, copies of which are circulated separately with this agenda for Members only. The draft is being made available on the Council's web site, as will the final version.

The Performance Plan is a statutory document which must be published annually by 30th June. The plan must include information showing the Council's objectives; how it has performed against those objectives; and what its plans are for improving services in relation to its objectives in the next year (2005/06) and beyond.

The draft plan is based on a number of decisions which have already been made by the Council. In particular, it reflects:-

- a) The three priorities adopted by the Council (Improving Customer Service, Northstowe and Affordable Housing)
- b) The CPA Improvement Plan approved by the Council in January.
- c) The Medium Term Financial Strategy and budget for 2005/06.
- d) The performance indicator targets set in service plans and approved by portfolio holders.
- e) The aims and actions agreed in the Community Strategy.
- f) Other plans and policies such as the IEG statement, the timetable for the LDF, the results of the Affordable Housing Best Value review, plans for developing risk management and the workforce plan.

The plan has been prepared on the basis of current budgets for 2005/06. **If the Council is required to make substantial budget cuts in response to capping, many of the improvement plans in the document will need to be revised.**

Members are requested to approve the plan, with any amendments they feel appropriate, but also to give delegated approval to finalise the plan prior to publication to take account of any detailed corrections and drafting changes that are required.

The Council is **RECOMMENDED**

1. To approve the draft plan as circulated.
2. To give authority to the Chief Executive and the Leader of the Council to approve the final draft of the plan for publication by 30th June 2005.

8. A14 IMPROVEMENTS - RESPONSE TO CONSULTATIONS

To consider the Council's response to the Highways Agency's public consultation on the proposed improvement scheme for the A14 from Ellington to Fen Ditton.

The report of the Development Services Director is attached.

(Pages 11 - 24)

9. INDEPENDENT MEMBERS' REMUNERATION PANEL

Further to suggestions made on 27 January, when Members' Allowances for 2005-2006 were considered, that the membership of the Independent Panel might require review, it is now **RECOMMENDED** that the Panel be appointed on a rolling three year basis starting with the current year.

The Panel currently has three members, so one would retire each year.

The Panel itself has suggested a term of three years, although with an option for a further term, and is supportive of a rolling programme of retirement.

Council is also invited to indicate areas which should be represented on the Panel: the present members have suggested:

- The business sector
- The public sector
- A former district councillor
- A former parish councillor

FOR DECISION

10. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

Representatives are required for the following bodies:

Cambridgeshire Association of Local Councils (CALC), South Cambs District
Former councillor Saberton has continued as this Council's representative, but the Association feels that, in order to maintain good links between the two bodies, a serving member would be preferable.

Circle 33 Housing Association

Councillor Kindersley wishes to step down

Cottenham Village College Sports Centre Management Group

No volunteer was forthcoming at the last Council meeting

11. TO RECEIVE THE REPORTS OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS

(* indicates that the Minutes have already been confirmed as a correct record)

11 (a) Cabinet 26 May 2005*

(Pages 25 - 26)

11 (b) Cabinet 9 June 2005

(Pages 27 - 38)

11 (c) Development and Conservation Control Committee 13 May 2005

(Pages 39 - 46)

11 (d) Licensing Committee 26 May 2005

(Pages 47 - 50)

11 (e) **Scrutiny and Overview Committee 19 May 2005**

(Pages 51 - 58)

12. **TRAVELLERS ISSUES : URGENT ITEM**

This urgent item seeks to broaden the scope of the planning enforcement activities relating to travellers funded by the current budget provision.

Report attached

(Pages 59 - 62)

13. **TO RECEIVE QUESTIONS ON JOINT MEETINGS**

None held since the last Council meeting.

14. **Updates from Members Appointed to Outside Bodies**

15. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

To consider the following Notice of Motion standing in the name of Councillor NJ Scarr:

"That South Cambridgeshire District Council is aware of the need to conduct as much as possible of its business in public, and to be seen to do.

Council therefore resolves that when agendas and reports are prepared for meetings, confidential material will be gathered into an appendix or separate section, so that as much as possible of the agenda, item or report can be debated in public.

Council believes that this commitment is essential to re-assure the public that only legally exempt material is being withheld, and to maintain public confidence in the decision-making processes.

To consider the following Notice of Motion standing in the name of Councillor JA Hockney, seconded by Councillor NIC Wright:

"This Council agrees that for future leadership elections candidates should each have an appointed observer during the count. The final result should then be confirmed with the candidates and Chief Executive before it is announced".

together with the following amendment standing in the name of Councillor A Riley, seconded by Councillor Dr DR Bard:

*"This Council agrees that for future elections for Leader, **Chairman and Vice-Chairman**, candidates should each appoint an observer of the count. The final result should then be confirmed with the candidates and Chief Executive before it is announced. **In the event of a tie the election is decided on the toss of a coin.**"*

16. **CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS**

To note the Chairman's engagements since the last Council meeting:

Date	Venue/Event
30 May 05	Madingley American Cemetery: Memorial Day

9 June 05 Official opening of South Cambridgeshire Hall by the Duke of Edinburgh

9 June 05 Horningsea: Sounds of Summer

10 June 05 Naming of Lake Lambert, Cambourne

10 June 05 Elsworth: Sounds of Summer

11 June 05 Ely Cathedral: launch of the Music Appeal

12 June 05 St Ives: Annual Civic Service

12 June 05 Peterborough Cathedral: Installation of Mayor

14 June 05 Waterbeach: visit to Environment Operations Department

17 June 05 Girton College: Romany Theatre Company production of "Our Big Land"

18 June 05 Ely Cathedral Trust: annual gathering

20 June 05 Homerton College: Evening News Awards

22 June 05 Peterborough Town Hall: open day

22 June 05 Proclamation of Midsummer Fair by Mayor of Cambridge

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At the annual meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 26 May 2005 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Councillors: Mrs CAED Murfitt, RF Bryant, SJ Agnew, Dr DR Bard, RE Barrett, JD Batchelor, EW Bullman, BR Burling, NN Cathcart, JP Chatfield, Mrs PS Corney, Mrs J Dixon, Mrs SJO Doggett, SM Edwards, Mrs A Elsby, R Hall, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs SA Hatton, Mrs JM Healey, Dr JA Heap, Mrs EM Heazell, JA Hockney, MP Howell, Mrs CA Hunt, HC Hurrell, Mrs HF Kember, SGM Kindersley, RMA Manning, RB Martlew, MJ Mason, DC McCraith, DH Morgan, Mrs JA Muncey, CR Nightingale, Dr JPR Orme, R Page, EJ Pateman, JA Quinlan, A Riley, Mrs DP Roberts, NJ Scarr, J Shepperson, Mrs GJ Smith, Mrs HM Smith, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, JH Stewart, RT Summerfield, Mrs VM Trueman, RJ Turner, Dr SEK van de Ven, Mrs BE Waters, DALG Wherrell, JF Williams, Dr JR Williamson, NIC Wright and SS Ziaian-Gillan

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor TJ Wotherspoon.

Presentation

The Chairman presented a cheque for £3,001 to his charity for the year, Cam-mind. It was accepted on their behalf by Mr Keith Evans. The Chairman confirmed that over the past two years, £7,000 had been collected and donated to Cam-mind and Arthur Rank House.

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR

On the proposal of Councillor Mrs DSK Spink, seconded by Councillor Dr JR Williamson, and there being no other nominations, Council

RESOLVED that Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt be elected Chairman of the Council for the coming year.

Councillor Mrs Murfitt accepted the office and signed the declaration of acceptance. She thanked Council for having faith in her and paid tribute to Councillor Bryant for his chairmanship and to Mrs Bryant for the support she had given him.

Councillor Bryant then gave a resume of some of the significant issues of his term of office, and offered thanks to the Chief Executive and Leader for their guidance, to Miss Leyshon, to his Vice-Chairman, to the staff and to Members for their support and good humour. Instead of accepting the customary portrait, he had given a sum equivalent to the cost to his charity.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN OF COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR

Councillor JH Stewart was proposed by Councillor MP Howell, seconded by Councillor Dr JPR Orme; Councillor RE Barrett was proposed by Councillor Dr DR Bard, seconded by Councillor EW Bullman. On a vote being taken, Council

RESOLVED that Councillor JH Stewart be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Council for the coming year.

Councillor Stewart accepted the office, signing the declaration of acceptance, and thanked Members for the honour.

3. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 28 April 2005 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Minutes of the Local Development Framework meeting held on 9 May 2005 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments:

LDF: Approval of Draft Documents for Publication for Pre-submission Participation (minute 3)

In bullet points in the first paragraph:

Public Examination to commence on 7th July 2006 and complete on 22nd October 2006.

The Inspector's report expected in mid February 2007

LDF Appendix B – Northstowe Area Action Plan (minute 3(b))

Tenth paragraph – the amendment to Policy NS/14 was proposed by Councillor Mrs HM Smith, not Dr JR Williamson.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor SM Edwards declared a personal interest in agenda item 8(b) because of acquaintance with a Nene Housing Society representative.

Councillor JA Quinlan declared a general interest as a Chartered Town Planner in practice.

5. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman asked that she be addressed as 'Chairman'.

Cabinet would meet directly after Council.

The Chairman would continue the practice of eliciting a £5.00 fine from those Members whose mobile telephones were allowed to ring in any meeting during the 2005/06 year. These fines, and other monies collected through the year, would be donated to the Chairman's chosen charity for the da Vinci robotic system project at Addenbrooke's Hospital for research and the care of patients with prostate cancer.

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None received.

7. PETITIONS

Receipt of a petition calling for the retention of the resident "warden" for the Plantation Road Sheltered Housing Community, Sawston and the action being taken, was **NOTED**.

Councillor CR Nightingale referred to a problem with the fire alarm at sheltered housing in Great Shelford; this was referred to the Portfolio Holder and the relevant manager.

8. PARISH MEMBERS OF STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Concerns were expressed about the manner of the selection of the recommended parish members of the Standards Committee and Council

AGREED that a review of the selection procedure be referred to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee and that consideration of the recommendation from the District Council members of the Standards Committee be deferred pending that review.

9. WINDMILL ESTATE, FULBOURN

The Housing Portfolio Holder expressed her thanks to all concerned with this project for their hard work. The project was now at the end of the first stage and the majority of residents were in favour of re-development of the estate. Councillor Mrs Heazell urged county councillors to lobby for support at the County Council.

Councillor NJ Scarr, as a local Member, commended the recommendations from Cabinet and Council unanimously **RESOLVED**

That once a redevelopment scheme for the Windmill estate has been approved and planning consent obtained, the properties held on a short term lease, together with any other Council properties that become vacant thereafter and any other land in the Council's ownership within the estate boundary (to be agreed), be disposed of to Nene Housing Society for redevelopment purposes subject to the following conditions:

- (i) that redevelopment will maximise the number of affordable homes to be provided with no more than 30% to be open market housing and,
- (ii) that the Council will only transfer the freehold interest in the land required for the open market dwellings at nil cost and,
- (iii) that the land on which any new affordable dwellings are provided (social rented and shared ownership units) will be leased under a 125 year term to Nene Housing Society at nil cost with the Council retaining the freehold interest. However, an option within the lease will enable Nene Housing Society to acquire the freehold interest at an independent open market valuation that reflects the use of the land ie for affordable housing and,
- (iv) that Nene Housing Society will meet any legal costs and home loss/disturbance payments incurred by the Council in respect of the Windmill estate in 2004/05 and future years and,
- (v) that a value for money scheme can be developed to enable appropriate funding from external sources to be secured,
- (vi) that any new affordable housing is tailored to meet identified housing needs as agreed by the Council,
- (vii) that the Council will be entitled to receive nomination rights of 100% of initial lets and 75% of subsequent lettings of all social rented units provided through refurbished and new build affordable housing on the sites and,
- (viii) that the Council will receive 100% nomination rights in perpetuity to any shared ownership and/or other intermediate tenures provided through refurbished and new build affordable housing on the sites and,
- (ix) that the Council will not seek to use compulsory purchase powers to facilitate the redevelopment and,
- (x) that as far as possible the wishes of all residents (tenants, owner-occupiers and leaseholders) should be accommodated without compromising the wishes of others on the Windmill Estate and,
- (xi) that Nene Housing Society will contribute towards the cost of any additional

staffing resources that may need to be identified within Shire Homes to manage the redevelopment scheme.

10. SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE'S SIX MONTHLY REPORT TO COUNCIL

The Report for the six months to May 2005 was **NOTED**.

11. POLITICAL PROPORTIONALITY

Councillor NJ Scarr having asked that setting up small groups on a party basis be avoided, Council unanimously

RESOLVED that current mixed arrangements for the allocation of seats on various constituent parts of the Council be maintained for 2005/06.

12. ELECTION OF LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR

Tributes were paid by the current and former Chairmen to Councillor Mrs DSK Spink, who was stepping down as Leader.

Councillor SGM Kindersley was proposed by Councillor RF Bryant, seconded by Councillor Mrs EM Heazell; Councillor Mrs DP Roberts was proposed by Councillor Mrs DSK Spink, seconded by Councillor MP Howell. On a vote being taken, Council

RESOLVED that Councillor SGM Kindersley be elected Leader of the Council for the coming year.

Councillor Kindersley paid tribute to Councillor Mrs Roberts and thanked Members for their support. He thanked Councillor Bryant and paid tribute to Councillor Mrs Spink; and expressed the hope that he could work with all for the benefit of the Council and that all Members would help the Cabinet achieve their best.

Councillor Mrs Roberts thanked Councillor Mrs Spink for her guidance and congratulated Councillor Kindersley, expressing confidence that they would work well together.

13. DETERMINATION OF THE SIZE OF THE EXECUTIVE (CABINET)

On the proposal of Councillor MP Howell, seconded by Councillor SGM Kindersley, Council

RESOLVED that for 2005/06 the Executive comprise 8 members (the Leader and 7 portfolio holders).

14. APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE FOR THE YEAR

The nominations put forward by the recognised groups were accepted and it was

RESOLVED that the following be appointed as members of the Executive for the coming year:

Councillor Dr DR Bard (Conservative)
Councillor JD Batchelor (Liberal Democrat)
Councillor Mrs JM Healey (Conservative)
Councillor Mrs EM Heazell (Liberal Democrat)

Councillor Mrs DP Roberts (Independent)
 Councillor Mrs DSK Spink (Conservative)
 Councillor RT Summerfield (Independent)

15. DETERMINATION OF THE SIZE OF THE SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

Council unanimously

RESOLVED that the total membership of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee for 2005/06 be 16.

16. APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

The nominations of the recognised groups were accepted, and Council

RESOLVED that the following members be appointed to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee for 2005/06:

Conservative Group	RE Barrett R Hall JA Hockney HC Hurrell DC McCraith DH Morgan
Liberal Democrat Group	AJ Agnew RB Martlew Mrs GJ Smith Mrs HM Smith Dr SEK van de Ven
Independent Group	RF Bryant MP Howell MJ Mason Mrs CAED Murfitt
Labour Group	NN Cathcart

17. DETERMINATION OF SIZE AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Development and Conservation Control Committee

RESOLVED that for 2005/06, the Development and Conservation Control Committee comprise 35 members as follows:

Dr DR Bard	RE Barrett	JD Batchelor
RF Bryant	Mrs PS Corney	Mrs J Dixon
SM Edwards	Mrs A Elsby	R Hall
Mrs SA Hatton	Mrs JM Healey	Mrs EM Heazell
Mrs CA Hunt	HC Hurrell	SGM Kindersley
RB Martlew	DH Morgan	Mrs JA Muncey
Mrs CAED Murfitt	CR Nightingale	Dr JPR Orme
R Page	EJ Pateman	JA Quinlan
A Riley	Mrs DP Roberts	NJ Scarr
Mrs HM Smith	Mrs DSK Spink	JH Stewart
RJ Turner	JF Williams	Dr JR Williamson
NIC Wright	SS Ziaian-Gillan	

Licensing Committee and Licensing Committee (2003 Act)

It was noted that 14 trained members of the Committee remained and it was felt that this would be sufficient to cope with hearings in the immediate future. Council

RESOLVED that for 2005/06 the Licensing Committee and the Licensing Committee (2003 Act) comprise 14 members as follows:

RE Barrett	EW Bullman	Mrs A Elsby
R Hall	Mrs SA Hatton	Mrs HM Kember
Mrs JA Muncey	Mrs CAED Murfitt	Dr JPR Orme
A Riley	NJ Scarr	J Shepperson
DALG Wherrell	Dr JR Williamson	

and that Councillors DC McCraith, Mrs DSK Spink (first reserve) and SS Ziaian-Gillan be reserves for the Committee and be provided with training.

Employment Committee

RESOLVED that for 2005/06 the Employment Committee comprise 8 members as follows plus the Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder:

RE Barrett	Mrs SJO Doggett	SM Edwards
Mrs SA Hatton	Dr JA Heap	MP Howell
Mrs GJ Smith	Mrs VM Trueman	

Electoral Arrangements Committee

RESOLVED that for 2005/06 the Electoral Arrangements Committee comprise 8 members as follows:

EW Bullman	Mrs SJO Doggett	Mrs SA Hatton
MJ Mason	Mrs HM Smith	RT Summerfield
Mrs VM Trueman	Mrs BE Waters	

Standards Committee

To fill the one vacancy, Council

RESOLVED that Councillor Mrs VM Trueman be appointed to the Standards Committee for a four year term.

Constitution Review Working Party

RESOLVED that for 2005/06 the Constitution Review Working Party comprise:

Leader of the Council	
Deputy Leader	
Chairman of the Council	
Chairman or Vice-Chairman of Scrutiny and Overview Committee	
Dr DR Bard	Conservative
Mrs EM Heazell	Liberal Democrat
RF Bryant	Independent
NN Cathcart	Labour

18. ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

RESOLVED that, subject to a Cabinet decision on whether the Conference should be attended, Councillor RB Martlew be appointed from Council generally to attend the LGA Annual Conference.

19. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE AND JOINT BODIES

RESOLVED to make the following appointments to outside bodies:

Addenbrooke's NHS Trust/LA Working Party	Mrs EM Heazell MP Howell CR Nightingale
Age Concern	Mrs HF Kember
Archives Advisory Group	Mrs GJ Smith
Arts in Cambridgeshire on Tour (ACT)	Mrs GJ Smith
Bassingbourn Village College Centre Management Committee	NN Cathcart
Cambridge Airport Consultative Committee	Mrs CA Hunt
Cambridge Airport Relocation Study Member Reference Group	JF Williams
Cambridge Arts Theatre	Mrs JA Muncey
Cambridge Bus Development Board	JD Batchelor Mrs SA Hatton Mrs BE Waters
Cambridge Citizens' Advice Bureau	RB Martlew
Cambridge and County Folk Museum	SJ Agnew
Cambridge East Member Reference Group	Mrs SJO Doggett Mrs CA Hunt Mrs HM Smith (sub) RJ Turner
Cambridge Film Consortium	JA Hockney
Cambridge Marriage Guidance Council (Relate)	Mrs VM Trueman
Cambridge Southern Fringe Member Reference Group	Mrs EM Heazell Mrs HF Kember CR Nightingale Dr JPR Orme
Cambridge Women and Homelessness Group	Mrs EM Heazell Dr SEK van de Ven (sub) CR Nightingale
Cambridgeshire Association of Youth Clubs (CAYC)	RE Barrett
Cambridgeshire County Council Health & Social Care Scrutiny Committee	
Cambridgeshire Historic Churches Advisory Council	R Hall
Comberton Village College Governing Body sub-committee	SA Harangozo
County Council Rail Policy (Service Advisory) Group	JD Batchelor
County Museums Advisory Committee	DC McCraith
Cross Border Arts	SA Harangozo
Duxford Airfield Management Liaison Committee	JA Quinlan
Eastern Orchestral Board	JA Quinlan
Emmaus Cambridge Community	Mrs HM Smith
Farmland Museum Trustees	JA Hockney
Friends of Milton Country Park	Mrs JA Muncey

Linton Community Sport Centre, Linton Village College	Mrs GJ Smith
Magog Trust	CR Nightingale
Melbourn Community Sports Ltd	Mrs CAED Murfitt
	DALG Wherrell
Mepal Outdoor Centre	SM Edwards
National Society for Clean Air and Environmental Protection	Dr JR Williamson
Needingworth Quarry Liaison Committee	BR Burling
North Herts Citizens' Advice Bureau	DC McCraith
	Dr SEK van de Ven
Old West Internal Drainage Board	MJ Mason
	J Shepperson
Over and Willingham Internal Drainage Board	RMA Manning
Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	MP Howell
River Cam Conservators	Mrs HM Smith
Sawston Village College Sports Users' Committee	Dr DR Bard
	Mrs SA Hatton
	HC Hurrell
	Mrs HF Kember
	CR Nightingale
	SS Ziaian-Gillan
SOFA (Shifting Offered Furniture Around)	Mrs HF Kember
South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Dr JR Williamson
Swaffham Internal Drainage Board	MJ Mason
Swavesey Byeways Advisory Committee	EW Bullman
	J Shepperson
Swavesey Internal Drainage Board	BR Burling
	J Shepperson
The Junction/Cambridge Drama Centre	JA Hockney
Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board	MJ Mason
	Dr JR Williamson
South Cambs Magazine Editorial Panel	Mrs CAED Murfitt
	Dr SEK van de Ven

No volunteer was forthcoming for the Cottenham Village College Sports Centre Management Group.

The Council's substitute on the Cambridgeshire County Council Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee was referred to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee

Representation on the following was deleted:

Bottisham Village College Liaison Group
Kettles Yard
The Junction – second representative

20. REPORTS OF MEETINGS

The Minutes of the following meetings were **RECEIVED**, subject to matters considered at Minutes 20(a) to 20(c) below:

Cabinet	28 April 2005
Cabinet	12 May 2005
Development and Conservation Control Committee	2 March 2005

Development and Conservation Control Committee	6 April 2005
Scrutiny and Overview Committee	17 March 2005
Scrutiny and Overview Committee	21 April 2005

Minutes of the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 19 April 2005 were withdrawn for referral to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee.

20 (a) Cabinet 28 April 2005

Strategic Implications of Possible Planning Enforcement Action at Traveller Sites
(minute 7)

In response to Councillor SM Edwards, the Chief Executive explained that Cabinet had authority to agree a policy of taking injunctive action, but that deciding on action on any specific site was a Development and Conservation Control Committee function. The Leader added that this decision did not exclude other action. It was further confirmed that that was not a change of policy but a supplemental form of action available to the Council, and that the policy needed to be kept under constant review.

The Leader indicated that he was happy for the Council's solicitors to meet the local councillors if they wished, to explain details of the additional alternative approach.

20 (b) Cabinet 12 May 2005

Windmill Estate, Fulbourn (minute 3)

In relation to his quoted comments, Councillor NJ Scarr asked to make it clear that he had never seen himself as persuading people to change their minds on their future housing. Any change of view must be on the merit of the case.

20 (c) Development and Conservation Control Committee 6 April 2005

S/1663/04/F – Boxworth and Conington (minute 3)

Councillor MP Howell, on behalf of the local Members, reported that they were extremely happy with the decision and asked that their appreciation of Mr Rush keeping them informed and giving full explanations, should be recorded.

It was noted that the Council's acceptance of wind energy in the right place had been explicitly stated at the Committee meeting.

Councillor Mrs EM Heazell reported that she had registered that she would not vote as she had not attended the site visit.

In relation to this comment, the Chief Executive stated that there were sometimes problems with the voting system when units were disconnected, but that it had been checked and found working prior to 6 April. The system would be checked regularly.

21. TO RECEIVE QUESTIONS ON JOINT MEETINGS

No questions received.

22. UPDATES FROM MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OUTSIDE BODIES

Councillor Mrs GJ Smith reported that Arts in Cambridgeshire on Tour (ACT) had moved office and were now sharing accommodation at Sawston Village College.

23. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS

The Chairman's engagements since the last Council meeting were **NOTED**.

The Meeting ended at 4.25 p.m.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Council 23rd June 2005.
AUTHORS: Director of Development Services/Chief Environmental Health Officer

**A14 ELLINGTON TO FEN DITTON PROPOSED SCHEME
PUBLIC CONSULTATION
RESPONSE FROM SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

Purpose

1. To agree the Council's response to the Highways Agency's public consultation on the proposed scheme for improving the A14 from Ellington to Fen Ditton.

Effect on Corporate Objectives

Objective	
2. Quality village life.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist the preservation and enhancement of the natural and built environment. • Assist the effective delivery of sustainable development at Northstowe and other major developments on the edge of Cambridge and development of sustainable communities. • Assist working with partners to help the early and sustained development of necessary infrastructure.
3. A sustainable future.	
4. A better future through Partnerships.	

Background

2. The Government published its general proposals for the A14 in the summer of 2001 in what is known as CHUMMS which recommended that: -
 - The A14 be constructed to the south of Godmanchester, Huntingdon and Brampton to rejoin the A14 to the west of the A1.
 - Parallel local roads be provided alongside the widened section between Girton Interchange and the point where the widened section begins east of Fenstanton. Extra links and slip roads were recommended at M11 Junction 13 (Madingley Road and Junction 14 Girton Interchange).
 - Improvements should be made to the junctions of the A14 with the B1049 (Histon) and A10 (Milton). Measures to enable public transport to cross the A14 Cambridge Northern Bypass should be investigated.
 - The existing A14 from Fenstanton to Huntingdon should be used as a public transport corridor and for access to Huntingdon centre and railway station. The status and standard be widened to a dual 3 lane carriageway, where necessary on its existing line between Fen Ditton and a point to the east of Fenstanton, and

that a new dual 3-lane carriageway of the existing A14 should be downgraded to discourage its use by long distance through traffic.

- Full consideration should be given to the needs of non-motorised travellers.
3. South Cambridgeshire's Cabinet in July 2001 agreed the Council's formal response and:
- welcomed the general approach of Option 2 for road improvement and new road building, but recognised the need to secure greatly improved landscaping and other measures to reduce visual intrusion and noise impact;
 - welcomed the reduction from dual four lanes to dual three lanes along the A14 Cambridge northern bypass, but continues to press for the Girton section to be covered;
 - welcomed the preference for guided bus, but emphasised the need for the cost to be reflected realistically in the Local Transport Plan settlement at an early stage;
 - recognised that there remained a number of important design issues which need to be addressed, particularly in respect of the improvements to the A14 interchanges with the B1049 (Histon) and A10 (Milton) and the extra links and slip roads at the M11 junctions 13 (Madingley Road) and 14 (Girton);
 - supported the extension of Park and Ride, subject to satisfactory sites being found and acknowledges that there will be a need for additional Park and Ride sites outside the study area;
 - noted that the problems on the road are acute now and can only deteriorate as development continues in the Cambridge area. Great strain would be put on the road for the development committed in planning permissions and Local Plan allocations, let alone the increased rate of development envisaged in RPG(S)6. A timescale of 10-12 years for a solution to be put in place would be totally unacceptable. If the Cambridge area is to deliver, there must be an early delivery of improvements to this route. The work should therefore be programmed so that some improvements to the road, including increased capacity and public transport improvements such as the use of the St Ives route, come forward at an early stage;
 - was concerned at the impact that construction would have on adjoining villages, particularly in terms of rat-running, and asks for suitable traffic management measures to be introduced.
4. The Highways Agency has now published its outline scheme for consultation. Consultation began on 30th March 2005, but almost immediately the exhibitions informing the public had to be suspended because of potential conflict with the General Election campaign. Exhibitions were resumed on 17th May. Despite protests from this Council and others, the end date for the consultation remains at 30th June.
5. The Highways Agency envisages the following timetable:
- | | |
|------------|------------------------------|
| Early 2006 | Preferred Route Announcement |
| 2007 | Draft Orders published |
| 2008 | Public Inquiry |
| 2008/9 | Start of construction |
| 2011/15 | Opening in stages |

The Current Proposals

6. The current scheme now put forward by the Highways Agency proposes some 35km of new or improved 2 and 3 lane dual carriageway trunk road, a number of diversions

to side roads, 10 route km of new local roads to a range of standards, seven new grade separated interchanges and the potential de-trunking of 17.5km of existing grade separated dual carriageway (depending whether the “CHUMMS” or an “Alternative” option is chosen).

7. The scheme comprises:
 - a new two lane dual carriageway for the A14 from Ellington to the A1,
 - a 1.5km widening of the A1 to three lane dual carriageway north of the new A14 /A1 interchange,
 - a three lane dual carriageway from the A1 to Fen Drayton. This length would only be to a two lane dual carriageway standard if an “Alternative” option of retaining the existing A14 Fen Drayton to the A1 at Alconbury was retained as a through route,
 - on-line widening to three lane dual carriageway standard from Fen Drayton to Bar Hill,
 - a replacement three lane dual carriageway between Bar Hill and Girton
 - a rebuilt and re-modelled Girton Interchange,
 - an on-line widening of the Cambridge Northern Bypass between Girton and Fen Ditton. Extended sliproads/ weaving lanes are proposed between Girton and Histon,
 - intermediate junctions with other roads would only be provided at the A1, Fen Drayton, Girton /M11, Histon, and Milton. (This is one less than the CHUMMS proposals which also proposed a junction on the A1198 south of Godmanchester and suggested modifications to Junction 13 of the M11).
 - a network of local roads to link to nearby settlements, which will become the responsibility of the County Council as Local Highways Authority .
8. The Highways Agency is seeking views on the proposals before confirming the route through the publication of a Preferred Route Announcement which would mean that the route could be protected under the Highways Act. The Agency would then appoint a Contractor/Consultant under the “Early Contractor Involvement” ECI procedure to work up the detail of the scheme. The proposed scheme is still at a relatively high level with many aspects of the details of design and potential impact still unclear.
9. The Highways Agency attended a meeting of Planning Policy Advisory Group (to which all members were invited) on 27th May to present the scheme and answer Members’ questions.

Partnership Working

10. The County Council has considered the scheme through a meeting of its Joint Planning and Transport Service Development Group (25th May) and Cabinet (14th June).
11. Discussions have taken place with the County Council at both officer and Lead Member (Portfolio Holder) level to gauge the extent to which there is common ground on issues arising from the consultation. The County Council determined its response at a Cabinet meeting on 14th June, but also agreed that *“the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive be authorised to make changes to the submission in the light of further information from the Highways Agency or requests from key partners. This*

authorisation will extend to the submission of an addendum to this report, which safeguards the County Council's technical and other interests under this scheme. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive be authorised to agree with the District Councils and other key partners a joint statement of general support for the proposals."

12. It is my assessment that the approach in broad strategic terms recommended to the County Council by its Deputy Chief Executive is very similar to my recommendations set out in this report. There would be much value in striving to achieve a joint statement in general terms with the County Council, and therefore I suggest that the Planning Portfolio Holder be given similar authority as the County Council's Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services.
13. Improvements on the scale envisaged in the proposed scheme are essential to meet the objectives of:
 - improving safety for long distance traffic
 - ensuring improved access for local traffic
 - reducing congestion
 - reducing the impact of noise on communities
 - improving air quality
 - enabling the continuing economic development of the Cambridge area to
 - providing improved opportunities for non-motorised modes.

Key Issues for South Cambridgeshire

Speed of Delivery

14. The programme set out above and derived from the Highways Agency is likely to be the best in terms of early delivery. There is a risk that the public inquiry could raise many complex issues and take longer than that estimated. Given the existing problems on this route, the need for it to support the increased rate of development in the area as required in RSS6 (and merging RSS14) and the Structure Plan, and given the importance of this route nationally and internationally it is essential that all stages in the process of delivering the scheme be expedited. The Government should be urged to consider this scheme as one of the highest in priority in national terms.

The Alternative: Keeping the Existing A14 Open in the Huntingdon Area

15. Although this is primarily an issue for the County Council and Huntingdonshire, taking account of the need to ensure the continued social and commercial vitality of Huntingdon and needs to take account of further study and clarification of the transport strategy for Huntingdon. This Council's view of the Sub-regional development strategy is that the market towns are sustainable locations for further development rather than in rural parts of South Cambridgeshire or by unacceptable release of Green Belt to the detriment of the special character of Cambridge. It is therefore not in this Council's interests to support the Alternative Option which could limit Huntingdon's potential.
16. The issue for South Cambridgeshire is whether there are unacceptable consequences of building the new length of A14 west of Fen Drayton as three lanes

of dual carriageway rather than two lanes of dual carriageway. I consider that there would be very little limited additional impact.

17. However, the proposed new route does pass very close to Conington. Its impact will be made greater by the fact that it will be on embankment in this section. Not only would the new road impact on the village which has a very rural character but also on Conington Hall (a Grade 2* Listed Building with the Stables being Grade 2) and its parkland which is recognised in the Local Plan 2004 as a landscape of local value. The Highways Agency should be asked to consider realigning the route to run slightly further to the north and as close as possible to the Conington Landfill site which would increase the distance from Conington village, the hall and its parkland. It is also essential that there is the highest standard of provision of landscaping and noise attenuation to minimise the impact on Conington.

An Additional Interchange with the A1198?

18. The Highways Agency scheme does not propose that the new route would connect with the A1198 where it crosses that road south of Godmanchester and north of the Papworth villages. The County Council is suggesting that consideration be given to an additional interchange here to assist access to Huntingdon and reduce through car and HCV traffic on the existing route through Huntingdon. The County Council suggests that the traffic movements at this junction should be part of the further study into understanding the traffic movements in Huntingdon.
19. My comments about the advantages of ensuring the continued vitality of Huntingdon are similarly pertinent to this issue. However, I do have concerns that such an interchange could encourage more traffic along the A1198. Whilst Caxton does have a bypass and Papworth Everard has one programmed, communities in other villages to the south, including Long Stowe, Arrington and Kneesworth are severed by the road. My advice therefore is that South Cambridgeshire should be cautious about the County Council's proposal. It may be that the interchange could be designed to facilitate access to Huntingdon alone, with only "north facing slip roads".

The Fen Drayton Interchange and Access to the Swavesey Services Area

20. Under the scheme proposals originally put forward by the Highways Agency, access to the Swavesey (Cambridge) Services area would only have been by means of the local distributor road via the interchanges at Fen Drayton and Girton. This would not be satisfactory as traffic would have to make the decision to leave the A14 at a considerable distance for the Services and it would have meant a significant number of HCVs using the local distributor road in close proximity to Bar Hill village – thus reducing the advantages of aligning the A14 away from the village.
21. The Highways Agency advised PPAG that they had taken note of concerns expressed on this issue, and have brought forward a revised proposal which would be a combined Fen Drayton Interchange/Trinity Foot Junction, which would allow the Services site to be served directly from the A14 instead of from the Girton Interchange. There would also be a dual carriageway between Cambridge Services and the Fen Drayton Interchange which is an improvement on the original single track provision.

Fen Drayton to Bar Hill

22. The local road along this section is proposed by the Highways Agency to be single carriageway, whereas for all other sections a dual carriageway standard has been put forward. The revisions now proposed by the Highways Agency to provide a dual carriageway local road between Fen Drayton and Trinity Foot as part of the improved access for the Swavesey Services is an improvement, but highlights the inadequacy of the section between Fen Drayton and Bar Hill, which may well not have adequate capacity and certainly the variation in standard is likely to lead to driver confusion and therefore safety problems. The Highways Agency should be urged to reconsider this matter.
23. Access to Northstowe is proposed to be exclusively via the local parallel distributor roads rather than the A14 itself. Northstowe traffic would connect to the A14 east and the M11 by means of the Girton Interchange. Connections with the A14 west would be via the revised Swavesey/Fen Drayton Interchange(s). Although it might be considered appropriate for a town the size of Northstowe to have a direct interchange onto the A14, the town is intended to be part of solving the development, particularly housing, needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region; to provide direct A14 access could fuel the perception of Northstowe fulfilling the housing needs and aspirations of London and other areas to the south. In this context a direct link to the A14 might simply encourage long distance driving and not encourage the use of the Guided Bus local for local journeys within the Cambridge Sub-Region.

The Girton Interchange

24. The remodelling of this Interchange is critical to the success of the scheme overall. Despite being a complex weave of routes, it does not allow all movements to take place. It does not allow traffic from the west coming along the A428 to access the A14 in the direction of Huntingdon with the result that such traffic would have to continue to “rat run” through Dry Drayton (and with the same problem in the opposite direction). Nor does it provide for direct connections for traffic from the west on the A428 to connect to the M11 with the result that such traffic would have to continue to leave the A428 at Madingley and travel along the Madingley Road as at present, thus adding to the congestion and queuing in peak hours. The County Council is particularly concerned about the lack of slip roads to enable the A428/A14 movements, and this approach should be supported whilst also seeking the additional link to the M11.
25. The implementation of the Girton Interchange is crucial to the continuing development of Northstowe as set out in the policies in the Draft Northstowe Area Action Plan which is currently the subject of public participation. The Government has indicated that it wishes to see an early start made to increasing the rate of house-building in the Cambridge Sub-Region. Northstowe is specifically targeted as one of the key opportunities to achieve this but it is dependent upon the A14 improvements. It is essential that the A14 is improved as quickly as possible in general and this part of the scheme is delivered as the top priority when the Highways Agency and its contractors determine phasing and programming.

26. CHUMMS proposed north facing slip roads at the M11/A1303 Madingley Road Interchange. The current scheme does not put this forward. The County Council has accepted that there would be little benefit to be gained by this additional facility at present but notes that further consideration will be needed in the context of the University development in West Cambridge. The provision of north facing slip roads could transfer of traffic from Huntingdon Road to Madingley Road, which is already heavily loaded in the morning peak. It will also be an issue in respect of the development of North West Cambridge.

The Cambridge Northern Bypass and the junctions at Histon/Impington and Milton.

27. The Cambridge Northern Bypass is proposed to be widened on-line between Girton and Fen Ditton, with extended slip roads/weaving lanes at the junctions with the B1049 at Histon/Impington and the A10 at Milton. There are considerable problems of capacity on the B1049 and A10 especially as they approach the A14 and Cambridge. The Highways Agency has made it clear that it considers these problems to be an issue of local rather than strategic accessibility and traffic management. However, given the commitment in the brief for the scheme set out in CHUMMS to consider the needs of non-motorised modes, the provision of a foot/cycle bridge over the A14 (similar to that at Milton) as suggested by the County Council should be supported.

Access to Cambridge East

28. The current scheme ends at the Fen Ditton junction with the A14 and does not propose any changes there or further east. The County Council's Structure Plan lists the need for a new interchange (in the vicinity of Honey Hill) between the Fen Ditton Interchange and the Quy Interchange, replacing the Fen Ditton Interchange and linked to Airport Way to serve development at Cambridge Airport. The Draft Cambridge East Area Action Plan considers how access to the A14 can best be achieved, including potentially a new link road to serve Cambridge East, although recognising that it would not be required for the development of the 1st phase north of Newmarket Road and that any scheme should not include improvements to the existing junction at Fen Ditton.
29. The Highways Agency's scheme does not include this proposal as it ends at Fen Ditton. However, consultations with the Agency in preparing the Area Action Plan indicate that they might resist the introduction of another interchange. That is properly a matter which will need to be determined through the Development Plan process. There is nothing in the current A14 scheme which would preclude such an improvement being made in the future.

Non-car Modes

30. CHUMMS recommended improvements other than merely increasing the capacity of the road network. The Cambridgeshire Guided Bus proposal, as recommended in CHUMMS, is currently awaiting the outcome of the Transport & Works Act public inquiry and will provide a High Quality Public Transport link from Huntingdon/St. Ives to Cambridge for this corridor.

31. However, there is very little obvious direct provision for non-motorised modes – walking, cycling and horse-riding. While the Guided Bus maintenance track will provide a continuous pedestrian and cycle route for the corridor, there is a need to consider the wider network of rights of way.
32. The A14 currently represents a major physical barrier to non-motorised users and horse-riders are particularly disadvantaged. The scheme provides an opportunity to develop an accessible network for all users through the provision of appropriate segregated routes for non-motorised users and new and improved junctions with side roads and bridge crossings where appropriate, such as at Histon/Impington. Where Public Rights of Way cannot be accommodated within the scheme, alternative routes should be provided that maintain network connectivity and quality for users through proper route design and landscaping. The Highways Agency should be pressed to consider these matters in more detail.

Landscape Impact

33. The scheme remains at a high level with insufficient detail to appraise fully the impacts. There is no clear indication of the mitigation measures which would be put in place presumably because they will require consideration as part of the final, more detailed, scheme and full landscape assessments would be a requirement. Assurance should be sought on this point.
34. Certainly there will be considerable impact on the landscape, in particular from the new and remodelled interchanges. There will be noticeable adverse impact on the landscape at the new Fen Drayton Interchange (where there is currently no interchange); Trinity Foot/Swavesey Interchange (remodelled with additional links); Bar Hill (substantial remodelled with new links); Dry Drayton Interchange (remodelled); Girton Interchange (substantial remodelled and new links). There will also be adverse impact from the increased width of the road corridor through South Cambridgeshire where the A14 is improved on the existing general alignment and through the building of bridges and associated embankments where side roads cross the A14. Such impact will need substantial and careful mitigation, and this should not be restricted to narrow planting alongside the highway; it is likely also to require blocks of planting to assimilate the road into the landscape compatible with local character. There may therefore be a number of areas where off-site planting will be essential in order to assimilate the road into the landscape. Some planting should be of more mature stock to provide better mitigation from the beginning. The landscaping of the Girton Interchange will be a particular challenge because of its scale; it may well require landscaping of areas currently occupied by road but which will not be used in the new scheme.
35. Another area of concern is along the Cambridge Northern Bypass where there is limited space to accommodate the widened road which will have an impact on the existing vegetation, especially in the Girton Cutting and at Milton Country Park. This will require very careful landscaping to mitigate the damage.
36. All junctions/interchanges are proposed to be lit which will increase light pollution in the open countryside although the use of modern lanterns will minimise light spillage.

However, lighting of the junctions is judged to be necessary to ensure improved road safety.

37. The new section of road to the north of Conington will be on an embankment around 3m in height which combined with loss of existing hedgerows will mean a significant impact requiring substantial careful and sensitive mitigation.

Noise

38. The noise assessment has been carried out according to the methodology set out in the Noise Insulation Regulation 1975 (as amended 1988). This sets out the accepted method for prediction of traffic noise in the UK.
39. The scheme indicates that there are existing properties within 300 metres of the A14 that will experience noise levels over 60dB LA₁₀ (18 hour) (the World Health Organisation quote levels of 55dB LA_{eq} or more to be sufficient to cause significant community annoyance and Planning Policy Guidance Note 25 would place such locations into Noise Exposure Category B which indicates that in determining planning applications noise should be taken into account and conditions imposed to ensure that an adequate level of protection is afforded). Mitigation measures are proposed including resurfacing with a thin wearing course to reduce levels by 2.5dB(A) and providing acoustic fences or earth bunds which could reduce noise by up to 15dB(A). However the detail provided in the report does not indicate the extent over which any barriers would be required, or exactly where noise levels are predicted to rise by increased traffic on local roads. The problem of reflective noise is raised and consideration must be given to acoustically absorptive barriers where this might be a problem.
40. Traffic noise attenuation will also be a major issue along the Cambridge Northern Bypass. The proposed development at Arbury Camp is designed to use opportunities to prevent unacceptable noise levels being experienced by the future residents and workers on this site. However, there have been many calls in the past from existing residents in Histon, Impington and Milton for improved sound attenuation. Milton Country Park is similarly affected, and the proposals indicate a loss of the existing vegetation screen. The written response from the Highways Agency to PPAG questions indicates that the problem of sound would only be addressed through low noise road surfaces. I consider that additional measures need to be considered. Given the limited width of the corridor, this may well mean solid acoustic barriers. Fencing or walls would not be appropriate in this rural landscape, but the opportunity to use engineered walls of living willow and earth should be explored. These have the additional advantage of absorbing rather than reflecting sound.
41. The EU environmental noise directive is to be implemented in the UK by 2007 and DEFRA is currently drafting a National Noise Strategy which may have implications for the noise environment in this location. Plans should be drawn up to protect quiet areas against noise increases as part of these proposals in advance of the forthcoming requirements.

Air Quality

42. The Highways Agency's consultants report is correct in stating that South Cambridgeshire does not currently have any local Air Quality Management Areas, although the Council is presently undertaking detailed modelling of traffic emissions and air monitoring adjacent to the A14 to establish the risk of exceeding the national air quality objectives for fine particles (PM₁₀) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). Both pollutants are derived from vehicle emissions which in this case are by far the most significant source. Should the national objectives be proven likely to be exceeded then the Council would have to declare an Air Quality Management Area and the Council would then have to work closely with the Highways Agency to produce a plan to lower emissions to acceptable levels.
43. The assessment by the Highways Agency's consultants predicts there will be a significant increase in traffic on the A14 by the time of completion of the scheme improvements and also that there will be an overall increase in PM₁₀ and NO₂ concentrations at the properties near to the A14. The increase in pollution would, however, be even greater if the improvements are not carried out. The consultants also predict that the wider network across the study area should see a large decrease overall in both PM₁₀ and NO₂, although the detail of the consultant's report does not identify the exact location of improvement and deterioration.
44. For South Cambridgeshire, the greatest concentration of dwellings affected by emissions are those close to the Cambridge Northern Bypass, especially at Girton, Impington and the Cambridge Northern Fringe. The design and layout of the roads and junctions and the traffic management measures in this section of the route will have to be carefully considered to maximise flow and reduce speed otherwise the implication for local air quality could be significant. The realignment of the A14 around Bar Hill is predicted to improve air quality at the individual properties currently located very close to the A14.
45. Both noise and air quality should be modelled in detail in order to identify where the impacts are going to occur and how they could potentially be mitigated. Provision of other measures such as improved public transport and cycleway network may be necessary to promote a modal shift and correspondingly alter overall emissions, improving local air quality at sensitive locations.

Ecology

46. Consideration must be given to the impact on the ecology of the area. The biodiversity value of the area will need to be established through detailed surveys, and data may take months or more than a year to collate depending upon species found and their habitat needs of the area. The arable landscape of the area must not be dismissed as being poor for wildlife.
47. On national scale the Highways Agency recognises the potential for impact upon biodiversity through road schemes. It has produced many best practise guides (such as *Highways and Birds*, 2001). The principles outlined in these documents should be adhered to. The Highways Agency recognises the potential for habitat management

and creation through new road schemes. To this end it has produced its own biodiversity action plan (BAP).

48. It should be made clear to the Highways Agency that the A14 scheme would be expected to contribute to the Cambridgeshire BAP (for example by ensuring that otter habitat is created and that safe underpasses are provided). Once ecological data is collated the Highways Agency's own BAP should be considered against the national and Cambridgeshire BAPs in order to identify areas where the road scheme could significantly contribute towards nature conservation. This need should be above the statutory requirement of the Environmental Statement. Some road schemes (such as the A30, A1, M1) have had their own BAPs produced to further focus nature conservation action specific to the road scheme and this approach should be used for the A14 scheme.
49. A major issue is likely to be the roost areas for the Golden Plover which is loosely focussed in the fields surrounding the Conington Landfill site. The Golden Plover is listed in Annex 1 of the European Union Birds Directive and is therefore a species for which Special Protection Areas could be designated if the population exceeds 1% of the reference population, that is the average population in the UK. There is a suggestion from other sources that the Conington population exceeds 1% of the reference population and therefore the area could be of international importance. One problem is defining this is that there is no specific site for the Golden Plover's roosting but rather covers a but rather covers a series of sites and locations in the general area and it varies from season to season or rather, is dependent on the type of crop under cultivation that season.
50. In coming to the scheme to be presented to the public, the Highways Agency considered a number of alternatives in the Fenstanton/Conington area. One of these would have continued the A14 on its existing alignment to a point further west before striking off on a new alignment. It might have less impact on the Golden Plover and certainly would have less impact on Conington. However, as set out above, the Golden Plover's roost area changes from year to year. The alternative route shows that more than twice the number of houses would experience an increase in noise, and only half the numbers of houses would experience a fall in noise levels compared with the route between Conington village and the landfill site. This is largely because the alternative would continue to affect adversely a large number of properties (in Huntingdonshire). I have carefully considered whether this Council should support such an alternative route, but noting the overall greater adverse impact do not consider that I can make such a recommendation on technical grounds.
51. Given the scale of construction, the development of the road will produce large quantities of spoil. A proportion of this may be used to create embankments for the road as required, but any excess will need to be accommodated in a way which is sustainable and does not adversely affect local landscape character.
52. What is therefore required is the same as the Council is requiring of developers in the Area Action Plans in the Local Development Framework, that is strategies for landscaping, ecology and spoil, which should be published and agreed with relevant key stakeholders.

Legal Implications

53. None directly for this Council unless the improvements do not take place and the Council has to declare a local Air Quality Management Area.

Staffing Implications

54. The continued involvement of Planning Policy, Conservation and Environmental Health officers will be needed to appraise the scheme as it goes through its next stages. This will be essential to protect the Council's interests and the interests of its residents and their environment.

Risk Management Implications

55. The A14 improvements are a critical part of the infrastructure improvements essential to underpin the developments proposed in South Cambridgeshire. It is also essential that it is provided at the earliest opportunity. Objections to the scheme may delay implementation, particularly if it involves a lengthy public inquiry. On the other hand, there is a risk of unacceptable environmental damage if the scheme is unsatisfactory. Delay or non-implementation of the scheme could also require the Council to declare a local Air Quality Management Area.

Consultations

56. The Highways Agency has consulted widely on the scheme. The District Council has worked in close partnership with the County Council and other District Councils in Cambridgeshire. Officers from both Development Services and Environmental Health have been involved in the preparation of this report.

Recommendations

57. Council is recommended to:
- a. Support the proposed scheme in general terms in order to improve road safety, accessibility, air quality and economic development and reduce congestion and the impact of noise on existing communities;
 - b. Urge the Government and the Highways Agency to give the highest priority to the scheme and deliver it at the earliest opportunity;
 - c. support the original CHUMMS proposal to provide a new 3-lane dual carriageway from Fen Ditton to the A1, but seek a minor realignment north of Conington, and reject the alternative which would reduce this new length of road to 2-lanes dual carriageway and keep the A14 north open as a Trunk Road;

- d. Propose that if the County Council's suggestion of an additional interchange at the A1198 is agreed then it should be designed with north-facing slip roads only;
- e. Support the Highways Agency's revised proposals for the Fen Drayton Interchange and Trinity Foot junction which would provide direct A14 access for the Swavesey Services Area;
- f. Urge the provision of a 2lane dual carriageway parallel local distributor road between Fen Drayton and Bar Hill so that it of the same standard as elsewhere along the route;
- g. Seek a change to the Girton Interchange to enable all movements to be made to prevent traffic passing through villages;
- h. Require the Bar Hill to Girton section to be the first phase of the scheme in order to facilitate the new developments close to Cambridge especially the new town of Northstowe;
- i. Support the suggestion of a foot/cycle bridge over the A14 at Histon/Impington;
- j. Seek assurance that the access needs of the major development location of Cambridge East will be taken into account;
- k. Require additional work to be undertaken by the Highways Agency to ensure adequate provision is made for non-car modes including the need to establish network connectivity over the wider area;
- l. Require careful consideration to be given by the Highways Agency to mitigating the environmental impacts of the proposals through the development of strategies for spoil, landscape, noise, air quality and ecology;
- m. Authorise the Planning and Economic Portfolio Holder to make any additional comments in the light of further information from the Highways Agency or other stakeholders;
- n. Authorise the Planning and Economic Portfolio Holder to agree with the County Council and other key partners a joint statement of general support for the proposals.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton, Stage 2 Scheme Assessment Reports by Highways Agency/Atkins March 2004

CDC Cabinet papers 19th July 2001

Contact Officer: Michael Monk – Principal Planning Policy Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713182
Susan Walford – Environmental Heath Officer (Scientific)
Telephone: (01954) 713124

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Cabinet held on
Thursday, 26 May 2005

PRESENT:	SGM Kindersley	Leader of Council
Councillors:	Dr DR Bard	Planning & Economic Development Portfolio Holder
	JD Batchelor	Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder
	Mrs JM Healey	Conservation, Sustainability & Community Planning Portfolio Holder
	Mrs EM Heazell	Housing Portfolio Holder
	SGM Kindersley	Leader of Council
	Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development Portfolio Holder
	Mrs DSK Spink MBE	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
	RT Summerfield	Deputy Leader of Council and Resources & Staffing Portfolio Holder

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

2. APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY LEADER

On the proposal of Councillor SGM Kindersley, seconded by Councillor JD Batchelor, Cabinet

RESOLVED That Councillor RT Summerfield be appointed Deputy Leader for the coming year.

3. ALLOCATION OF PORTFOLIOS

After a vote between Councillors Mrs DSK Spink and Mrs EM Heazell for the Housing portfolio, Cabinet, on the casting vote of the Leader,

RESOLVED That Councillor Mrs EM Heazell be the Housing Portfolio Holder for the coming year.

The remaining portfolios were allocated:

Resources and Staffing	RT Summerfield
Planning and Economic Development	Dr DR Bard
Community Development	Mrs DP Roberts
Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning	Mrs JM Healey
Information and Customer Services	JD Batchelor
Environmental Health	Mrs DSK Spink

4. APPOINTMENT OF EXECUTIVE MEMBER TO ATTEND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONFERENCE

Cabinet

AGREED That, subject to decisions on expenditure, the Leader and Councillor Mrs DP Roberts attend the Annual Conference of the Local Government Association.

5. APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE TO EAST OF ENGLAND REGIONAL ASSEMBLY

Cabinet

AGREED That the Leader represent the Council on the East of England Regional Assembly in 2005/06.

6. APPOINTMENTS TO ADVISORY GROUPS

Planning Policy Advisory Group

Given that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Development and Conservation Control Committee were ex-officio members of the Advisory Group, Cabinet considered that 1st and 2nd choices should be granted. It was therefore

AGREED That for 2005/06 the Planning Policy Advisory Group comprise the following:

RF Bryant	SM Edwards	R Hall
Mrs JM Healey	RB Martlew	MJ Mason
Mrs CAED Murfitt	CR Nightingale	Mrs DSK Spink
JH Stewart		

Conservation Advisory Group

Cabinet

AGREED To ask the Advisory Group to accept all those members having expressed a wish to be a member:

SJ Agnew	RF Bryant	NN Cathcart
Mrs PS Corney	Mrs SJO Doggett	Mrs A Elsby
R Hall	Dr JA Heap	Mrs CA Hunt
Dr JPR Orme	R Page	EJ Pateman
JA Quinlan	Mrs DSK Spink	JH Stewart
RJ Turner	Dr JR Williamson	NIC Wright

**The Meeting ended at 4.35
p.m.**

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Cabinet held on
Thursday, 9 June 2005

PRESENT: Councillor SGM Kindersley (Leader of Council)
Councillor RT Summerfield (Deputy Leader of Council and Resources & Staffing Portfolio Holder)

Councillors:	Dr DR Bard	Planning & Economic Development Portfolio Holder
	JD Batchelor	Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder
	Mrs JM Healey	Conservation, Sustainability & Community Planning Portfolio Holder
	Mrs EM Heazell	Housing Portfolio Holder
	Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development Portfolio Holder
	Mrs DSK Spink MBE	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder

Councillors RE Barrett, NN Cathcart, SM Edwards, Mrs A Elsby, R Hall, Dr JA Heap, JA Hockney, Mrs CA Hunt, Mrs HF Kember, MJ Mason, Mrs JA Muncey, Mrs CAED Murfitt, CR Nightingale, EJ Pateman, NJ Scarr, J Shepperson, Mrs GJ Smith, Mrs HM Smith, JH Stewart, Dr SEK van de Ven, JF Williams, Dr JR Williamson and NIC Wright were in attendance, by invitation.

Procedural Items

1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Leader was authorised to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 May 2005 as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

Willingham – Right of Way over Brickhills (minute 7)

Delete "*with the recommendation of refusal*" from the first sentence.

Add "*With the consent of the Leader, the Housing Portfolio Holder circulated the applicant's photographs of the access.*"

The Leader was authorised to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2005 as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

Appointments to Advisory Groups (minute 6)

Add *Councillor JH Stewart* to the membership of the Planning Policy Advisory Group.

In relation to minute 4 – Local Government Annual Conference – the Leader announced that neither he nor Councillor Martlew would be attending the Conference, on the grounds of cost. Councillor Mrs Roberts would be attending as it was important for her to do so in view of her membership of the LGA traveller group.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor SGM Kindersley recorded a prejudicial interest in agenda item 13, former St Denis Church, East Hatley.

**Recommendations to
Council**

3. HOUSING STOCK OPTIONS APPRAISAL

The Housing Portfolio Holder presented the outcome of the housing options appraisal project and Management Team's conclusions, advising amendments to:

Paragraph 25 – add “*elected*” before “tenant representatives”

Appendix A - add to paragraph 2.2 “*the Housing Portfolio Holder was present in a non-voting capacity*”

Councillor Mrs Hezell referred to the promise made to tenants that their views would be paramount and to the divided views of the Advisory Group, which made it difficult to put forward a definite recommendation. She personally, however, felt that the £750,000 which would have to be spent to reach formal ballot stage could be better spent on repairs and maintenance; and that to recoup that expenditure, tenants would get only 50% of their aspiration list. She would, however, be interested in a new stock condition survey as required by the Government. If the decision was to proceed to transfer she asked that equity share tenants should be balloted informally in order to assess their views.

Councillor Mrs DSK Spink voiced her opinion that transfer would be good for the Council and the tenants, but was concerned about risking £750,000 with the threat of capping hanging over the Council, and proposed, seconded by Councillor Dr DR Bard, that a decision be deferred pending the capping decision and for more work on the reaction of tenants and Members.

The Housing and Environmental Services Director advised Members that the money at risk included the setting up costs for a transfer organisation; the ballot of tenants itself would cost around £15,000. The detailed report made to the Housing Options Working Group gave the break down. He also confirmed that the Government would take 20% of any capital receipt and that consent would be required for the use of the remainder.

Other views and comments put forward by Members included:

- That the Council could achieve the Decent Homes Standards, albeit with a struggle
- That transfer was financially favourable only because of Government rules
- That it was now unsustainable to retain the houses
- That there was no option but to decide on transfer, but that this must be promoted positively
- That it would be better for the Council not to run the housing management service
- That the Housing Revenue Account was ring-fenced so did not affect other parts of the Council
- What was the accountability of Registered Social Landlords to their tenants?
- Were there existing RSLs who could take over the stock?
- Tenants were very satisfied with the Council's service

The Leader asked that the answers to the various detailed questions should be published on the weekly bulletin before the next discussion.

Hopes were expressed that pressure would be put on the Government again over housing finance, and Councillor Mrs Spink reported that representations were made constantly.

Cabinet **DEFERRED** making a recommendation to Council on its preferred future housing option pending the result of the capping decision and for more work on tenants' and Members' views.

The Housing and Environmental Services Director warned that there was a requirement to submit a decision to Go-East by 31 July 2005 and that, without a clear outcome, the Government Office might want further discussions.

4. WORKFORCE PLAN

Cabinet **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL**

That the Workforce Plan (including the Action Plan in Appendix 2) be approved as submitted, with the addition of a reference to a customer satisfaction feedback mechanism if necessary.

5. FOOD SAFETY SERVICE PLAN

Noting that detailed procedures for food safety were contained elsewhere and that food hygiene courses were income generating, Cabinet

RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL

That the Food Safety Service Plan 2005/06 be approved as submitted to Cabinet.

6. HEALTH AND SAFETY SERVICE PLAN

Cabinet **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL**

That the Health and Safety Service Plan 2005-2006 be approved as submitted to Cabinet.

Decisions made by Cabinet

7. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ACT - HIGH HEDGES PROVISIONS

The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder advised that the proposed fees for the Council to deal with complaints about high hedges were pitched with the aim of encouraging negotiations between neighbours. There were provisions for reduction in fees in the case of hardship, but the circumstances of someone who could not afford to have work carried out could not be covered in these procedures.

In view of the current financial circumstances, the Leader requested the deletion of the recommendation to authorise a new part-time high hedges enforcement post should the number of cases exceed the equivalent of 1 day per week; for Cabinet to consider if the circumstances arose. This was accepted by the Portfolio Holder as long as the position was kept under review, and Cabinet

RESOLVED

- (a) That the proposed process for the administration of high hedge complaints (Appendix 1 to the report) be adopted;
- (b) That the scheme of delegated powers to officers (Appendix 2 to the report) be approved;
- (c) That the fee charged in respect of complaints under the high hedges provisions of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 be £450 where there has been no formal mediation;
- (d) That where formal mediation has been undertaken, the fee be reduced, equivalent to the costs of the mediation, up to a maximum reduction of £150, subject to provision of evidence of the attempt and failure of the mediation and its cost.

8. DISCRETIONARY COMPENSATION FOR REDUNDANCY

The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder advised that the current discretionary compensation scheme had been introduced at the time of local government reorganisation when many authorities were implementing redundancies, but had not subsequently been reviewed. The Head of Legal Services had advised that there were no legal obstacles to the change, but Unison was opposed to the proposal.

In view of the changed employment situation and the Council's current financial position, Cabinet

RESOLVED that the Council return to providing compensation for redundancy under the statutory Employment Rights Act 1996 scheme, but by reference to actual remuneration at the date of termination.

9. PERFORMANCE PLAN

Cabinet

APPROVED the following arrangements for consideration and approval of the Performance Plan 2005:

- (a) Copies of the draft Plan to be distributed to portfolio holders as soon as possible, for them to make comments;
- (b) Council on 23 June 2005 to receive copies of the draft Plan for approval, with approval of the final version being delegated to the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council.

10. AFFORDABLE HOUSING - COMMUTED SUMS

Cabinet were presented, as requested, with two examples where commuted sums could be considered as an alternative to the provision of land for affordable housing under Section 106 agreements. Officers confirmed that the sums received would be ring

fenced and that a programme of affordable housing schemes which could be funded would be presented for Members to decide on priorities. Cabinet

RESOLVED that the acceptance of commuted sums in lieu of provision of land for affordable housing under Section 106 agreements be adopted as Council practice in appropriate cases.

11. IT COMMS ROOM AIR CONDITIONING

Cabinet was advised of recent over-heating in the ICT Comms Room, which resulted in the ICT systems being shut down for approximately four hours. Some concern was expressed by Members that this had led to a security door being left open, but assurances were given that the entrance was monitored by cameras.

Cabinet expressed grave concern at the apparent lack of response from the developers to the situation, the latest incident not being isolated, and urged urgent pressure on them to accept their responsibilities for this and other remedial action needed.

The Finance and Resources Director confirmed that the disaster plan allowed for mobile servers to be brought in if the systems were down for over four hours, and that they had been on stand-by. The Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holder gave an assurance that no information had been or would be lost in any similar incident.

The Head of Legal Services had advised that if retention monies were used to fund a further air conditioning unit, there might be legal processes to be pursued eventually.

Cabinet **RESOLVED**

- (a) That a second air conditioning unit be obtained for the ICT Comms Room and installed at the earliest opportunity; the costs of this and the ongoing costs of the hire of mobile air conditioning units to be funded from the retention monies held back subject to successful completion of building snagging issues;
- (b) That the use of capital reserves for funding this expenditure be authorised in case this should prove necessary;
- (c) That strenuous efforts be made to ensure the developers accept responsibility for the faults.

12. HISTON AND IMPINGTON SPORTS FACILITY GRANT

Cabinet was asked to increase the grant to the Histon and Impington recreation ground project to help cover additional costs identified by the received tenders. The local Members supported the application, but Councillor MJ Mason recorded a personal interest as a member of the management committee. Cabinet

APPROVED an increase of £10,000 in the grant to Histon and Impington Recreation Ground Management Committee towards the new pavilion, games area and improvements to the car park, making a total grant award of £100,000

13. EAST HATLEY, ST DENIS CHURCH

(Taken at item 4 in the absence of Councillor SGM Kindersley)

The Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder reported on the tenders received for re-roofing and general repair works to arrest the deterioration of former St Denis Church, owned by the Council. The tenders were higher than hoped, but Councillor Mrs Healey felt that, as demolition was not an option in view of the listing at Grade II*, it was necessary to proceed in order to take advantage of the English Heritage grant offer of £61,000. In addition, Hatley Parish Council had offered £2,000 towards a clay tile roof. The Council had a fund established for this purpose but there should be the clear understanding that the Council would not spend any more money on the building.

Some Members favoured allowing the building to fall down, or even demolishing it as it was of no practical use, and were concerned at how the expenditure would look at this time to applicants for small grants. However, the Council's responsibility for the safety of people visiting the graveyard around the building was considered paramount, and other applicants would not be affected as the expenditure would be met from the historic buildings preservation fund. Indeed, if the Council did not repair this historic building, in the highest category of the Council's own buildings at risk register, it would be difficult to put pressure on other owners to restore their property. In addition, it was thought that once the building was safe it might be possible to transfer ownership to another body.

The Conservation Manager reported that the lowest tenderer would need to be interviewed, but that the architect was satisfied that the specification had been followed. He agreed to ask the architect to remove the day-works figure and have any extra items priced.

Councillor Mrs DP Roberts proposed, seconded by Councillor Dr DR Bard, that a decision be deferred for enquiries of the commercial sector on the prospects for the building's use and for an application to English Heritage to demolish. The Conservation Manager advised that that, although no formal application to demolish had been made, discussions had indicated that consent would be unlikely in the building's present condition.

The proposal to defer was **LOST**. Cabinet then

RESOLVED

- (a) To authorise officers to let a contract to implement first phase repair works at former St Denis Church, East Hatley including replacement clay tiles, at a works cost of £129,662; funded by grant support from English Heritage, Hatley Parish Council and the Historic Buildings Preservation Fund;
- (b) That no further expenditure be incurred by the Council on former St Denis Church.

14. BROADBAND PROJECT CLOSURE

Cabinet **NOTED** the success of the Broadband deployment across the District and

SUPPORTED the formal closure of the Broadband Project and the proposed arrangements for the continuing management of the East of England Development Agency (EEDA) funding.

15. **ADVISORY GROUPS FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SPORTS DEVELOPMENT**

Cabinet

APPROVED the establishment of two time limited advisory groups, one for Community Development and one for Sports Development, each to review the relevant previous strategies and develop new strategies and action plans; and

that each advisory group comprise six nominated members plus the Community Development Portfolio Holder.

16. **APPOINTMENTS TO ADVISORY GROUPS AND OUTSIDE BODEIS**

A plea was made for Members appointed to advisory groups to attend the meetings.

Cabinet made the following appointments for 2005/06 (plus the relevant portfolio holder for each advisory group):

Arts Development Advisory Group

SA Harangozo	JA Hockney	Mrs JA Muncey
JA Quinlan	Mrs GJ Smith	Mrs DSK Spink

(Existing members as the task is nearly complete)

Housing for Older People Steering Group

RE Barrett	RF Bryant	NN Cathcart
Mrs A Elsby	Mrs SA Hatton	Mrs HF Kember
Mrs JA Muncey	J Shepperson	Dr JR Williamson

(Existing members to maintain continuity on time limited group)

Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Advisory Group

SM Edwards	Mrs HF Kember	MJ Mason
Dr JPR Orme	A Riley	Mrs HM Smith
JH Stewart		

Land Drainage Advisory Group

EW Bullman	BR Burling	Mrs J Dixon
SM Edwards	RMA Manning	MJ Mason
J Shepperson	Mrs HM Smith	NIC Wright

(First and second choices)

Member Training Advisory Group

SJ Agnew	Mrs SA Hatton	Mrs DSK Spink
Dr SEK van de Ven	DALG Wherrell	JF Williams

Milton Country Park Advisory Group

R Hall	Mrs SA Hatton	Mrs HF Kember
Mrs JA Muncey	Mrs HM Smith	RT Summerfield
RJ Turner		

Waste Management Advisory Group

RE Barrett	RF Bryant	EW Bullman
JP Chatfield	Mrs SJO Doggett	SA Harangozo
Mrs CAED Murfitt	NJ Scarr	J Shepperson
Mrs HM Smith	Mrs VM Trueman	Mrs BE Waters
DALG Wherrell	Dr JR Williamson	

Northstowe Member Steering Group

All Cabinet Members, Development and Conservation Control Committee Chairman and all local Members:

Dr DR Bard	JD Batchelor	EW Bullman
BR Burling	JP Chatfield	Mrs PS Corney
Mrs J Dixon	SM Edwards	R Hall
Mrs JM Healey	Mrs EM Heazell	MP Howell
SGM Kindersley	RMA Manning	MJ Mason
Mrs JA Muncey	Dr JPR Orme	A Riley
Mrs DP Roberts	J Shepperson	Mrs DSK Spink
RT Summerfield	Mrs BE Waters	TJ Wotherspoon
NIC Wright		

Local County Councillor

1 Cambridge City Councillor

Vice-Chairman of Development and Conservation Control Committee as substitute for any SCDC Member (if not already a member)

South Cambridgeshire Environment and Transport Area Joint Committee

SGM Kindersley	Leader
RT Summerfield	Deputy Leader
Mrs DSK Spink	Environmental Health PFH
JD Batchelor	Information & Customer Services PFH
Dr DR Bard	Planning and Economic Development PFH
Mrs DP Roberts (substitute)	Community Development PFH

County Council/City Council/South Cambridgeshire Environment and Transport Joint Strategic Forum

SGM Kindersley	Leader
JD Batchelor	Information & Customer Services PFH
Dr DR Bard	Planning and Economic Development PFH
Dr JPR Orme or NIC Wright	Chairman or Vice-Chairman of Development and Conservation Control Committee
RT Summerfield (substitute)	Deputy Leader

Cambridgeshire Councils' Association

SGM Kindersley	Leader
RT Summerfield	Deputy Leader
Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development PFH
Mrs EM Heazell (substitute)	Housing PFH

South Cambridgeshire Local Strategic Partnership Board

SGM Kindersley	Leader
Mrs JM Healey	Conservation Sustainability & Community Planning PFH

CambSport

Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development PFH
----------------	---------------------------

Cambridge Airport Relocation Study Member Reference Group

Dr DR Bard Planning & Economic Development PFH

Cambridge City Centre Consultative Forum

Dr DR Bard Planning & Economic Development PFH

Cambridgeshire Council's Association Waste Forum

Mrs DSK Spink Environmental Health PFH

Cambridgeshire Horizons

SGM Kindersley Leader

Cambridgeshire Transport Forum Reference Group

Dr DR Bard Planning & Economic Development PFH

East Anglia Tourist Board

Mrs JM Healey Conservation Sustainability & Community
Planning PFH

East of England Regional Assembly

SGM Kindersley Leader

Home Improvement Agency

Mrs DSK Spink Environmental Health PFH

Northstowe Trust Development Group

SGM Kindersley Leader
Dr DR Bard Planning & Economic Development PFH
Mrs DP Roberts Community Development PFH

17. ADDITIONAL REFUSE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION ROUND - LATE ITEM

This additional item was accepted by the Leader as urgent as the point had been reached where it would be unwise not to proceed with the permanent solution for additional refuse collection provision. Cabinet

RESOLVED that

- (a) The £130,000 included in the 2005/06 original budget estimates for an additional integrated refuse and recycling collection round be released;
- (b) Approval be given for the procurement of an additional refuse collection vehicle;
- (c) Approval be given to increase the establishment by 1 HGV driver, scale 13-20 and 2 refuse operative loaders, scale 6-13.

Information Items

18. TRAVELLERS UPDATE

Members were given an update on actions taken in advance of the deadline for unauthorised travellers at Pine View, Smithy Fen to leave. The Leader welcomed local

media interest, which he felt led to free and frank debate, despite corrections which had had to be made, and hoped for a good relationship in the future.

Councillor SM Edwards queried the use of the word “reaffirmed” in paragraph 4 and it was agreed that “stated” would be more accurate.

Councillor Edwards also urged that a report on the concept of land swaps should be considered as soon as possible, and the Leader gave an assurance that land swap and other options would be considered as soon as resources permitted and details could be confirmed, including awaited Government regulations. He confirmed that the travellers at Smithy Fen would not be staying but that the Council would do everything possible to help.

It was noted that this report related to Cottenham, but that meetings with the Commission for Racial Equality could be arranged for other areas.

The Leader also recorded Cabinet’s apologies to the local Members that they were not advised in advance of the recent visits made by Cabinet to traveller sites.

The Deputy Development Services Director outlined the processes involved in serving injunctions on unknown persons.

The report was **NOTED** and it was suggested that cultural awareness training would be useful for all Members.

Standing Items

19. MATTERS REFERRED BY SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

None

20. UPDATES FROM CABINET MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OUTSIDE BODIES

None received.

Further decisions made by Cabinet

21. COTTENHAM - THREE HORSESHOES, 135 HIGH STREET

The progress report on outstanding grant aided works at this property was taken in open session.

The Environmental Health Portfolio Holder read additional information from the applicant on the latest position on the works, from which it appeared that steady, if slow, progress was being made. She believed that continued monitoring as recommended was the only way to ensure completion of the works. Cabinet, bar one who felt that completion should be required by the end of the year,

AGREED

- (a) To seek written confirmation from the applicant that, if he is allowed to follow his own logical programme of works, the property will be brought up to the fitness standard by March 2007, irrespective of any other desirable works still outstanding at that time. He must also confirm that he has the resources to do this.
- (b) To allow the applicant to complete works according to his own logical programme of works on the understanding that failure to achieve the fitness standard by the due date will result in immediate action to reclaim grant funding
- (c) To seek provision of a new programme of works, showing only works essential to achieve the fitness standard under the Housing Act 1985, with achievable dates, which will be closely monitored by Environmental Health
- (d) To serve a deferred action statutory notice under section 189 of the Housing Act 1985 (as amended) to empower the Council to carry out work in default in the event of non-compliance. The cost of works would then become a charge on the property and would accrue interest until settled. Where significant sums were involved, there would also be power to enforce sale of the property afterwards.

22. CAMBRIDGE OFFICE

This report on the operation of the Cambridge Office was taken in open session.

The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder reported that the staff were fully occupied with workloads related to their previous service areas in addition to their customer services duties, but that the cost of maintaining the office was unacceptable given the number of visitors. Options for the future were set out in the report: to enhance the service, to close the office, or to arrange for Cambridge City Council to operate the service.

Views varied from the need to publicise the office more, to support for closure, but it was ultimately

RESOLVED

- (a) To ask Cambridge City Council to provide the Cambridge based customer service facility, transferring the Cambridge Office staff back to appropriate departments at the Cambourne HQ;
- (b) To give delegated authority to the Leader and Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder to deal with any associated staffing matters, including redundancies and the transfer/establishment of posts as necessary;
- (c) That investigations be carried out into the possibility of applying for the removal of the planning condition requiring provision of the Cambridge facility.

**The Meeting ended at 3.00
p.m.**

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Development and Conservation Control Committee held on
Friday, 13 May 2005 at 9.30 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Dr JPR Orme – Chairman
Councillor NIC Wright – Vice-Chairman

Councillors:	Dr DR Bard	RE Barrett
	JD Batchelor	RF Bryant
	Mrs PS Corney	SM Edwards
	R Hall	Mrs SA Hatton
	Mrs JM Healey	Mrs EM Heazell
	Mrs CA Hunt	SGM Kindersley
	MJ Mason	Mrs CAED Murfitt
	CR Nightingale	EJ Pateman
	JA Quinlan	Mrs DSK Spink MBE
	JH Stewart	JF Williams
	Dr JR Williamson	SS Ziaian-Gillan

Councillor JA Hockney was in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs A Elsby, HC Hurrell, Mrs JA Muncey, A Riley, Mrs DP Roberts, RJ Turner and TJ Wotherspoon.

1. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as correct records, the Minutes of the meetings held on 2nd March 2005 and 6th March 2005.

2. **S/0530/05/F - HASLINGFIELD**

APPROVAL, as amended by plan no. SF.04./10/A date-stamped 25th April 2005, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein, expanded to require the provision sufficient space to allow vehicular access to and from the site, and turning thereon.

3. **S/2379/01/O - IMPINGTON**

Report **NOTED** pending the presentation of a full report to the Development and Conservation Control Committee in July 2005.

Councillor JP Chatfield (a local Member) sent apologies for absence.

4. **S/2604/04/F - IMPINGTON**

DEFERRED to enable further discussions to take place between the Local Planning Authority and applicant in connection with noise attenuation, design and road issues. Members asked officers to tell the applicant that this represented a final opportunity for it to present non-noise sensitive uses acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.

Councillor JP Chatfield (a local Member) sent apologies for absence.

5. S/0520/05/F - LINTON

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement covering the financial contribution to cover the cost of providing two additional places at Linton Village College and the Conditions referred to in the report, with an additional informative that the Local Planning Authority would consider this as the first part of any future development adjoining the site so as to secure an element of affordable housing and open space at that time.

6. S/2445/03/F - LINTON

Members noted that this application had been **WITHDRAWN** from the agenda.

7. S/0475/05/O - LONGSTANTON

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

8. S/0200/05/F - MELBOURN

DELEGATED APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein and to the prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement revoking consent for the remainder of the works approved under consent Ref: S/0073/99/F.

Councillor JA Quinlan declared a prejudicial interest (and withdrew from the Chamber) by virtue of having acted in the past on behalf of the applicants in a professional capacity.

9. S/0402/05/F - MELBOURN

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

10. S/0588/05/F - GT & LT CHISHILL

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

11. S/0587/05/F - ORWELL

APPROVAL, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services,, with Members voting not to request a site visit beforehand. Members felt that the spacious nature of the site and its relationship to adjacent properties did not contravene Policy HG/12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

12. S/0538/05/F - PAPWORTH EVERARD

APPROVAL, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Members felt that the variety brought about by the development would improve the street scene and would not contravene Policy HG/12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004. The two car parking spaces adjacent should be retained.

13. S/0306/05/F - SAWSTON

DELEGATED APPROVAL / DELEGATED REFUSAL. Approval if the application is amended so that the rear of the two-storey part of the extension projects no further back

than the rear of No.10. Refusal if it is not so amended on the grounds that the development would lead to a loss of light to and be overbearing to No.10. Approval would be for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

14. S/0393/05/F – SAWSTON

DELEGATED APPROVAL, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein and to the prior receipt of a unilateral undertaking that there will not be any deliveries of vehicles to, or collection of vehicles from, the site by Heavy Goods Vehicles or low-loaders.

Cllr Dr DR Bard declared a personal interest as a family member had recently been a customer of the applicant.

15. S/0313/05/F – TEVERSHAM

APPROVAL, as amended by e-mail dated 8th April 2005, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

16. S/0620/05/F – TEVERSHAM

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

17. S/0615/05/F - GT WILBRAHAM

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

18. S/0562/05/F - LT WILBRAHAM

APPROVAL in line with the amended recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services.

19. S/0455/05/O - STOW-CUM-QUY

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

20. S/0524/05/F – LANDBEACH

REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and an additional reason relating to the increase in traffic, resulting from the proposal, seeking to access a busy stretch of the A10.

21. S/0391/05/F – WATERBEACH

DEFERRED for a site visit.

22. S/0462/05/F – WATERBEACH

REFUSED contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services.. Members considered the proposed layout to be poor in the context of the one on the adjacent site, that it was overbearing on the existing properties

to the west, and that it did not represent the best use of land.

Councillor SGM Kindersley declared a prejudicial interest by virtue of being related to some of the Directors of the applicant company, and withdrew from the Chamber.

23. S/0497/05/F – THRILOW

On behalf of South Cambridgeshire District Council as a statutory consultee, the Committee **RESOLVED** to respond to consultation by Cambridgeshire County Council, by expressing serious concerns in relation to the adverse health impacts of the site, and particularly dioxin emissions, but making no other specific comments on this application. It was suggested that any permission should be conditional upon a reduction in the total tonnage of waste that can be processed each year at the site. The concerns raised by Councillor JA Quinlan (local Member) and local residents would also be conveyed to the County Council.

24. S/0438/05/F – SHEPRETH

APPROVAL contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Members felt that the proposal would not harm the viability of nearby stores or have an adverse impact on the area. There was adequate on-site parking. Access was reasonable. Members requested that Conditions be imposed restricting the consent to the first occupier of the premises and and the property's use to that of furniture / soft furnishing retail.

25. S/0543/05/F – BASSINGBOURN

REFUSED for the reason set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.

26. S/0516/05/F – ELTISLEY

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein and an informative drawing attention to the public drain in the immediate vicinity of the proposal.

Councillor Mrs DSK Spink declared personal interests as an adjacent landowner and member of Eltisley Parish Council, although she had not contributed to the debate when that Parish Council had considered this application.

27. S/6227/03/RM - GT CAMBOURNE

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to Conditions relating, among other things, to those issues referred to therein.

28. S/0483/05/F - CASTLE CAMPS

DELEGATED APPROVAL, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the receipt of a landscaping scheme acceptable to the Local Planning Authority, to the Conditions referred to in the report, and to agreement over the species of trees to be planted.

29. S/0551/05/F – COMBERTON

APPROVAL for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein, Condition 2 being expanded to require details of design and the extent of the hardstanding.

Councillor Dr SA Harangozo (the local Member) sent apologies for absence.

30. S/0552/05/F - COMBERTON

APPROVED for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein with Condition 2 being expanded to cover materials for the parking area.

Councillor Dr SA Harangozo (the local Member) sent apologies for absence.

31. APPROVED AS REPORT.S/2412/04/F - COTTENHAM

APPROVAL, as amended by letter and Flood Risk Assessment dated 14th March 2005 and referenced FRA02/3_jed., for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and subject to the Conditions referred to therein.

32. S/0467/05/RM - DUXFORD

Members noted that this application had been **WITHDRAWN**.

33. S/1154/04/F- FULBOURN

APPROVAL as amended by letter and Traffic Analysis dated 1st February 2005, and letter and Drawing No. 6799/SK002/A, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and subject to the Conditions referred to therein..

34. S/2194/01/F- GAMLINGAY

REFUSED in line with officers' revised recommendation on the grounds of the unacceptable impact on the rural character of the countryside by virtue of removing the hedge, absence of an Environmental Impact Statement, the effect of aircraft noise, and adverse effect on views as people enter the village from Little Gransden and Hatley.

35. S/2193/01/F - GAMLINGAY

REFUSED contrary to officer recommendation.

36. APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION

The Committee **NOTED** the following from the report prepared by the Director of Development Services:

- Decisions notified by the Secretary of State
- Appeals received
- Local Inquiry and Hearing dates scheduled before the next meeting on 1st June 2005
- Advance notification of future local inquiry and informal Hearing dates (subject to postponement or cancellation)

37. APPEAL STATISTICS

The Committee **NOTED** planning appeal statistics for the period from 1st January 2005 to 31st March 2005.

38. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ACT: 2003 - IMPLEMENTATION OF HIGH HEDGES PROVISIONS

The Committee considered a report on the implications of the enactment of Section 8 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act relating to high hedges' control and enforcement, and outlining a protocol for dealing with such complaints, until the full resource implications had been determined. The Council would not expect there to be any applications until at least September 2005, thus allowing individuals a three-month period in which to assess the implications of involving the Authority in such matters.

The Conservation Manager said that Section 8 should be seen as a last resort, with the Council encouraging the private resolution of neighbour disputes arising out of the presence of high hedges.

Members requested that parish councils be kept informed of any issues flowing from this part of the Act, short of formal consultation.

Members discussed the extent to which the legislation could be enforced, and concluded that it was not relevant in the case of root systems.

The Head of Legal Services commented on specific aspects of the proposed scheme of delegation.

It was **RESOLVED**

- (1) that the protocol for dealing with complaints about High Hedges, under Section 8 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003, as outlined in the report from the Director of Development Services, be endorsed;
- (2) that the scheme of delegation of powers to officers, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report be approved, subject to the removal of all references to the Head of Legal Services and Solicitors who, in the usual way, would be instructed by the Director of Development Services, if required; and
- (3) That a full refund be given of the fee paid where a Tree Preservation Order is placed on the hedge in question; and

It was **RECOMMENDED** that Cabinet

- (1) Sets a fee of £450 (to be reviewed annually) in respect of complaints under these provisions if there has been no formal mediation;
- (2) That, in the event of the number of received cases exceeding the equivalent of one day a week, assessed during an initial three-month period, a new post of a High Hedges Enforcement Officer be established, financed by the receipt of fees; and
- (3) That, In the event that formal mediation has been undertaken, there should be a reduction in the fee, equivalent to the costs incurred by attempting formal mediation, up to a maximum reduction of £150, subject to there being

evidence of such formal mediation and the cost thereof.

39. CAMBOURNE SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT - FACILITIES AND TIMING OF PROVISION

The Committee received a further report on progress being made by the Developers of Cambourne in complying with their obligations under the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated 20th April 1994.

The Committee had lifted the “embargo” on issuing planning permissions for market housing at Cambourne at the March meeting, in order for the developers’ consortium to progress the legal matters associated with the provision of the trailer park. The Head of Legal Services reported verbally that construction of the trailer park was underway, and that ongoing negotiations were proving to be positive. He was confident that completion should take place by the end of June 2005.

It was **RESOLVED**

- (1) that the Council should not re-impose the embargo at this stage, but reaffirm its stance in relation to seeking substantial compliance with the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated 20th April 1994
- (2) that the situation be reviewed at the Committee’s meeting in August 2005.

The Meeting ended at 3.15 p.m.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Licensing Committee held on
Thursday, 26 May 2005

PRESENT: Councillor RE Barrett – Chairman
Councillor Dr JR Williamson – Vice-Chairman

Councillors:	R Hall	Mrs HF Kember
	Mrs JA Muncey	Mrs CAED Murfitt
	Dr JPR Orme	NJ Scarr
	J Shepperson	A Riley
	EW Bullman	Mrs SA Hatton
	Mrs A Elsby	

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor DALG Wherrell.

1. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

The Chairman was authorised to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 28 October 2004.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following interests were declared:

Councillor Mrs HF Kember as local Member for The Shelfords
Councillor Mrs JA Muncey as local Member for Histon.

3. GREAT SHELFORD - APPLICATION FOR CONSENT STREET STATUS

The Assistant Licensing Officer asked the Committee to consider and approve Great Shelford's request for Consent Street Status, in order that the necessary process to organise the Status could be commenced.

The Licensing Committee

AGREED to the request from Great Shelford Parish Council for all streets in the village to be designated as Consent Streets.

Members raised the issue of the possibility of designating blanket Consent Street Status across the district, as opposed to waiting for each village to make an application and agreeing them individually. It was confirmed that this had been discussed in the past and no further action taken due to the costs and officer time involved. At present there would also need to be a focus on ensuring applications under the Licensing Act 2003 were dealt with efficiently, thereby making Consent Street Status a lower priority except where specific applications were made by villages.

Until the Committee was able to devote its energies to this topic, it was agreed that all Council Members should be encouraged to consider talking to their parishes about making Consent Street applications. This was to be done through the Members' Weekly Bulletin. It was also suggested that the process of application be advertised in a future edition of South Cambs Magazine.

4. **HISTON – RENEWAL OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT LICENCE AT THE ROYAL BRITISH LEGION CLUB**

Councillor Mrs JA Muncey declared an interest in this item as the local member for Histon.

Four residents of Saffron Road, Histon were in attendance to voice their objections to the renewal of the Public Entertainment Licence for the Royal British Legion Club. These included:

- Loud music being audible in their homes including high levels of bass, causing vibrations;
- Noise disturbances from people leaving the club continuing well after closing time;
- Rowdyism of young people – including apparent under-age drinking – in the car park during opening hours;
- Glass bottles left in the car park and on the street;
- Extended opening hours until midnight, potentially every night of the week, since 2004 without the knowledge of local residents.

The applicant on behalf of the Royal British Legion Club sought to address these issues in his support of the application for renewal of the Public Entertainment Licence.

- The Noise Limiter in the Club was set to 90 Dba which was lower than it had been previously;
- Noise after closing time could not be commented on;
- No under-age persons were allowed to buy alcohol at the Club and only children of members and guests at the Club were only allowed on the premises;
- People buying drinks in the Club were asked by signage not to take glasses and bottles outside the Club;
- The notice of intent to extend public entertainments to midnight in 2004 was posted on the Club notice board outside as per the requirements of the application.

The Environmental Health Officer reassured the Committee of the capabilities of the Noise Limiter that was fitted at the Club but that it could not limit the power of low frequency or bass music and that alternative remedies to this problem would need to be discussed with the Club.

Having taken regard of the information provided by the Licensing Officer and the arguments of the applicant and the objectors, the Licensing Committee

AGREED that a Public Entertainment Licence be issued until such date as the new Licensing Act 2003 comes into force, in respect of the Royal British Legion Club, Histon, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) A sound limiter should be installed limiting all music and other entertainments to 87Dba.
- (b) Public entertainments can continue until midnight on a Friday and Saturday night only.
- (c) On Monday to Thursday nights public entertainments must finish by 10.30pm. There will be no entertainment licence granted for Sundays.
- (d) The applicant may also hold an additional one event per month to finish at midnight, subject to seven days prior notice being given to the Council's Licensing Officer and a prominent notice displayed on

the door of the premises, notifying local residents of such additional events.

- (e) The applicant should ensure that fire doors at the premises are kept closed but unlocked whilst an event is taking place.

The Committee would also like to recommend that the applicant consult further with the Environmental Health Officer regarding additional noise limitation measures, before a new licence is applied for.

The Meeting ended at 12.45 p.m.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee held on
Thursday, 19 May 2005

PRESENT: Councillor MP Howell – Chairman
Councillor Mrs GJ Smith – Vice-Chairman

Councillors:	SJ Agnew	RE Barrett
	RF Bryant	NN Cathcart
	R Hall	JA Hockney
	HC Hurrell	MJ Mason
	DC McCraith	Mrs CAED Murfitt
	Mrs HM Smith	Dr SEK van de Ven
	DALG Wherrell	

Councillors Mrs A Elsby, SGM Kindersley, RB Martlew, Dr JPR Orme, Mrs DP Roberts, RT Summerfield and Dr JR Williamson were in attendance, by invitation.

Officers:	Patrick Adams	Senior Democratic Services Officer
	Mike Clarkson	Internal Auditor
	Kari Greaves	Head of Shire Homes
	Steve Hampson	Housing and Environmental Services Director
	Greg Harlock	Finance and Resources Director
	Tim Wetherfield	Head of Policy and Communications

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor DH Morgan.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 21st April 2005 were agreed as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

- Councillors SGM Kindersley and Mrs A Elsby were added to the list of those present.
- In Minute 6, third paragraph, “Shona” was corrected to “Solma”.

Minute 3 - Guide to the Voting System

It was understood that the installation engineers had not yet provided a definitive guide to the voting system. The Senior Democratic Services Officer was instructed to inform the company of the Committee’s displeasure in the amount of time it was taking to produce a guide.

Minute 3 - Grounds Maintenance Task and Finish Group

Councillor Mrs GJ Smith reported that the Group would meet shortly and they would discuss whether they should disband as it appeared unlikely that anything useful could be achieved in the near future. She concluded that the Group should reform in approximately a year’s time to assess the implementation of an initiative from the Government.

Minute 7 - Climate Change Group

Councillor NN Cathcart stated that, as expected, there had been an informal meeting to discuss climate change.

Minute 9 – Electronic Service Delivery

The Senior Democratic Services Officer was instructed to inform the ICT Advisory Group of the Committee's disappointment in the improved but still low performance on services delivered electronically (BV 157).

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor MP Howell declared a personal interest during discussion on item 7 as an employee of a Housing Association.

Councillor RT Summerfield declared a personal interest during discussion on item 8 as he receives a pension from Deloitte and Touche. It was understood that the Head of Legal Services had advised Councillor Summerfield that this constituted a personal interest in discussions involving internal audit but that he should declare a prejudicial interest on any discussions of a tender from Deloitte and Touche for the Council's contract for internal audit.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None.

5. DRAFT AGENDA PROGRAMME AND PROGRAMME OF KEY DECISIONS

The Chairman presented this item on the Committee's agenda programme and the Council's forward programme of key decisions. It was agreed that the items listed as being deferred from May and June should be removed from the agenda.

It was noted that June's meeting would focus on a service in the bottom quartile and the duplication indicated at July's meeting should be removed from the programme.

It was agreed that the report on the Waste Minimisation Best Value Review would be circulated to members as soon as it became available. The next available agenda would include an item on the review but the report would not be attached. This would allow the Committee to efficiently focus on any concerns, without dedicating a sizeable proportion of the meeting to discussing the review.

Councillor Mrs GJ Smith suggested that the following items should be included on the agenda programme:

- Survey of village facilities, to examine what progress had been made
- Scrutiny of the Council's lettings policy
- To review the Cost of the Freedom of Information Act to the Council – an update following the scrutiny in April

Councillor Mrs EM Heazell stated that there had been no volunteers to serve on a Lettings Policy Advisory Group. She suggested that the reason for the apparent Member apathy towards Advisory Groups needed to be investigated.

The Committee

AGREED

- a) To add the above items to the agenda programme;

- b) To evaluate all the issues that had been put on the agenda programme during 2004/05 at the next meeting in June and consider whether to include them in the 2005/06 programme.

The Committee **NOTED** the Committee's version of the Council's forward programme for May, which indicated how the programme had altered since April and listed the items that had been agreed at April's Cabinet without appearing on the forward programme. An explanation had been provided from the report writer detailing why the item had never appeared on the forward programme. It was agreed that this format was useful and should continue to appear in the agenda.

6. QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION FOR THE HOUSING PORTFOLIO HOLDER

The Chairman introduced this item on questions to Councillor Mrs EM Heazell, the housing portfolio holder by inviting Members for supplementary questions on the answers that had already been circulated by e-mail.

Participation Groups for Tenants

Councillor Mrs Heazell stated that there were a number of residential groups in the district: three schemes in Cottenham, the Wadlow Group in Waterbeach, the Chalklands Group in Linton, the Vincent Close Group in Girton, the Hereward Close Group in Impington, St Audrey's Close Group in Histon, the Windmill Estate Group in Fulbourn and a group in Sawston.

It was understood that if housing stock were transferred to a housing association, tenants would still be encouraged to form Tenant Participation Groups as this would be a condition of transfer. This matter would be discussed in greater detail under the next agenda item.

Sheltered Housing

Councillor Mrs Heazell was pleased to report that a recent QAF assessment had upgraded the Council's sheltered housing service to four 'C's. The Chairman congratulated the staff involved in this achievement.

The Chairman advised Councillor JA Hockney to liaise with Councillor Mrs Heazell outside the meeting to discuss an individual case of a sheltered housing resident.

OT Assessments

Councillor Mrs GJ Smith expressed her concern over a lack of reassessments by Occupational Therapists (OT) following a delay in the provision of service. The Head of Shire Homes explained that the waiting time for an assessment depended on the work. The most straightforward and most common request for a shower alteration would be completed quickly. It was noted that the Primary Care Trust were employing extra staff to deal with the current backlog.

Neighbourhood Managers

Councillor Mrs Heazell stated that monitoring of neighbourhood manager teams was carried out and she had seen evidence that this was effective. The Housing and Environmental Services Director explained that it was more of a challenge to produce measurable targets for qualitative issues such as neighbourhood management than it was for quantitative issues such as repair completions.

Installation of Solar Panels on Council Houses

Concern was expressed at the modest number of solar panels installed in Council homes. Councillor Mrs Heazell explained that it took a long time to recoup installation

costs and the beneficiary would be the tenant and not the landlord. It was hoped that incentives could be offered to promote this scheme. It was suggested that a partnership with the City Council should be re-considered.

Homelessness

In response to questioning, Councillor Mrs Heazell stated that it was the aim of the Council to only put families into Bed and Breakfast accommodation in an emergency. She stated that the Council's homeless service had improved greatly since the Best Value review. The Housing and Environmental Services Director stated that by law families were not allowed to be in Bed and Breakfast accommodation for longer than six weeks. It was understood that family break up was the most common cause of homelessness.

7. UPDATE ON HOUSING OPTION APPRAISAL PROCESS

The Housing and Environmental Health Director introduced this item by giving a detailed presentation on the future housing options facing the Council. He explained that the Housing Options Working Group had finished discussing this issue and it would now be considered at June's Cabinet and Council.

Consultation by the Housing Options Working Group

Councillor Mrs DP Roberts suggested that the results of the recent consultation appeared to show that tenants had not been made properly aware of the service a housing association would be able to provide and had opted for the housing stock to remain in the Council's control due to fear of the unknown. Councillor Mrs Heazell stated that every attempt had been made to provide tenants with the adequate information but she could not guarantee that tenants would read the information.

The Committee shared the Housing Options Working Group's concerns regarding the low response from tenants but the Housing and Environmental Services Director predicted that the necessary 50% turnout would be achieved in an official stock transfer ballot on the basis of experience elsewhere. Councillor Mrs Roberts lamented the fact that the remit of the Housing Options Working Group had not included the need to provide a recommendation at the end of their deliberations.

Balloting Tenants

It was understood that the housing stock could not be transferred without a ballot of tenants. Over 50% of the tenants need to vote and of those who vote, 50% or more need to approve the transfer for this to be agreed. The pre ballot preparation would cost in the region of £750,000, with approximately two thirds of this cost being met by the Housing Revenue Account and the remaining third from the general fund. The Housing and Environmental Services Director stated that part of the £750,000 would include a pro-active attempt to encourage tenants to vote. He reminded the Committee that there was a large difference between the recent consultation exercise and an actual ballot of tenants. It was noted that if the Council did decide to ballot its tenants and they rejected transfer then the £750,000 would be irrecoverable. However, not all of the associated expenditure would be abortive as some of the investment would result in more up to date and meaningful management information; for example the £75,000 investment in the Stock Condition Survey.

Equity Share tenants were prohibited from voting and the Housing and Environmental Services Director had been asked by the HOW Group to write to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister to complain about the inequity of this rule. The Equity Share tenants had been asked to give their views in the recent consultation by the Council on future housing options.

Financial Considerations

Councillor Mrs Roberts stated that in the past the transfer of housing stock had been rejected by this Council as it did not make financial sense. However, the Government's decision to take a proportion of the Council's capital receipts had to be taken into consideration along with the Council's current financial situation.

In response to questioning, the Finance and Resources Director explained that the transfer of housing stock could, indirectly, lead to a lower level of council tax. A transfer of housing stock would require the permission of the ODPM, who would probably insist on a substantial element of the associated capital receipts being re-invested in social housing. However, on the basis of the financial modelling prepared by the Council's Consultant, Tribal, and on the assumption that all receipts were invested rather than spent, the impact on the General Fund was such that over the following five year period a net inflow of funds in order of £5.4 million could be expected. For ease of understanding, the Finance and Resources Director explained that if this additional income was to accrue evenly over the five years, at a rate of just over £1 million per annum, then this would equate to £20 per annum at Band "D" Taxpayer level.

In response to questioning The Housing and Environmental Services Director explained that tenants, as with most people, now had higher expectations and this led to higher maintenance costs for the Council. He added that all costs were estimated and it was hard to predict when items would need to be replaced. However, under the current rules it appeared unlikely that the Council would be able to meet the revenue cost of the housing stock indefinitely. He concluded that it could prove difficult to continue to provide the service in 5-6 six years time.

Councillor Mrs A Elsby lamented the loss of the Local Authority Social Housing Grants at such short notice and praised the Council for its delivery of quality housing for its tenants.

The Process for a Stock Transfer

The Housing and Environmental Services Director explained that there were three steps to transferring the Council's housing stock. Firstly the ODPM would have to approve the Council's proposal to transfer its housing stock. Secondly the Secretary of State would need to be satisfied that the existing tenants supported a transfer. Thirdly the Council would need to agree the transfer. He added that the Council would need to be satisfied that the new landlord would maintain the Council's current agreements. This would include negotiations with a future landlord about the division of future preserved Right to Buy receipts as opposed to the 25% which the Council will receive from 2007/08 under receipts pooling if it retains its housing.

The Housing and Environmental Services Director stated that if the decision was taken to transfer the stock then the Council would have to decide whether to set up a new local association or whether it wished to invite existing associations to take over the stock. The successful housing association would have to comply with a set of criteria including the decent homes standard.

In response to a question from Councillor RB Martlew, the Housing and Environmental Services Director explained that in the event of a stock transfer the majority of the Council's housing officers would be likely to be employed by the new housing association, so in the short term there would be no change in the officers that tenants were dealing with following a stock transfer.

The Housing and Environmental Services Director confirmed that as the housing

association would not have to pay a proportion of rent to the Government, it would receive more rental income than the Council. Part of this would be used to service loans which would fund the investment programme. If the transfer of stock was agreed there would follow a period of 6-9 months of intense negotiation to inform the new association's business plan.

Consultation

The Housing and Environmental Services Director stated that the Housing Options Working Group had consulted with other local authorities, including Colchester Borough Council who had set up an Arms Length Management Organisation or ALMO.

The Committee was clearly divided on this subject with the following comments being made in favour of a stock transfer:

- There were successful precedents for stock transfers by other public bodies.
- The Government's policy made a stock transfer the only sensible option.

However, the following comments were made against a stock transfer:

- There was no guarantee that a housing association would be able to maintain the same standards as the Council.
- Council tenants had an 82% satisfaction rating with this authority, but this rating would inevitably drop if the stock were transferred.
- The Council has invested heavily in its housing stock and the projected costs looked pessimistic
- The consultation was biased in favour of a stock transfer.

The Committee requested that Cabinet and Council pay particular attention to the low tenant turn out achieved through the consultation by the HOW Group and ensure that a meaningful consultation form the part of any balloting process.

8. DIRECT LABOUR ORGANISATION

The Housing and Environmental Services Director introduced this item by giving a presentation on the Direct Labour Organisation (DLO). He detailed the extent of the operating deficit and concluded that it had been caused by a number of factors. While customer satisfaction had been maintained operational and financial management had been inadequate. There had been no evidence of fraud, and the DLO recovery team had instigated changes. He concluded that there were four options for the future:

- Maintain the in-house DLO, but expand its business base to make it viable.
- Enter into a public-private partnership, insourcing private sector management
- Develop a partnership with the Council's other existing repairs contractor, City Services
- Retender the contract.

The Housing and Environmental Services Director explained that if the DLO had not been awarded the contract in 2004 the Council would have incurred higher costs from an external contractor. He also reminded the Committee that the diminishing HRA repairs budget threatened the DLO's future viability, suggesting that responsive repairs could not remain the DLO's primary source of income. He concluded that it would be wrong to give preference to any of the options prior to detailed evaluation.

Improvement in Service

It was noted that tenant satisfaction had improved from 68% to a current figure of 94%. The prices for work had remained the same and the challenge was to deliver the service for the same price.

Councillor Martlew stated that he was reassured that no fraud had been discovered in the DLO operating deficit, which had been caused by error not by design. He stated that the Council had far more influence over response repairs by keeping the service in-house and he hoped that the service would not be contracted out. He suggested that the service could be combined with that of the City Council if necessary.

Staff Sickness

The Chairman suggested that the long-term sickness of DLO staff be examined. Councillor Hockney expressed concern at the apparent discrepancy between the figures for DLO staff sickness in the Cabinet reports of 13th January and those in the report on 14th April 2005. Councillor Summerfield explained that the Council's long-term sickness had reduced and the figures for sickness were cumulative throughout the year and this might explain the apparent contradiction. It was agreed that the Committee should be e-mailed an explanation of this apparent discrepancy.

Internal Audit

Councillor Mrs Roberts expressed her disappointment at the events leading up to the revelation of the deficit to the DLO in November 2004. She suggested that Internal Audit could have done more to warn the Council of potential problems with the DLO.

The Finance and Resources Director reported that approximately a year ago the Commercial Services department had been in transition. The former Commercial Services Director had begun a series of structural, organisational, changes in anticipation of the removal of the hard client / contractor split established in the former CCT environment, in anticipation of a new era which would see work directly allocated to the DLO, without recourse to competition. As a result of this transition towards adopting the Egan principles, the Finance and Resources Director had become concerned that key posts had been removed and that staffing levels had been reduced such that the Department's financial and administrative procedures could be at risk of failure. If it became necessary at a later stage for the Commercial Services Department to submit a tender for any of the range of activities and services presently provided, the Finance and Resources Director was concerned that they may not any longer possess the necessary skills to do so. To fulfil his Section 151 obligations the Finance and Resources Director had asked Internal Audit to examine the related affairs of the Department. Internal Audit's subsequent report gave a "substantial" assurance. Related recommendations, with a view to improving financial control, were subsequently implemented.

Mike Clarkson from Internal Audit reported that Commercial Services had shown a deficit in 2003/04. The Internal Audit report highlighted a risk of poor budgeting and the fact that procedures in place were not making full use of the new Financial Management Systems, which meant that decisions could be taken on incorrect information. Recommendations were made to address these deficiencies and assurances were made by officers that they would be complied with. Mr Clarkson stated that in hindsight internal audit should have given a "limited" not a "substantial" assurance.

The Chairman suggested that internal audit objectivity had suffered as a result of being too close to the Council. Concern was expressed that internal audit had not examined the DLO since June 2004. Mr Clarkson countered that internal audit had highlighted the pertinent issues and as they had not been asked to examine the DLO tender they had not done so. It was agreed that the Audit Panel would be the most appropriate forum to discuss this matter further.

The Director of Housing and Environmental Services reported that the managerial team for the DLO had been strengthened.

Members of the Committee made the following suggestions:

- The service should be combined with that of the City Council to make it viable.
- The effect of the move from Oakington to Waterbeach on the DLO should be examined
- Clear improvements should be made before any retendering process.

In response to concerns about supplies, the Director of Housing and Environmental Services explained that the aim was to finish all jobs in one visit, although this was not always possible.

The Committee expressed concern regarding the deficit. It was suggested that the accounts at the DLO should have been carefully examined monthly as that was a standard accounting procedure.

The Committee

AGREED to pass this issue to the Audit Panel for greater investigation.

9. TO NOTE THE DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Annual Council will appoint the Committee for 2005/06 on Thursday 26th May. The new Committee will meet on the following dates:

2005: 16th June, 21st July, 18th August, 15th September, 20th October, 17th November and 15th December;

2006: 19th January, 16th February, 16th March, 20th April & 18th May.

All meetings are scheduled for a 2.00pm start.

The Meeting ended at 6.05 p.m.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Council

23 June 2005

AUTHOR/S: Strategic Officer Group on Traveller Issues

URGENT ITEM: TRAVELLER ISSUES

Purpose

1. To seek Council's approval to broaden the scope of planning enforcement activities, which may be funded within the existing, agreed 2005/06 budget for Traveller Issues.

Effect on Corporate Objectives

2.	Quality, Accessible Services	Traveller Issues have implications for all four objectives. The Council's commitment to firm, fair and consistent planning enforcement is central to maintaining Quality Village Life and treating all sections of the community equitably. This is reflected in the Council's Policy on Traveller Issues, agreed in July 2004. The Performance Plan cites the challenge of unauthorised plots and future site provision as a major issue facing the Council.
	Village Life	
	Sustainability	
	Partnership	

Background

3. Whilst the Development and Conservation Control Committee is responsible for taking regulatory decisions to enforce planning law in relation to unauthorised Traveller sites, decisions on providing the necessary funding rest with the full Council.
4. The Council's 2005/06 budget for Traveller Issues, under the Planning portfolio, allocates £450,000 for planning enforcement, with another £100,000 for related legal advice. The £450,000 relates to a decision made by the Council on 28 October 2004, when it agreed that "the £250,000 spending limit for Phase 1 of direct enforcement action at the Smithy Fen traveller site be increased by a further £200,000". Phase 1 relates specifically to "land behind Setchell Drove (including Victoria View)".

Considerations

5. Since that Council decision last October, the situation has changed:
 - The High Court, in November 2004, ruled that the Council should put possible action at Victoria View on hold until the outcome of a new planning inquiry, which will take place next month (with a final decision some months after that).
 - Other unauthorised Traveller sites in the District have also come to the end of standard planning enforcement processes. These include: Sandy Park, Chesterton Fen; Moor Drove, Histon; and Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey.
 - The Cabinet, in April 2005, agreed a preference for taking injunctive action in the first instance (as opposed to 'direct action') against individuals persistently in breach of planning control. It was accepted that land clearance might be necessary as a follow-up measure.

- The illegal occupants of Pine View, Smithy Fen are in breach of the Deputy Prime Minister's decision last March for them to move by 11 June 2005. The Development and Control Conservation Committee on 6 July will be asked to give formal approval for injunctive action in this case.

6. This urgent item for the Council agenda is necessary because, as funding authorisations currently stand, the £450,000 can only be spent on 'direct action' on Victoria View. The Council is asked to allow the funding to be made available for any form of appropriate planning enforcement action (including injunctive action) on any unauthorised Traveller site in the district.

Financial implications

7. An estimate of the possible costs of injunctive action at one site has been provided by specialist external legal advice. Based on their experience of a similar case carried out for another local authority, the total costs (from preparatory work, through to issue of proceedings to trial, and including legal work on dealing with homelessness applications) are estimated at around £212,000 (though not necessarily all to be incurred in one financial year). It is possible, of course, that the Council may need to consider taking appropriate planning enforcement action on more than one site, given the need to take a consistent approach towards all cases of unauthorised traveller encampments.
8. This recommendation to broaden the scope of planning enforcement activities, which may be funded relates to the existing, agreed 2005/06 Council budget. Even so, it needs to be considered in the context of the Government's current proposals for council tax capping.
9. So far in 2005/06, the Council has spent around £20,000 on legal advice in relation to Traveller and none of the £450,000. If further spending on planning enforcement, (beyond the already authorised £450,000) proved necessary, this request would be reported back to full Council for consideration.

Legal implications

10. The Council, as the Local Planning Authority, is duty bound to uphold planning decisions made by the Deputy Prime Minister and other aspects of planning law.
11. The Commission for Racial Equality states that "Gypsies and Irish Travellers are recognised ethnic groups for the purposes of the Race Relations Act (1976), identified as having a shared culture, language and beliefs".
12. Whilst the recent passing of the 11 June deadline means that the current focus is on Pine View, Smithy Fen (occupied by Irish Travellers), Council spending on Traveller Issues needs to take account of other traveller sites in the District where there are outstanding breaches of planning control. It is important that the Council is consistent in responding to all these sites and can demonstrate an equitable approach to dealing with both English Romany Travellers and Irish Travellers.

Staffing implications

13. The Council's approach to Traveller Issues continues to take up a considerable amount of staff time from managers across the range of Council services. This is

overseen by a Strategic Officer Group and co-ordinated, on a day-to-day basis, by the Corporate Projects Officer.

Risk management implications

14. Traveller Issues are highlighted as one of the key corporate risks facing the organisation (currently rated 'very high likelihood' / 'critical impact') on the Council's Risk Register. The management action plan was included in the report to Cabinet on 12 May 2005 on Strategic Risk Management.

Consultations

15. This report has been produced following a discussion at the meeting of the D&3C Advisory Committee on 14 June. The need to present the report to full Council as an urgent item has been agreed by the Chairman of the Council.

Recommendations

16. That the Council endorses the proposal that the £450,000, already authorised for direct action at the Victoria View traveller site, be made available for any form of appropriate planning enforcement action (including injunctive action) on any unauthorised Traveller site in the district.

Background Papers:

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Council's Policy on Traveller Issues, SCDC, July 2004.
- Reports to Cabinet, 28 April 2005
- Reports to Development and Conservation Control Committee, 6 April and 1 June 2005.
- Report to Development and Conservation Control Sub-Committee, 10 May 2005.
- Report to Cabinet on Strategic Risk Management, 12 May 2005.
- Report to D&3C Advisory Committee, 14 June 2005.
- "Gypsies and Travellers: the facts", Commission for Racial Equality website, May 2005 (http://www.cre.gov.uk/gdpract/g_and_t_facts.html)
- 2005 Performance Plan - draft for Council, SCDC, 23 June 2005.

Contact Officer: Strategic Officer Group on Traveller Issues
e-mail: traveller.project@scams.gov.uk
Telephone: (01954) 713297

This page is intentionally left blank