

PLANNING AND NEW COMMUNITIES JOINT PORTFOLIO HOLDERS' MEETING

TUESDAY, 2 MARCH 2010

DECISIONS

Set out below is a summary of the decisions taken at the Planning and New Communities Joint Portfolio Holders' Meeting held on Tuesday, 2 March 2010. Decisions made by the Portfolio Holder will be subject to call-in. Recommendations made to the Cabinet or to the Council are not subject to call-in. The wording used does not necessarily reflect the actual wording that will appear in the minutes.

If you have any queries about any matters referred to in this decision sheet please contact Ian Senior.

1. PROCUREMENT STRATEGY 2010

The Planning Portfolio Holder **AGREED** to adopt the updated Procurement Strategy 2010/11.

Other Options Considered:

Planning Portfolio Holder could suggest changes to the proposed updated Procurement Strategy.

2. FINAL SERVICE PLANS 2010/11: CORPORATE SERVICES (PROCUREMENT AND EFFICIENCY)

The Planning Portfolio Holder **APPROVED** the Procurement element of the Corporate Services 2010/11 Service Plan.

Other Options Considered: None specified

Reason For Decision: Organisational effectiveness

3. FINAL SERVICE PLANS 2010/11: PLANNING

The Planning Portfolio Holder **APPROVED** the Planning 2010/11 Service Plan.

Other Options Considered: None specified

Reason For Decision: Organisational effectiveness

4. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

The New Communities Portfolio Holder **AGREED** the Local Development Scheme 2010-2013.

Other Options Considered: The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the Local Development Scheme is reviewed annually and submitted to the Secretary of State.

Reason For Decision: The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the Local Development Scheme is reviewed annually and submitted to the Secretary of State.

5. FINAL SERVICE PLANS 2010/11: NEW COMMUNITIES

The New Communities Portfolio Holder **APPROVED** the New Communities 2010/11 Service Plan.

Other Options Considered: None specified

Reason For Decision: Organisational effectiveness

6. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY

The Planning Portfolio Holder **AGREED** that the Council's reply to the Green Infrastructure Strategy consultation should be:

- (a) The Council supports the role that an effective strategy will have in the protection, creation and management of green infrastructure.
- (b) The Council supports the development of a strategy which will provide a robust and defensible basis for green infrastructure planning and delivery, for both existing communities and the growth areas.
- (c) The Council has significant concerns about the approach and content of the draft Green Infrastructure Strategy as set out in this report and previous officer comments to Cambridgeshire Horizons.
- (d) The Council will require major changes to the strategy addressing its concerns before it will be able to endorse it.
- (e) Council officers will work with Cambridgeshire Horizons and other partners to achieve the changes required.

Options Considered:

1. To accept the consultation draft and not request changes.
2. To object to the consultation draft.
3. To respond to the consultation draft with comments and recommended changes and say that officers will work with Cambridgeshire Horizons and other partners to help make the required improvements.

Reason For Decision: Green infrastructure helps give quality of life, healthy and attractive places, and a range of other benefits. It is a key way of maintaining and creating successful, sustainable communities and is supported by policy at all levels.

7. SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT:AFFORDABLE HOUSING, DESIGN GUIDE AND LANDSCAPE

The Planning and New Communities Portfolio Holders **AGREED** the adoption of the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and to proceed in accordance with Regulations 18 and 19.

Other Options Considered: None specified

Reason For Decision: None specified

8. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN

The Planning and New Communities Portfolio Holders **AGREED** that the Council make the following representation to Cambridgeshire County Council in response to the LTP3 consultation:

“The Council supports the overarching objectives of LTP3 and prioritises non-car modes as these will provide travel choice and best achieve the objectives with limited resources. The strategy areas should be prioritised as follows:

- (1) Public Transport
- (2) Cycling
- (3) Walking
- (4) Smarter Choices
- (5) Road Safety
- (6) Traffic Management

“It is important to ensure the needs of all sectors of community are addressed, including the most vulnerable – the young, elderly and disabled. At present many residents experience social isolation as they are unable to access essential services, shopping, leisure or simply meet with friends, due to a lack of bus or community transport service and/or the prohibitive cost of using it.

“The Council would urge the County Council not to forget linkages to market towns outside the county as many of the remoter parts of the district look to these areas for their services.

“The Council would also ask the County Council to take in to consideration the outcomes of plans and strategies produced by other organisations, including the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, Community Transport Strategy and Air Quality Action Plan, Parish Plans, the Children and Young People’s Plan (BigPlan2), and Cambridgeshire Horizon’s Green Infrastructure Strategy, to name a few. These may provide an extensive evidence base of transport provision and need, highlight issues concerning specific groups of people, and many contain an action plan including issues that can be addressed through LTP3.

“The Council would like to continue to work closely with the County Council and the other Cambridgeshire districts on drafting LTP3.”

Other Options Considered: None specified

Reason For Decision: To agree the Council’s response to Cambridgeshire County Council’s consultation on the third Local Transport Plan (LTP).

9. SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Portfolio holders for Planning and New Communities **AGREED** the responses to the consultation on the two Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) as given below and in Appendix 2 for The Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities SPD and Appendix 3 for RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD:

“The Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities SPD (draft)

“South Cambs welcomes the detailed guidance produced in this SPD and welcomes that rural locations have been considered separately thereby recognising the different considerations that must be given to locating waste management facilities in countryside settings such as is found in much of South Cambridgeshire. Also that separate consideration is given to urban fringe sites and major development sites of which South Cambs has within its boundaries.

“There needs to be recognition within the SPD that South Cambs has a number of adopted planning policy documents in the Local Development Framework. For planning applications for waste management facilities within this district there are a number of relevant Development Plan Documents (DPD) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) that would need to be considered.

“In the principles to apply for rural locations one must be added that considers the traffic generated by a waste facility particularly heavy commercial vehicles (HCV) so that there is not an increase in unsuitable traffic on rural road through rural settlements. The criteria is applied to both urban and urban fringe locations but is equally as valid in rural areas if traffic ends up going through nearby villages.

“There also needs to be consideration of impact that locating a waste management

facility will have on the existing local communities in urban fringe and major development sites. The needs of these communities must be taken into account in planning these facilities.

“The SPD promotes the idea of the co-location of related waste facilities which although may have significant benefits, would obviously result in a much larger of scale development. This would be potentially more intrusive on the environment thereby reducing those sites that could be considered suitable.

“Waste Management sites have potential to cause significant and complex noise impact. South Cambs has concerns about how noise is addressed in the SPD. In the section considering noise (page 36) reference is made to a noise reportand appropriate mitigation measures.....but does not detail that the main purpose is to assess noise impact locally, characterise the existing noise climate at noise sensitive premises and use the best practical means to mitigate any adverse noise as necessary. This must be included in this section to safeguard amenity and minimise noise disturbance from any future facilities.

“Also in the SPD reference is made to guidance against World Health Organisation Community Noise Guidelines and actual dB levels are quoted e.g. 55dB day 45 night and or no more than 5 to 10 dB increase in background. These actual dB noise levels should be used with caution as these levels can be misleading and understate impact. South Cambs requests that any reference to actual dB noise levels should be removed and simply state that noise will be assessed on a site by site basis on its merits having regard to local circumstances. It would be simpler within the SPD to refer to assessment in accordance with PPG 24 methodology and recommended noise guidance in WHO and best practice such as British Standards.

“The SPD considers the air quality of waste facilities but narrows this consideration to the impact arising from traffic. There should also be included the air quality issues arising from the on-site operations of the facility.”

“The Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Partnership (RECAP) Waste Management Design Guide SPD (draft)

“Whilst recognising that this document has been in existence for a while it does not appear to have been reviewed thoroughly before it has been approved for consultation as a draft SPD. An SPD cannot create new policies but must support policies in an adopted Development Plan Document and it is not clearly stated within the SPD which policies the SPD is providing guidance to. The structure of the SPD must be revised so that this fundamental fact is made clear at the beginning of the document.

“The SPD states that one of the purposes of the document is to be ‘ a strategic tool for use for Planning Authorities when assessing development applications.’ An SPD cannot have this strategic role – it can only provide guidance for local planning authorities when they are considering planning applications, supporting policies in a Development Plan Document.

“Mention is made in the SPD of the need for a ‘ waste audit ‘ to be carried out by a developer of a development proposal but there is no definition of this term or what it may include. This must be included in the SPD to assist both developers and local planners.

“If this is to be used by planners and developers the SPD as a design guide must be easy to use and the SPD as drafted needs to be revised so that it is clearer what the planners should ask for from developers submitting planning applications e.g. if a waste audit is required and what developers should provide when submitting a planning

application. It is unclear whether a developer would be expected to produce both a waste audit and to complete the Toolkit included in the SPD.

“If it is expected that a ‘Toolkit’ be filled out for each planning application submitted by a developer then consideration needs to be given as to the format of the SPD and where the Toolkit is placed within the document. Consideration should be given to making the Toolkit section of the SPD as a clearly identifiable part. Suggestions to achieve this include putting it at the end of the SPD with a different coloured background or font to make it easily seen. As a paper document the SPD could have a pocket in the cover in which the Toolkit is placed so that it can be accessible. An electronic version of the SPD could have the Toolkit as a separately accessible document, which could either be downloaded as a Word document or printed off so that it can be filled in and submitted with a planning application.

“The earlier version of the Waste Design Guide was adopted by South Cambs as Council Policy in March 2008 and planners have referred developers to the guide before they submit planning applications to the Council. South Cambs encourages pre-applications discussions with developers. There is no indication in the current SPD or in the accompanying report, which was prepared by County planners in September 2009 of the success of the guide, and details of which other local planning authorities within Cambridgeshire had adopted it as Council Policy. It would be useful to know what success there was been in improving the waste management content of planning applications as a result of the existence of the guide. The toolkit appears to be a useful way of assessing the waste needs of a development but are developers submitting these with their applications?

“The chapter setting the planning and policy context of the SPD refers to documents but does not make it clear who has published these and the relevance of their content. The section on the Minerals and Waste Development Plan is particularly weak and does not appear to reflect that the MWDP is at the proposed Submission stage, being out for consultation at the same time as this SPD. This must be amended and further highlight the difficulties of consulting on this SPD when the MWDP is not yet adopted.

“Part 3 on ‘Waste Management in Context’ needs to mention the fact that Cambridgeshire comes within the area identified by Central Government as an area where there will be a step change in growth and that this is planned for in the East of England Plan up to 2021 and beyond. It is not just the popularity of the area that has led to an increase in its population but it has been specifically identified as a growth area where there will be a planned step increase in house building.

“The SPD in considering the practical needs of how to assist a developer in planning for waste management in residential and commercial developments is welcomed by South Cambs. It will assist planners to recognise the need to consider waste within proposed developments. However the emphasis seems to be upon the technical / functional specifications needed for waste facilities at the expense of considering the aesthetic design of such facilities to fit into their surroundings. This should be addressed in the SPD.

“The SPD should highlight to developers that there will be financial implications relating to the provision of waste management infrastructure. These will vary according to the nature and scale of the proposed development and associated supporting infrastructure and will be based on any additional costs likely to be incurred by the local authority arising out of the proposed development.

“The Council is concerned at the lack of information within the Design Guide to justify the request for contributions to household recycling centres. Planning obligations cannot

be used to ask developers to simply provide contributions to extra sites. There are five tests that have to be satisfied to allow obligations to be sought.

1. Relevant to planning;
2. Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;
3. Directly related to the proposed development;
4. Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and
5. Reasonable in all other respects.

“In the MWDP Core Strategy in Policy CS16 it states that ‘...New housing development will contribute to the provision of household recycling centres. Contributions will be consistent with RECAP Waste Guide....’. South Cambs is concerned that the DPD cannot require such contributions from planning obligations and as drafted the SPD does not contain sufficient information about this matter to provide guidance to developers.”

Other Options Considered: None specified

Reason For Decision: To agree the Council’s response to a consultation currently being carried out by the Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

10. MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION

The Portfolio holders for Planning and New Communities **AGREED** the responses to the Minerals and Waste Development Plan consultation as contained within the report to their 2 March 2010 meeting and in Appendices 2, 3 and 4.

Other Options Considered: None specified

Reason For Decision: To agree the Council’s response to a consultation currently being carried out by the Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

11. COMMUNITY CAPITAL GRANTS PROGRAMME 2009/10

The New Communities Portfolio Holder **AGREED** to the following grants being made, requiring a virement of £5,651 from Arts Capital Grants to Community Facility Grants:

Community Facilities Grants

Applicant	Project	Total Cost	Grant Recommended
West Wratting Village Hall Committee	Renovation of the west gable wall	£1,900	£700
Landbeach Village Hall	To extend and refurbish the Village Hall	£273,000	£10,000 (with a further £15,000 to be allocated from 2010/11)
Hinxton Village Hall	Refurbishment of WC’s	£11,993	£3,000
Little Wilbraham PCC	Installation of public toilets	£27,060	£4,000 subject to PC granting a minimum of £2,000 and the PCC making the church available for wider community uses

Cottenham Community Centre	New Community Centre – conversion and renovation of existing Methodist Church	£210,175	£8,000 (Top-up in future if required and subject to funds being available)
Fowlmere PC	Extension of play area	£2,770	£700
Milton Community Centre	Refurbishment of Community Centre	£166,685	£8,500
The George Long Charity, Swavesey	Improvements to Swavesey Memorial Hall	£67,506	£9,500
Whaddon PC	Improvements to the Village Hall	£353,630	Defer until 2010/11

Village Sports Facility Grants

Applicant	Project	Total Cost	Other Income	Grant Recommended
Histon and Impington PC	Improvements to the Recreation Ground	£35,131	PC - £1,396 Community Chest - £500 Applications to WREN £10,000 and Football Foundation £6,485	£15,000
Gamlingay PC	New multi-use changing room and a store as part of the Eco-Hub Project	£32,000	The Parish Council has committed £49,684 towards the whole project and has also applied to the Public Works Loan Board for £500,000. £20,000 has also been requested from the Football Foundation.	£10,000
Thriplow Cricket Club	Installation of two astroturf practice nets for cricket.	£24,575	Club funds - £3,575 Applications to:-	£5,000

			ECB Lord Taverners £3,000, Awards for All Lottery £10,000 and Cambridgeshire Community Foundation £5,000.	
Barton Recreation Improvement Group	New pavilion	£196,000	Own funds - £19,000. Other grants applied for total £145,000.	£30,000
Caldecote PC	New pavilion	£346,414	S106 funding £131,908 Grant applications have been submitted to the ECB, Football Foundation and Donarbon, and funds will be submitted on the transfer of the land.	£33,400 subject to support from the Local Member
Castle Camps PC	New changing-room facility	£111,060	PC - £11,106 Changing Room Cmmtte - £3,000 Application to FF - £20,000	Defer until 2010/11

Arts Capital

Applicant	Project	Total Cost	Other Income	Grant Recommended
Swavesey Village College	New performing arts centre - retractable seating; lighting equipment, sound equipment, film equipment and drapes.	£200,000	£140,000 secured	£27,260
Melbourn Village College	Video kiosk for community consultation (part of the equipment bank)	£6,904	None	£6,904 subject to South Cambridgeshire District Council

				being able to make use of the equipment
Inspire	Digital arts equipment	£5,306	Own funds - £3,184	£2,122

Other Options Considered: None specified

Reason For Decision: None specified

12. PLANNING PORTFOLIO: CARRY FORWARD OF UNCOMMITTED GRANT BALANCES AS AT 31 MARCH 2010

The Planning Portfolio Holder **AGREED** that the following uncommitted grant balances be carried forward into the 2010/11 financial year:

- Heritage Initiatives Grants: £29,061
- Historic Buildings Preservation Fund: £54,622

Options Considered: The decision is simply whether or not to carry forward the balance in each case. The current Medium Term Financial Plan assumes that all uncommitted balances are carried forward until used for grant expenditure. The recommendation is to carry forward the balances. The recommendation follows the wishes of the Conservation and Design Manager, whose plans would be compromised by the loss of funds needed for future grants or possible action to protect key listed buildings at risk. The outstanding balances brought forward could then be reviewed again at any stage in the future.

Reason For Decision: None specified

