

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

**REPORT TO:** Council  
**AUTHOR:** Director of Development Services

11th February 2005.

### **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE AREA ACTION PLAN: RESULTS OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON PREFERRED OPTIONS AND DIRECTION OF WAY FORWARD**

#### **Purpose**

1. To advise Members of the results of the public participation on the Preferred Options Report for the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan, to identify the key issues raised and determine the general approach to be taken in drafting the document to be submitted to the Secretary of State. Members are reminded to bring to the meeting the Preferred Options Report for the Cambridge Southern Fringe, published in October 2004.

#### **Effect on Corporate Objectives**

2.	High quality, accessible, value for money services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assist the Council's objectives to deliver quality accessible development in the district</li><li>• Include the provision of affordable housing and the effective delivery of sustainable development and the development of sustainable communities</li><li>• Assist the delivery of the Community Strategy</li><li>• Be used by Cambridgeshire Horizons (formerly the Infrastructure Partnership) to help the early and sustained development of the necessary services and infrastructure.</li></ul>
	Quality village life	
	A sustainable future	
	A better future through Partnerships	

#### **Background**

3. The Council published the Preferred Options Report on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2004. Public participation on the matters raised took place over a six-week period ending on 12<sup>th</sup> November.
4. Council met on 20<sup>th</sup>/21<sup>st</sup> January to determine the direction to be taken on the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Documents and on 1<sup>st</sup> February for the Northstowe AAP.
5. Public participation involved a number of exhibitions, public meetings, an inter-active website, a special edition of South Cambs magazine delivered to all households in the District, and copies of the reports being made available at the Council's offices and at public libraries and local access points. Copies of the Reports were sent to key organisations such as statutory bodies including Parish Councils.
6. For the Cambridge Southern Fringe, exhibitions were held at Great and Little Shelford Primary School (on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> October). A public meeting was held following the exhibition on 4<sup>th</sup> October. Around 60 people attended the exhibitions and about 20 people attended the public meeting.

7. The participation process has resulted in a total 239 representations being made on the Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP Preferred Options Report. Members should be aware that these may have been increased as in some cases the representations covered more than one point in which case they have been split to allow consideration to be given to each point.

### **Considerations**

8. This meeting of the Council will consider the results of public participation and determine the direction the Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP should take having considered the responses to the options. Account will need to be taken of the decisions reached by Council on the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPDs on 20<sup>th</sup>/21<sup>st</sup> January. The approach for the AAP will be as set out in the Preferred Options Report when changed as a result of recommendations in this report (with Appendices) or other decisions of Council.
9. The meeting of Council on 8<sup>th</sup> April will determine the policy content of the draft Area Action Plan. A final meeting of Council on 9<sup>th</sup> May is programmed to deal with any amendments to any of the DPDs which need to be considered as a result of any of the previous meetings (20<sup>th</sup> May has also been reserved as a fall-back position if required).
10. The AAP can only cover the relevant area in South Cambridgeshire but has to have regard to the proposals and policies of the Cambridge Local Plan which is scheduled for public inquiry for July 2005. That Local Plan identifies areas to the east and south-east and west (i.e. Monsanto) of Trumpington and to the south and west of Addenbrooke's Hospital for major growth as urban extensions to Cambridge.
11. In South Cambridgeshire, the AAP needs to identify:
  - a. The extent of any land for housing development on the Monsanto land to the west of Trumpington
  - b. Revised Green Belt boundaries
  - c. Proposals for enhanced landscaping and public access to the wider countryside
  - d. How an individual identity for the area can be created.

### **Options**

12. In the Preferred Options reports options were presented as:
  - A *preferred approach* where it was considered that there were no appropriate alternative options
  - A *preferred option* where it was considered that alternatives were available other than that favoured by the Council
  - An *alternative option* where it was considered that there was a genuine choice to be made although the Council had indicated its preference
  - A *rejected option* where it was considered that there should be open debate about an option often put forward by other parties
  - A *series of options* where there was no preference expressed by the Council and there was a genuine choice to be made.
13. Council is now requested to consider the options which were the subject of participation and indicate, in the light of responses and any material considerations

since the publication of the Preferred Options but also taking into account the views of the independent consultants who undertook the SEA/SA, whether particular options and approaches set out in the AAP Preferred Options report should be confirmed, whether they need any amendment or refinement, or whether there should be a change in direction. This will enable officers to draft the AAP which will come before Council on 8<sup>th</sup> April.

### **The Main Issues to be resolved**

14. This section of the report highlights the *main* issues which arose during the participation process. Attached is Appendix 1, the detailed schedule which sets out a summary of each representation or group of like representations and an officer response with an action as appropriate. Members will need to consider the details set out in the Appendix, noting that the main issues drawn out in this covering report are those which *officers* consider the key ones, either because of the volume of representations or because there is a significant change in direction which your officers wish to draw to your attention. At the end of each issue, a recommendation is made on the way forward, ie to confirm a Preferred Approach, to decide an appropriate option from those suggested, with any amendments necessary, or to decide on a different approach. Council is asked to determine the appropriate action for both the main issues set out in this report and the individual actions in respect of each representation in the schedules in Appendix 1. Also attached is Appendix 2 which is the index of those making representations.
15. The key strategic issues arising as a result of participation are considered to be:
  - The extent and nature of the development to take place on the Monsanto site
  - Drainage
  - Development of a landscape strategy
  - Green corridors at Monsanto
  - Impact of roads on the landscape
  - The management of open spaces
  - Countryside recreation

### *Vision and Objectives*

16. In response to the Vision for the Cambridge Southern Fringe, whilst there is considerable support, there is a representation suggesting that the Area Action Plan should not include any landscape and recreation proposals in the countryside outside the major developments. It is recommended that this is not accepted. Planning Policy Statement 12 "Creating Local Development Frameworks" states that Area Action Plans are relevant in a wide range of circumstances including: "*Areas that are particularly sensitive to change or development, such as areas of significant nature or cultural heritage value. Plans for such areas would establish the conservation and enhancement objectives and how these might be reconciled with sensitive development*". The Cambridgeshire Structure Plan includes at policies P4/2 and P9/2c a specific link between major developments adjoining the countryside including proposals for informal leisure and recreation, including country parks and routes for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Administrative boundaries should not confine this approach. The Green Belt on this southern side of the city is particularly important as it provides open views across the whole of Cambridge from vantage points such as Wandlebury and the Magog Down. The developments will have a major impact on this area, these impacts will need to be mitigated in South Cambridgeshire if the removal of the land from the green belt for their development is to meet the objectives

of enhancing the character and setting of Cambridge. Improved access to the countryside will be important for the increased resident population.

#### *Monsanto Site*

17. Monsanto has closed its plant research facility at Trumpington and has offered its site as previously developed land for redevelopment to help meet the housing and other development needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region. Most of the complex of Monsanto's buildings at Trumpington lie within Cambridge and outside the green belt. The southern part of the building complex and most of the open land south as far as Hauxton Mill lies within South Cambridgeshire. In addition to redeveloping its complex at Trumpington, Monsanto is seeking some development in the green belt for which it is proposing compensatory public access and landscape improvements on the remainder of its land holding.
18. The objective of creating a new high quality urban edge of Cambridge which provided a socially balanced community with a mix of house types, sizes and tenures was generally supported as is the objective to integrate landscaped fingers of countryside into the development.
19. The Preferred Options Report explored three approaches to development at Trumpington West:
  - a. Option 1 – the redevelopment of the previously developed land and a margin of greenfield land (and green belt) land as far eastwards as a north/south concrete drive and as far south as a new access road from the Hauxton Road just south of the present Park and Ride site. This option received 3 representations of support and 8 objections only 2 of which opposed development.
  - b. Option 2 – Only land within South Cambridgeshire which is not currently within the green belt would be developed. This would mean that only a very small area of previously developed land within South Cambridgeshire built on. This option received 4 representations of support and 5 objections. The support for this objection is based on leaving green belt boundaries as they currently exist. The objections are principally based on the objective to secure the creation of a better edge to Cambridge on this southern approach by place some screening development south of the Park & Ride site.
  - c. Option 3 – This is an option being promoted by the development company that has acquired the Monsanto land holding which is a variation on Option 1 which takes development substantially closer to the River Cam, but no further south along Hauxton Road.. The Council's rejection of this option was generally support.
20. Overall there has been little public comment on development at Trumpington West. Public consultation has raised any significant new issues. The greatest support is for the Council's preferred approach – Option 1. As part of the public consultation, the development company which has taken an interest in the development at Monsanto has asked the Council to consider a modified proposal which would now differ from the Council's preferred approach only marginally. This development company has undertaken a detailed topographical survey and as a result amended their proposal such that the extent of development on the riverside frontage would be drawn back from the river and follow the break in slope for the whole of this eastern edge. This is less clear cut a boundary than the concrete road but is such a marginal change that it can be supported if it can guarantee the creation of an high quality new urban edge together with landscape, habitat and access improvements to the countryside

between the Hauxton Road/A10 and the River Cam as far south as Hauxton Mill. It will however be crucial to include quite detailed policies covering the treatment of these new urban edges, particularly the edge facing the river which will be viewed at the top of a slope, here a relatively low key approach with development no higher than 2 storeys would be most compatible with the minimising impacts on the river corridor. The southern frontage facing the M11 might be more appropriate for 'landmark' treatment on the Hauxton Road approaches to Cambridge and slightly higher buildings (3 or 4 storey) would better screen the warehouse buildings which will be retained north of the Park & Ride site and more in keeping with the height of buildings on the eastern side of Hauxton Road (see Map 1).

#### *Drainage*

21. The principle issues raised by the representations concern the drainage of the development land in Cambridge City at Addenbrookes and Clay Farm/Royal Showground, including the drainage of the Addenbrookes Link Road. Provision is likely to be needed for surface water attenuation ponds in South Cambridgeshire for the Link Road which will run close to the District boundary. It will be important that this and any other water features are designed in such a way as to promote wildlife and public access. At Monsanto where most land is likely to drain into South Cambridgeshire, there is general support for creating a 'sustainable drainage system' which will rely upon natural drainage features which can be assimilated into the landscape.

#### *Separation of Communities and Landscape Strategy*

22. Objections from the developers of land in Cambridge City at Addenbrookes and Clay Farm/Royal Showground that they should not contribute to landscape, habitat and access improvements in the countryside in South Cambridgeshire which would adjoin their developments. Countryside access, habitat and landscape improvements will mitigate the impacts of these developments on the surrounding countryside as well as provide valuable amenities for the surrounding area. The Structure Plan requires major development such as these to provide such improvements to the countryside and it is a key plank of the Government's Sustainable Communities Plan. There is support for these proposals, particularly from a number of local trusts who have expressed an interest in being involved in implementation and long term management.

#### *'Green Corridors' within the Monsanto development*

23. A bit of a mixed bag of representations which generally support the approach of taking 'green fingers' of countryside into the development at Trumpington West,

#### *Roads and Landscape*

24. Overall support for the requirement for high quality landscaping of road proposals, particularly the Addenbrookes Link Road. A number of detailed objections concerning such matters as the Monsanto development not compromising the provision of the Addenbrookes Link Road and the developments that it will serve, and the implications of road building on 'green corridors' within the City.

#### *Maintenance and management of landscape and open spaces.*

25. Objections to the requirement to agree a maintenance and management strategy before planning permission is granted. This can be a 'grampian' condition on any

planning permission which the City Council in particular would need to apply to the developments at Addenbrookes and Clay Farm/Royal Showground without which the objectives for securing landscape, habitat and access improvements as a result of and to serve the developments will not be secured. A number of local Trusts have expressed interest in being a party to such agreements.

#### *Spoil and recycling redundant buildings*

26. Like all of the major developments, a considerable amount of spoil will be accumulated as a result of development, including development of the Addenbrookes Link Road. The representations do not raise any substantial issues and taking a sustainable approach to managing spoil on site can be supported with the caveat that it will need to be managed carefully on these southern approaches to Cambridge which are such an important part of the setting of the City.

#### *Recreation*

27. Overall there is support for applying a single open space standard to the developments which cross the District boundary and that the City standard should apply as the vast majority of the development within the Cambridge Southern Fringe will be in Cambridge. The representations do not however provide much steer on the location of sports pitches and building and floodlit areas where they will minimise impacts of the countryside and there is no reason to depart from the preferred approaches.

#### *Countryside Recreation*

28. Significant support for the development of a strategy for creating a network of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways throughout the Cambridge Southern Fringe.

#### *Biodiversity*

29. The representations overall (objection and support) are seeking to ensure that the existing biodiversity of the Cambridge Southern Fringe is enhanced as a result of development and the accompanying countryside improvements. In particular, the representations seek the encouragement of species which are native to (a) the chalkland approaches to Wandlebury and (b) the River Cam valley. The option of funding Project Officer is also generally supported although it is possible that such a Project Officer could be shared between a number of major developments.

#### *Archaeology and heritage*

30. Very few representations, but the approach on the Preferred Options Report is supported.

#### *Energy*

31. The Preferred Approach is to apply the Core Strategy approach to energy provision and conservation at all major developments (new development should provide at least 10% of their energy requirements from renewable sources and a further 10% energy saving through energy conservation measures). Objections focus on having the same approach to City and South Cambridgeshire (already agreed) and that the Council is either being too cautious or too ambitious.

#### *Noise*

32. Support for mitigating noise including through tree planting, but question for a different approach from that applying to all development as set out in the Core Strategy.

#### *Implementation and Delivery*

33. A corner stone of the policies for the Cambridge Southern Fringe are the landscape, habitat and access improvements required by Structure Plan policy P4/2 and P9/2c as a result of major development on the edge of Cambridge. This will require developer contributions from developments in South Cambridgeshire as well as within Cambridge City. Overall there is support for this approach. The notable objection comes from Addenbrookes Hospital which presently has the greatest adverse impact on the surrounding countryside of any development on the edge of Cambridge and demonstrates the clear need for countryside landscaping to mitigate the impact of such large scale development on this sensitive part of the setting of Cambridge.

#### **Financial Implications**

34. The cost of progressing the LDF including the AAP is set out in the Council's budget.

#### **Legal Implications**

35. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 imposes a statutory duty to prepare a Local Development Framework and to keep it up to date. An AAP for the Southern Fringe will enable land for housing development to come forward on part of the Monsanto land and safeguard South Cambridgeshire's interests in terms of Green Belt, landscape, countryside access and maintaining separation for villages.

#### **Staffing Implications**

36. The programme for the LDF has been compiled having regard to the staffing resources that the Council can commit to planning policy preparation in the context of wider pressures for the early delivery of the development strategy set out in the Structure Plan.

#### **Risk Management Implications**

37. It is important for the District Council, as the plan-making authority, to be able to ensure that development takes place consistent with its policies. If the AAP is not in place at an early stage there is the risk of the development being determined by the development control and appeal process and without adequate reference to those matters of key interest to the District Council.

#### **Consultations**

38. The Preferred Options Report has been the subject of extensive public participation. Before the public participation on Preferred Options, a dialogue was established with key stakeholders, which included a workshop in October 2003 which explored some of the guiding principles for the development of the Southern Fringe in both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire.

#### **Conclusions/Summary**

39. The public participation exercise has been effective at involving local communities, individuals and organisations and has given them an early opportunity to determine the direction the AAP should take. Agreeing the approach to be taken in developing policies should enable the Council to meet its objective of submitting the AAP to the Secretary of State in the summer of this year.

### **Recommendations**

40. Council is recommended to agree the recommendations set out in this report and the Appendix as the basis for developing the policies to be set out in the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan. Council would receive this draft AAP at the special meeting arranged for 8<sup>th</sup> April.
41. It is also recommended that any minor editing changes necessary to the responses as set out in Appendix 1 be delegated to the Development Services Director, with any which involve a material change being delegated to the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder.

**Background Papers:** the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

Core Strategy Preferred Options Report, SCDC, October 2004

Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan, Preferred Options Report, SCDC, October 2004.

Representations received in response to the above documents.

Agenda and Minutes of the meeting of the Council, 20<sup>th</sup>/21<sup>st</sup> January 2005.

**Contact Officer:** Keith Miles – Planning Policy Manager  
Telephone: (01954) 713181