

**COUNCILLORS' BULLETIN
12 JANUARY 2005**

CONTENTS



**South
Cambridgeshire
District Council**

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Committee Meetings
2. Lunchtime Seminar: Conservation and Community Projects – Money is Out There (Landfill Tax Credit Scheme)
3. Asian Disaster: Update from the Chief Executive of the National Association of Local Councils (NALC)
4. Letter to the Deputy Prime Minister – 2005/06 Local Authority Financial Settlement
5. Traveller Issues in 2005
6. Northstowe Planning Applications: Update

DECISIONS MADE BY OFFICERS AND REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

1. Arts Development Officer:
 - Middle Eastern Dance (**Grantchester** Village Hall)
 - Cambridgeshire County Council: Young Writers' Poetry Competition
 - Opportunities Without Limits (**Sawston** Village College)
 - Public Arena Theatre Company (**Fulbourn**)
 - The Target Group (**Gamlingay** Parish Council)
2. Conservation Manager: Butterfly Conservation

MINUTES

1. County Council/Cambridge City/South Cambs Strategic Forum – Minutes of 15 December 2004
2. Cambridge East Member Reference Group – Draft Minutes of 17 December 2004
3. Special Meeting of South Cambridgeshire Environment and Transport Area Joint Committee – Letter to all District Council Members and Draft Agenda for 28 January 2005

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FROM:
17 January 2005 to 21 January 2005**

Monday 17 Jan	10 am	Licensing Training	Council Chamber
	10 am	Safety Committee	Swansley Room
	10 am	Development and Conservation Control Committee Chairman's Delegation	Mezzanine
	2 pm	Housing Options Working Group	Swansley Room
Tuesday 18 Jan	9.30	Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder	Finance and Resources Director's Office
	12 pm	Lunchtime Seminar: Conservation & Community Projects – Money is Out There (Landfill Tax Credit Scheme)	Council Chamber
	2 pm	Chairman / Vice-Chairman Training	Swansley Room
Wednesday 19 Jan	2 pm	Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holder	Finance and Resources Director's Office
Thursday 20 Jan	9 am	Special Council: LDF: Core Strategy and Rural Centres Results and Approach - Part 1	Council Chamber
	2 pm	Scrutiny and Overview Committee	Council Chamber
Friday 21 Jan	9.30 am	Special Council: LDF: Core Strategy and Rural Centres Results and Approach - Part 1	Council Chamber

LUNCHTIME SEMINAR: CONSERVATION AND COMMUNITY PROJECTS – MONEY IS OUT THERE

12pm, Tuesday 18 January, Council Chamber

From muck there's brass. Donarbon and WREN explain how funding is available for conservation and community projects through the landfill tax credit scheme.

Speakers: Murray Fishlock, Donarbon and Jon Winslow, WREN

To reserve your seat for this seminar, and to ensure that enough food is ordered, please e-mail reception@scams.gov.uk.

ASIAN DISASTER: UPDATE FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL COUNCILS (NALC)

Members may find the following press release useful when speaking to their Parish Councils about disaster relief.

This Update was issued by John Findlay, Chief Executive

No. CE01-05

Date 04/01/05

The national Chairman, Councillor Ken Cleary, has been in touch with me about the response of our sector to the disaster in Asia.

I am sure that many of you will already have contributed to the relief effort either individually or through other organisations. The National Association has sent messages of condolence and support to the embassies and high commissions of the countries affected. We have also been in touch with the relevant government departments about what role town and parish councils might be able to play in responding to the disaster.

Town and parish councils do not of course have the power to contribute to disaster relief abroad, but they have a key role to play in providing **community support**, both to those returning to the UK and to the families and friends of those who have been killed and of those among the steadily rising numbers of those missing.

Such support will obviously need to be sensitive to the needs of the people concerned and should be developed in conjunction with other concerned organisations such as local churches and schools, local voluntary organisations and charities and the principal authority.

You may wish to pass this message on to member councils. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you need any further clarification.

Annex: The Legal Position

It is unlawful for a council to contribute to a charity operating overseas, or to a fund established to help persons outside the UK. If a council wishes to make a contribution then the Town Mayor's or Chairman's allowance can be used or the council can organise a collection from councillors and / or members of the public.

LETTER TO THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER – 2005/06 LOCAL AUTHORITY FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT

Cabinet on 9 December 2004 asked that a joint letter be sent to the Deputy Prime Minister from the Leader and the Chief Executive making the case for a more advantageous financial settlement. The text of the letter is reproduced below.

7 January 2005

Dear Mr Prescott

2005/06 LOCAL AUTHORITY FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT

The Council's Cabinet has asked us to write to you in order to raise considerable concerns about the proposed local authority financial settlement for 2005/06, the plans for Council Tax capping next year, and the likely impact of both on services for South Cambridgeshire residents.

Proposed Financial Settlement

The £343,000 overall grant increase, in cash terms, for the District Council in 2005/06 would be a step in the right direction. However, it is not enough to meet the additional expenses of extra service requirements (such as the introduction of the new licensing system), inflation and the particular development pressures faced in South Cambridgeshire as part of the 'M11 corridor' growth area.

The Government's stipulation that the district's population should grow by a third by 2016 imposes substantial costs on the Council a number of years in advance of any new council tax income from the additional properties constructed. The Council is especially disappointed that the proposed 2005/06 financial settlement is based on official population statistics that are two years out of date. This is a real problem for those authorities experiencing massive population growth. For example, in the year ending March 2005, an extra 650 new homes will have been built in the district – housing an additional 1,500 residents and service users who have not been taken into account in the financial settlement. This alone request to a £200,000 shortfall in grant. Lord Rooker appeared to recognise these issues when he came to open the Cambridge Horizons office on 26 October 2004. He held out a promise of better recognition of this population growth in the 2005/06 settlement.

The proposed financial settlement also does not seem to recognise that the Council is having to shoulder the burden of the significant extra costs caused by traveller issues at Smithy Fen, Cottenham and elsewhere in the district. As we explained to your Head of Housing Management (Neil McDonald), when he visited on 10 December, this is a local example of a national problem. Additional national funding needs to be made available for those local authorities most affected. Even though the Council has done far more than most local authorities to provide authorised traveller sites and to work closely with the travelling communities, the number of unauthorised traveller plots has increased six-fold in just 2½ years. In 2004/05 the Council has spent around

£200,000 on planning enforcement activities in relation to traveller sites, without yet taking the final sanction of land clearance and removal of caravans. If this did prove necessary, as a last resort, in order to uphold the law and safeguard the interests of local residents and legitimate travellers on authorised sites, this could cost hundreds of thousands of pounds.

The Council has a good record of prudent financial management, with staffing levels well below the average for similar districts, and generally competitive performance indicators and unit costs. Faced with such financial pressures outlined above, we are currently looking to make £500,000 savings the next year's budgets, with a programme of significant service cutbacks and efficiency savings in future years.

Council Tax capping regime

We note the announcement from Mr Raynsford, your Minister of State for Local Government, that the Government "expects to see significantly lower council tax increases next year, with a national average increase of less than 5%", that it is "prepared to take even tougher action in 2005-06", and that "this applies to all authorities".

The Council is alarmed to hear that the Government may be taking a 'blanket' approach to capping, focused on the percentage increase in council tax, without necessarily putting this in the context of the overall amount that the local authority is charging. We have assumed that – as last year – the Government would continue to apply the three tests for capping, including the criterion it would only relate to councils charging above the national average council tax.

In 2004/05, South Cambridgeshire District Council set the fourth lowest tax in the country (£70 for a 'Band D' home). It was only seven years ago that the Council set a zero council tax. We have, historically, used General Fund balances (plus interest accruing) in order to subsidise the amount that local residents have had to pay. Approximately £4.6 million is being drawn from balances in 2004/05 to bridge the gap between the total income from council tax & other sources and the actual cost of providing services. Our underlying council tax (not using balances) is currently running at £155.

The Council has made clear to local residents over recent years that the current levels of subsidy would have to come to an end. We have explained to them that General Fund balances are now close to minimum safe levels, and that there would need to be a significant increase in the District Council's part of the council tax.

We are now making plans to bring our level of council tax more in line with (but slightly below) the national average for district councils next year by contemplating a 'Band D' levy of £140 in 2005/06. This is based on a 7% increase in spending, largely based on inescapable spending commitments. Following a major consultation exercise, which took place last September and attracted 2,500 replies, it is clear that local residents understand the need for a council tax increase. From a choice of options, 60% of respondents said they would support a 'Band D' council tax from the District Council of £140 or more.

Despite the Minister's initial position, we hope that the Government will reconsider its approach to take account of the special circumstances of low spending councils, including those – like South Cambridgeshire – where the method of financing services is migrating from use of reserves to a larger dependence on council tax. The capping of the Council's budgets next year would otherwise have very serious implications for our day-to-day services for local residents. A £20 reduction in our council tax would equate to 8% of our net revenue budget and would require £1.1 million of extra service cuts.

In short, the Council has very little room for manoeuvre and is deeply concerned about the risk of capping being applied in an arbitrary fashion despite the exceptional circumstances. We would urge you to increase your 2005/06 financial settlement and to adopt a more flexible approach to capping.

Yours sincerely,

Daphne Spink, MBE
Leader of the Council

John Ballantyne
Chief Executive

TRAVELLER ISSUES IN 2005

The following statement on Traveller Issues was quoted extensively in the *Cambridge Evening News* last week and is also featured on the Council's website:

In 2005, South Cambridgeshire District Council looks forward to making good progress on three main goals on traveller issues.

- The Council will continue to enforce planning regulations on land use fairly, consistently and firmly. We want everyone to respect the special character of South Cambridgeshire's environment. This applies as much to the travelling communities as it does to every other resident of the district. We will keep on liaising closely with travellers to make sure that they understand what is expected of them, so that they can comply with planning law. In 2005, we await the Deputy Prime Minister's decision on last year's planning inquiry into Pine View, Smithy Fen. The Planning Inspectorate will also be setting a date for another planning inquiry into unauthorised traveller plots at Victoria View, Smithy Fen - although delays in the national planning appeals system mean that there could be a long wait. Whilst we cannot consider taking direct enforcement action on those parts of Smithy Fen until the results of these inquiries are known, the Council has not ruled out the option of land clearance for unauthorised traveller encampments elsewhere in the district.
- The Council will continue to work closely with both the travelling and settled communities. We want to promote greater mutual understanding and respect, and closer community cohesion. As part of this, we are setting up a new forum for representatives of villages and travellers in the northern part of the district. This is a pilot project which, if successful, could also be mirrored elsewhere in South Cambridgeshire. The District Council will keep on liaising with parish councils and other partner organisations (such as the County Council, the Police and the Ormiston Trust). With other public bodies in Cambridgeshire, we have commissioned a survey of travellers' housing needs, as required by the Housing Act 2004: the findings will be reported in the autumn. At the same time as tackling unauthorised development, the Council recognises that there are more travellers in the district who live here legitimately on authorised sites: it is important that their needs are taken into account. South Cambridgeshire District Council has already provided and enabled through planning permission more traveller pitches than any other local authority.
- The Council will continue to lobby the Government to develop a clear national policy on traveller issues. The difficulties and frustrations faced in Cottenham - and other villages faced with illegal encampments - are local examples of a national problem. This has become widely understood both in and around Cambridge, and throughout the country. The District Council will keep on working with MPs, national bodies, the media and other local authorities facing similar problems. Statements by the Prime Minister last month, promising changes in the law, have been a positive step forward. With the likelihood of a General Election in the next 12 months, members of the public have an opportunity to keep traveller issues in the national spotlight. The Leader of the South Cambridgeshire District Council, Mrs Daphne Spink MBE, is encouraging local residents to write to their MPs, government ministers and other political parties in order to focus attention on these important concerns.

In short, South Cambridgeshire District Council is committed to working with others to find a solution to these difficult problems. We share the frustrations and concerns of local residents and legitimate travellers about the twists and turns of the legal process. No single local authority can realistically be expected to resolve the issues alone. Working together, we can achieve so much more.

NORTHSTOWE PLANNING APPLICATIONS: UPDATE

Planning Applications

SCDC will shortly be receiving planning applications from at least one potential applicant.

Gallagher Estates intend to make several planning applications (in duplicate) at the end of January 2005 comprising:

- Outline application for the core area of the New Town.
- Detailed application for the Hattons Road Link and drainage.
- Detailed application for the Hattons Road/A14 junction.

- An additional application will be submitted for the **Dry Drayton** Road link – but not part of the application material to be submitted in January.

Officers will carry out consultations in early February with an extensive number of consultees, including neighbours, Parish Councils, statutory and interested parties, with an extended time for comment of up to 9 weeks. Copies of the application will also be lodged with local libraries, as additional inspection points.

The four local Members, whose ward (**Cottenham** and **Longstanton**) the applications fall within, will receive copies, and an additional copy will be placed in the Members' lounge to enable easy member inspection.

The Fairfield Partnership has previously stated that if Gallagher's make a planning application for a new town, they will follow suit. Officers met with their consultants J B Planning Associates Ltd before Christmas who confirmed that this is still their intention. It is not yet known when they may make any application (s).

Updates will be given in future bulletins.

If there are any queries, please contact Jane Green, Major Developments Manager, 01954 713164 or e-mail jane.green@scams.gov.uk.

DECISIONS MADE BY OFFICERS AND REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

Arts Development Officer

Applicant	Decision and Reasons
Middle Eastern Dance	Agreed to award a £600 Arts Project Grant (AP16) for a series of drumming and dance workshops culminating in an event on 5 and 6 March at Grantchester Village Hall, for over 100 villagers and residents around the district to participate in an evening of Middle Eastern music and dance. The event will promote better understanding between cultures.
Cambridgeshire County Council	Agreed to award a £500 Arts Project Grant (AP17) to promote and deliver a young writers' poetry competition with workshops and a final performance to provide young people from around the district with an opportunity to develop writing and performance skills.
Opportunities Without Limits (OWL)	Agreed to award a £1,000 Arts Project Grant (AP18) for a series of performing arts and disability workshops from January to April 2005

	at Sawston Village College. The sessions will benefit 12 OWL members directly as well as contributing to in service training for staff.
Public Arena Theatre Company	Agreed to award a £1,000 Arts Project Grant (AP19) for a series of one-to-one arts sessions with older people living in very sheltered accommodation in Fulbourn . The project will benefit 15 older people and a wider audience will be reached by an exhibition and film based on the project.
The Target Group (Gamlingay Parish Council)	Agreed to award a £1,000 Arts Project Grant (AP20) for a series of young people's arts workshops towards the design of seating for the Butts play area. The project will involve up to 50 young people. The whole village will benefit from the seating.

Conservation Manager

Applicant	Decision and Reasons
Butterfly Conservation	Agreed to award a £200 grant to Butterfly Conservation, a registered charity saving butterflies, moths and their habitats, for a May 2005 survey of two sites for the Grizzled Skipper butterfly.

CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY/CAMBRIDGE CITY/SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT JOINT STRATEGIC FORUM: NOTES

Date: Wednesday, 15th December 2004

Time: 2.30 – 3.52 p.m.

Place: Council Chamber South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambourne

Present: County Council

Councillors T J Bear, S F Johnstone C Shaw and A Reid
(Substitute for Councillor A Kent)

Officers: K Baldwin, C. Brown,
M Lugg and R Sanderson (Secretary)

Cambridge City Council

Councillors J Bailie, K.Blencowe

Officers: B Human

South Cambridgeshire District Council

Councillors J Batchelor D Bard (Chairman) Dr P Orme and D Spink

Officers: K Miles

Also Present: Cllr R Summerfield South Cambridgeshire District Council
J. Onslow Cambridgeshire Horizons

* Attendance for part of the meeting only

No members of the press and public were in attendance.

Apologies: Councillors A Kent Cambridgeshire County Council S Reid Cambridge City Council

24. NOTES – 20TH OCTOBER 2004

Agreed as a correct record.

25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Johnstone declared a personal interest in the Progress Report on Major Development Areas as a Non Executive Director of Addenbrooke's Hospital.

Councillor Bard declared a personal interest in the Progress Report on Major Development Areas as his wife worked for Addenbrooke's Hospital.

26. WASTE MANAGEMENT PFI CONTRACT

This report briefed Members on progress with the bid for Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Credits for a long-term municipal waste management contract. It also provided information on related sites and land issues.

Since the last report to the Forum in July, a number of significant developments had occurred including:

- Peterborough City Council taking the decision to withdraw from the PFI Project as a result of financial and contract timing issues affecting Peterborough alone;
- Comprehensively re-drafting the Outline Business Case (OBC) as a result of the above, to reflect a revised project scope based within the administrative county of Cambridgeshire; and,

- All five District Council Cabinets (Environment & Transport Committee in East Cambridgeshire) confirming their support in principle for the PFI project and the proposed Partnering Agreement arrangements as described in the July report.
- A thorough re-appraisal of the options and re-evaluation of the financial and waste flow models to exclude Peterborough's waste, and submitting a revised OBC to The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) in mid-November. It was orally reported that DEFRA, though not the final decision making body, had now indicated that £35m PFI credit would be available.

Central to the revised OBC was a Reference Project, a hypothetical technical solution capable of delivering the required outcomes of the project. The principal assumptions were:

- A continued emphasis on high recycling and composting with residual waste being treated in two new Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) facilities;
- Use of the existing In-Vessel and Green Waste Composting infrastructure;
- Providing four new or refurbished Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) in St Neots, Ely and two for Cambridge/South Cambridgeshire);
- The output of the MBT facilities, a refuse derived fuel (RDF), being treated in third party facilities (not necessarily located in the county) at a cost equivalent to landfill; and
- A delivery point (Waste Transfer Station (WTS)) for residual waste being provided in each District.

While the favoured Reference Project represented an increase of approximately one-third in the County Council's budget for waste management from 2007/8 onwards, it was stressed that this remained less than the cost of maintaining the status quo in the face of landfill tax increases and the need to purchase landfill allowances. A decision on the OBC was expected in January or February 2005 with the procurement process to identify the PFI service provider commencing shortly thereafter. The new waste management facilities would be via a competitive procurement and negotiation process and it was expected that the PFI contract would be in place for the financial year 2007/8.

In terms of the request at the previous meeting for a critical path analysis for each of the likely sites, this was not currently possible due to the number of 'unknowns'. However, a number of assumptions had been made in addressing sites and land issues with one or possibly two major facility sites required, either through sites already owned by waste management companies or the County Council. In order to meet landfill diversion targets. These major facilities required to be operational by 2010.

It was noted that the majority of likely major sites were identified in the Waste Local Plan (WLP). However, as these sites could not be assured against the necessary timescale in respect of Cambridge the Northern and Eastern Fringes requirement, other sites were being examined. These would be made available to all bidders in order to create a 'level playing field'. Clarity around the identity of these sites would be needed by the early summer 2005.

It was noted that the future provision of Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) required:

- Replacement of the two existing sites at St Neots and Ely;
- Two new sites to serve Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire – Cambridge Southern Fringe and Northstowe; and, possibly
- A replacement site for Milton HWRC in the Cambridge Northern or Eastern Fringe developments.

In terms of the replacement of the Milton site, it was reported that none of the proposals would allow a site to be operational by mid 2010 and in addition, if either of the proposed Southern Fringe or Northstowe sites could not operational by the summer of 2010, the

effect of Milton closing would be a significant loss of HWRC provision for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire. The preferred contingency was for the Waste Disposal Authority to seek to extend the planning permission at Milton for a further four years to allow the Northern and Eastern Fringe developments to progress to the point where a suitable alternative site could be brought forward.

In terms of planning issues, the County Council intended to prepare a new joint Minerals and Waste Plan with Peterborough City Council under the new planning framework to be adopted by the end of 2007 to cover the period to 2021. While the new plan might provide an opportunity for the inclusion of additional waste sites and policies, for the most part, sites for the PFI project would be determined in accordance with the existing WLP.

Responsibility for determining planning applications rested with the County Council with the immediate priority being to ensure that where waste sites were identified as being required by the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA), that they were also included in the appropriate master plans to facilitate planning applications being brought forward. A Planning Brief prepared with the advice of the WPA would be included with the PFI Invitation to Negotiate, to provide design guidance to bidders to ensure that new facilities developed under the PFI contract met the WPA's requirements.

Comments from the Joint Forum:

- Clarification was requested to confirm that there was currently no intention to extend landfill facilities, and a question was also raised concerning a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF). In response the officers confirmed that the proposal at Milton concerned the HWRC only and did not concern the landfill activity. In respect of the MRF, a recent tendering by two districts had shown that at present, there was sufficient capacity to serve Cambridgeshire from facilities out of the County. A MRF might be desirable, but could not be considered as essential.
- A question was raised regarding whether the output from MBT facilities (refuse derived fuel) was the same as that used at the Barrington cement works, the introduction of which had triggered concern in adjoining villages. In reply, it was indicated that case had involved burning a secondary liquid fuel (waste solvents) which was a different material.
- A question was raised regarding the possible future for the recycling of plastics. In answer, while it was accepted that the public did require such a facility, this was a complicated area and would be determined by whether there was a market for recycled plastics.

It was resolved

- i) To note the progress with the Waste PFI project and
- ii) Support the approach to the provision of major facility sites and HWRC sites as set out in the Officers report.

27. PROGRESS ON MAJOR DEVELOPMENT AREAS FRINGE DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

It was noted that the consultation on Preferred Options for the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework had ended on November 12th and that consultation on the Redeposit Draft of the Cambridge City Local Plan had ended on December 6th. It was reported that it was too early to provide feedback on the consultations received.

Northstowe New Town

The key events timescales were noted as set out in the report.

Details were provided of the cross-authority officer group established to begin negotiations with Gallagher on the S106 contributions for their site (Site A in South Cambridgeshire's

Options consultation with a capacity for 8,000 dwellings) with a planning application expected to be submitted by the end of January. Fairfield Partnership, who were promoting a site that spanned the St Ives railway line, were likely to submit a planning application later in 2005 (September/October).

Work had been commissioned by the County Council from consultants to inform the consideration of transport options for Northstowe, including a more detailed assessment of the implications of the alternative site boundaries included in the South Cambridgeshire Preferred Options Consultation.

Details were provided on the representations received on the three options, currently suggesting that Option A had received more support. However caution was expressed on making any premature conclusions as officers needed to undertake more detailed analysis of the representations received on the Green Separations Option. It was possible that this might alter the final option choice.

It was noted that a report on the results of the public participation exercise would be presented to South Cambridgeshire District Council on 1st February at which time a decision would be made on the site options to be included in the Area Action Plan. The report on the Area Action Plan would be considered at the end of March/April and it was expected that the scheme would be signed off at a full Council meeting in May.

The County Council Portfolio holder for Environment and Waste, who also had an interest as a local member living in an area affected by the proposals, reiterated again the fact that only option A complied with the agreed Structure Plan. While the County Council's formal response indicated that it could accept either Option A or B, Option C was considered completely unacceptable. In addition the Member again highlighted that options B and C would have a greater adverse affect on the surrounding villages and that the line of the railway and the B1050 formed a good natural boundary and that going beyond these, would in time, inevitably result in urban sprawl. While it might be many years in the future this expansion if not checked, would eventually result in the incorporation of Rampton and Willingham into a greater Northstowe.

Southern Fringe

The public consultation on 3 alternative route options between Shelford Road and Addenbrooke's for the access road had ended on 6th December. It was noted that very few respondents had expressed support for Option B, while 32% supported Option A and 48% had expressed support for Option C. In January The County Council would consider at its Cabinet meeting which of the 3 route options should be the preferred route. Following this, an application for planning permission would be submitted (May). As part of the consultations, the Southern Fringe Member Reference Group was due to meet in the following week to consider their preferred option. Their preferred option would be submitted for consideration by Cabinet, who would make the final decision.

It was noted that Trumpington Residents Association had published a document setting out their own views on how the area should be developed in response to Structure Plan proposals. The document took a very positive approach to the development proposals and was considered helpful in indicating local residents' aspirations.

Details were provided of the presentations made by the Trumpington Meadows Land Company on their proposals on land to the west of Trumpington, previously owned by Monsanto. There were concerns raised at these public meetings that the area of development being proposed was larger than originally expected. Other issues were in relation to concerns on the Access Road. There were to be more consultations with residents during February/March.

Joint Forum member comments:

- Clarification was sought on the number of bridges crossing the railway line on Route A (the northern crossing). It was confirmed that it was only intended to have one bridge crossing on this route.
- A question was raised regarding the funding mechanism for the provision of the Southern Access Road. In response, it was indicated that funding would mainly be from GADG and from Section 106 monies, as well as possibly a contribution from the Community Infrastructure Fund.
- Concern was expressed about the impact of the junction of the access road with Shelford Road, which was already congested, particularly at the junction with Hauxton Road/Trumpington High Street. In response officers indicated that the access road would have a separate access onto Hauxton Road, south of development on Glebe Farm.
- One Member suggested that to lessen the impact of severance through the community by a Southern Access Road route, consideration should be given to route A being re-routed so that it was more in line with the Guided Bus route. Another advantage suggested by the Member was that it would flow into the Country Park. Officers undertook to look into the proposal but it was suggested that there were likely to be good reasons why this had not been an option in the first place.
- Another Member reminded the meeting that Route C would impact on the Nine Wells conservation area.
- The Member who had declared a personal interest as a Non Executive Director of Addenbrooke's Hospital reminded the forum that as the routes were linking Addenbrooke's Hospital, it was vital to take account of their views.

It was commented that as there now only five weeks before a decision had to be made, whichever route was chosen, this would not be popular with some residents in the community.

Cambridge Northern Fringe East

There was currently little progress to report.

It was noted that modelling of the transport requirements for Phase 1 of the development (up to 950 dwellings) had been completed and that with improvements to the A10/A14 junctions and Cowley Road/Milton Road junctions over the next 18 months both the housing development and the station with up to a thousand space car park could now be catered for.

An update indicated that Anglian Water (AW) were expected to receive a report to its Board on the feasibility of relocating the sewage treatment works in early January. If the AW Board made a positive decision on relocating, there would need to be further work on identifying a suitable alternative site. One Member suggested that Anglian Water might also look at how proactive local authorities had been in identifying alternative sites, before making any final decision.

It was clarified that South Cambridgeshire District Council had already made clear to AW that they would object to any site proposed between Milton and Waterbeach, but would look positively at site proposals beyond Waterbeach. They were aware that the latter had significant cost implications for Anglian Water. It was noted that any proposals would need to be included in the proposed Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Questions were raised regarding:

- What action would be required to progress alternative housebuilding if Anglian

Water refused to move? Officers indicated that while they would not progress the issue until the position of AW was clear, they would need to look at other areas of the Structure Plan to see what could be moved forward. For the City, this would require looking at changing their Local Plan and having to move earlier to the new Local Development Framework system.

Cambridge East

The review of the Airport relocation site options carried out by Arup on behalf of Marshall had been completed during the summer and presentations had been made to both District and County Members.

Further work was to be led by Cambridgeshire Horizons, who would help to assess the suitability of alternatives for relocation, and who would also clarify the position of the land owners at each of the five sites already considered, all of which posed considerable challenges.

The County has commissioned work to examine the travel and transport implications of the Cambridge East development. The appraisal would look at the implications of the development of the North Works site proceeding at an early stage before the aerospace activities have been relocated, and identify transport infrastructure required to support that initial phase of development (up to 2,000 dwellings)

A member raised concerns that while it was orally reported that two access roads were being considered from Newmarket Road (to High Ditch Road and in a later phase on to the A14) urgent consideration needed to be given to the congestion problems already apparent on this road. Officers undertook to prepare details in a future report on the various development options including the infrastructure requirements.

It was noted that the member reference group was to meet for the first time in mid December. It was also proposed to hold a stakeholder workshop to consider key issues early 2005.

It was resolved:

To receive a report back on the detail for the various development options, including the infrastructure requirements.

NORTH WEST CAMBRIDGE

It was noted that while there had been no formal progress Cambridge University had indicated an intention to hold design workshops in connection with land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road early in the New Year. The South Cambridgeshire Local Development Scheme showed work on an Area Action Plan for North West Cambridge beginning in 2006 and not being completed until 2009. The Cambridge Local Plan allowed for development within the city to begin any time after adoption of the Local Plan in 2006.

A member raised the issue that there needed to be a balance between Greenspace and development and that he had read on a University Website that only 15% of land would be retained as Greenspace. He requested to know what guidance had been provided on what was considered acceptable development and also whether the University could be made to provide better quality greenspace. At the current time in his opinion there was generally nothing more than masses of verges with strips of green grass representing an appalling waste of land. His view was that 50% should be turned into quality green space and that any future permission sought to release land from the Greenbelt, should only be on the basis that some of it would be turned into community open space to be enjoyed by the public.

In respect of concerns raised on the amount of progress in this area, officers responded that as the land was to be taken out of the Green Belt and reserved for the University for long term development, this could be very much further in the future and therefore with limited officer resources, the other Area Action Plans required to take priority. It was confirmed that South Cambridgeshire District Council had been proactive by providing the University with the following guidance:

- The need to retain the Green Belt between Girton/South Cambridge and an expanded City.
- That if the University was considering providing more college buildings these would need to be high quality buildings as they represented the public face of Cambridge that would be seen as people entered the City.

On behalf of the City Council, Brian Human confirmed that there was no question of allowing the University or other developers to put forward unacceptable plans. The Council employed good urban designers and there were positive aspirations for the green spaces in the Southern Fringe.

The Joint Forum noted the report.

28. UPDATE ON AIRPORT RELOCATION

It had been anticipated that there would have been an announcement in time for the meeting on the Marshall consultants' report. Unfortunately by the time of the meeting the Marshall Board had still not allowed the reports' release.

A question was raised regarding how the report would be shared with Members. In response it was indicated that it would be published by Marshalls who would distribute it to the Councils who would then be responsible for sharing it with their Members.

The Chairman made reference to a press release posted on Duxford's website the previous day which indicated that the Trustees of the Museum were anxious to ensure that Duxford retained its character as a museum and continued to develop as a national and regional visitor attraction. Although it noted that no formal announcement had yet been made on Marshall's future, any move of Marshall's facilities to a large site immediately adjacent to the Duxford site and the sharing of the runway would be evaluated in the light of the best interests of the Museum, which is its overriding concern. The statement indicated that Marshall's proposals as reported were considered unacceptable to the trustees of the Museum.

29. DATES AND VENUE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Members noted the future dates for the Forum but agreed that the start times on all the dates should be moved forward from 2.30 p.m. to 2.00 p.m.

Dates 2004/05

Wednesday 2.00 p.m. 30th March 2005
Wednesday 2.00 p.m. 22nd June 2005
Wednesday 2.00 p.m. 14th September 2005
Wednesday 22nd March 2006

Venue

Shire Hall Cambridge
Guildhall City
South Cambs

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Cambridge East Member Reference Group held on
Friday, 17 December 2004

Councillors:	Ms J Bailey	Dr DR Bard
	CC Barker	B Bradnack
	Mrs SJO Doggett	J Durrant
	J Gluza	Mrs CA Hunt
	Ms S Reid	RJ Turner

Councillor Mrs HM Smith was in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J Huppert.

Procedural Items

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

On the proposal of Councillor Mrs CA Hunt, seconded by Councillor Mrs SJO Doggett, and noting the proposal that alternate meetings should be chaired by the executive Members for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, it was

RESOLVED that Councillor Dr DR Bard be elected Chairman for this meeting.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

On the proposal of Councillor Mrs SJO Doggett, seconded by Councillor Ms S Reid, it was

RESOLVED that Councillor Ms J Bailey be elected Vice-Chairman for this meeting.

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The recommended terms of reference were considered, and the Chairman emphasised that the possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace was not part of the remit of this Group.

The non-inclusion of Cambridgeshire Horizons as a formal member of the Group was queried. It was noted that the Joint Strategic Forum had not specified the partnership as a member, but that the Group could extend a formal invitation. After discussion on the proper nature of its membership, the Group

RESOLVED that a representative from Cambridgeshire Horizons be included on the Reference Group as a technical adviser.

The Group further

RESOLVED that the following terms of reference be adopted:

Membership

1. The Group will comprise four Members from each constituent council. The councils will comprise Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District

Council as the local planning authorities who will adopt the Area Action Plans. The County Council will also be represented by four Members by virtue of its role as local highways authority and service provider.

2. The councils may substitute Members as necessary. Each council will appoint one substitute who will be provided with all agendas, reports and minutes.

Chairing

3. Alternate meetings will be chaired by the Executive Members for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Frequency of Meetings

4. Meetings will take place as required and agreed by the membership, subject to the timing of other local authority initiatives and processes that relate to the work of the Group.

Role

5. The Reference Group is not a decision making body, that function will remain with the two local planning authorities; rather its purpose is to provide direction and co-ordinate progress by:
 - Facilitating the exchange of information, ideas and experiences in order to achieve the development of Cambridge East as a modern, vibrant and distinctive new urban quarter for Cambridge
 - Advising on the practical issues associated with the development of Cambridge East
 - Advising the officers of the three local authorities in reporting back to the Joint Strategic Forum and the relevant bodies in Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council
 - Providing links to local communities and advise on public consultation
 - Fostering effective partnerships between the local authorities, individuals and organisations including landowners and developers in order to deliver a successful development.

Technical Steering Group

6. The Reference Group will be supported by the Cambridge East Technical Steering Group which comprises officers of Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, GO-East, Cambridgeshire Horizons and representatives of the Marshall Group of Companies (as the major landowner).

Administration

7. Agenda and Minute management will be undertaken by the Democratic Services Section of South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Freedom of Information

8. This item was discussed separately. *[see Minute 4 below]*.

It was noted that Councillor John Reynolds had now been nominated as the County Council's fourth member of the Reference Group.

4. PUBLIC EXCLUSION FROM MEETINGS

The Group discussed whether meetings should be open to the press and public. A proposal that they should not be open in view of potential sensitivities was defeated and, in consequence, it was

AGREED that meetings of the Reference Group be open to the public, except where confidential or exempt information, within the meaning of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, may be revealed.

It was further

AGREED that reports to and draft minutes of meetings be made available to the public at the earliest opportunity.

Operational Items

5. PREPARATION OF THE CAMBRIDGE EAST AREA ACTION PLAN (AAP)

The Group **NOTED** the work so far towards the preparation of a draft Cambridge East Area Action Plan, including the main issues arising from consultations.

Some reservations were expressed about the likelihood of the development of the site being deliverable, particularly financially and in terms of sustainable transport. The latter would depend on the outcome of the transport study, but the Chairman noted that the Structure Plan allocated the site for development.

The need for County officers with transport expertise to attend Reference Group meetings was emphasised.

6. STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

AGREED

- (a) that a stakeholder workshop be held to support the preparation of the CEAAP, provisionally on the 29th January 2005;
- (b) that the list of stakeholders to be invited be circulated to the members of the Reference Group for comment as a matter of urgency;
- (c) that an outline of the workshop and proposed follow-up action be circulated to the Reference Group in advance of the workshop

7. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

AGREED 21st February 2005 at 2.00 p.m.

The proposed further date of 5th April 2005 would cause some problems and it was

AGREED that other dates in early April be investigated, possibly hosted by Cambridge City.

The Meeting ended at 3.12 p.m.

Date: 12th January 2005
Please ask for: Mrs Michelle Rowe
Direct Dial No: Cambridge (01223) 717293
Fax: Cambridge (01223) 717561
Email: michelle.rowe@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Resources Directorate
Legal & Democratic Services Division
Mailbox No 1102
Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge CB3 0AP

To: County Councillors representing
South Cambridgeshire Electoral Divisions
All South Cambridgeshire District Councillors
Parish Clerks for Boxworth, Conington, Cottenham, Dry Drayton, Elsworth, Fen Drayton,
Fowlmere, Girton, Histon, Impington, Knapwell, Longstanton, Madingley, Oakington, Over,
Rampton, Swavesey and Willingham

Dear Councillor

SPECIAL MEETING of South Cambridgeshire Environment & Transport Area Joint Committee –
28th January 2005

I am writing to give you advance notice of the item, listed on the draft agenda attached, which is likely to be considered at the next meeting of the South Cambridgeshire Environment and Transport Area Joint Committee at 2.30p.m. on Friday, 28th January 2005 in the Council Chamber, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne. Local Members are welcome to attend and speak on matters concerning their electoral division/ward/parish. (Clerks to Parish Councils please note that the agenda will be available on the County Council's Internet at www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk from Thursday 20 January).

If you wish to discuss any item in detail before the meeting, could you please contact the appropriate officer as indicated.

Please note that the agenda is not final and there may be changes before it is despatched on 19 January.

Yours sincerely

Senior Democratic Services Officer

**SPECIAL MEETING OF SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE
ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT AREA JOINT COMMITTEE**

**Friday, 28th January 2005
2.30 p.m.**

**Council Chamber, South Cambridgeshire Hall,
Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne**

Resources Directorate
Director: Mike Parsons
Shire Hall, Castle Hill,
Cambridge, CB3 0AP

Draft Agenda

1. A14 Village Traffic Calming Project – Progress Report

David Brace
01480-375663
david.brace@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

Members of the Committee:

County Councillors: T J Bear, J E Coston, P D Gooden, S F Johnstone and J E Reynolds

**District Councillors: D Bard, J D Batchelor, S G M Kindersley, D S K Spink and R
Summerfield**

CALC Councillors: G Everson, M Farrar, J McGregor & M Williamson

The Councils are committed to open government and the public are welcome to attend this meeting. For more information about this meeting, including access arrangements and facilities for people with disabilities, please contact Michelle Rowe at the County Council's Democratic Services Division on Cambridge (01223) 717293 or by email at michelle.rowe@cambridgeshire.gov.uk.