

## **South Cambridgeshire District Council**

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on  
Thursday, 24 November 2022 at 2.00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Councillor Anna Bradnam – Chair  
Councillor Peter Fane – Vice-Chair

**Councillors:** Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Paul Bearpark, Tom Bygott, Ariel Cahn, Dr. Martin Cahn, Graham Cone, Stephen Drew, Libby Earle, Sue Ellington, Corinne Garvie, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Sally Ann Hart, Geoff Harvey, James Hobro, Carla Hofman, Mark Howell, Helene Leeming, Daniel Lentell, Dr John Loveluck, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Annika Osborne, Dr Lisa Redrup, Judith Rippeth, Peter Sandford, Bridget Smith, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, Natalie Warren-Green, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams, John Williams and Dr. Richard Williams

Councillors Cllr Michael Atkins, Cllr Dr Shrobona Bhattacharya, Cllr Sunita Hansraj, Cllr William Jackson-Wood and Cllr Lina Nieto were in attendance remotely.

<b>Officers:</b>	Rebecca Dobson	Democratic Services Manager
	Kirstin Donaldson	Service Manager - Acquisitions and Development
	Rory McKenna	Monitoring Officer
	Peter Maddock	Head of Finance
	Liz Watts	Chief Executive

### **1. Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Dr Tumi Hawkins, Pippa Heylings, Richard Stobart and Dr Susan van de Ven.

### **2. Declaration of Interest**

Councillor Helene Leeming declared an interest in agenda item 11, Making of Gamlingay Neighbourhood Plan, as an employee of the Wildlife Trust. Councillor Leeming left the Council Chamber whilst this item was discussed and did not vote.

Councillor Bridget Smith declared an interest in agenda item 11, Making of Gamlingay Neighbourhood Plan, as a former employee of Gamlingay Parish Council. Councillor Smith left the Council Chamber whilst this item was discussed and did not vote.

Councillor Mark Howell declared an interest in agenda item 6, Questions From the Public, as a question had been received from Cambourne Town Council and he was the County Councillor for Cambourne.

Councillors Paul Bearpark, Annika Osborne and Heather Williams all declared

interests in agenda item 15 Great Cambridge Partnership, as members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly. Councillor Brian Milnes declared an interest in the same item as a member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board.

### **3. Register of Interests**

Members were reminded to inform Democratic Services of any changes in their Register of Members' Financial and Other Interests form.

### **4. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2022 were agreed as a correct record, subject to the inclusion of the words "Member of the public" to the beginning of the second paragraph of minute 6.

### **5. Announcements**

The Chair reported that Councillor Peter McDonald had won the LGIU 2022 Cllr Award for Resilience and Recovery, which was testament to the Council's commitment to support local businesses in difficult times.

The Leader welcomed Councillor Tom Bygott and Councillor Natalie Warren-Green, who had been elected in the by-elections held earlier that month.

The Leader was pleased to announce that Mayor Nik Johnson was out of hospital and was recovering at home.

The Leader reported that the Council was working with Cambridgeshire ACRE and Cambourne Town Council to set up a warm hub in Cambourne where residents would be able to enjoy a safe, warm and friendly environment for free.

The Leader explained that Councillor Judith Rippeth had stood down as Deputy Leader, a role that was now being fulfilled by Councillor Brian Milnes. Councillor Henry Batchelor had joined the Cabinet as the Lead Member for Environment, Waste and Licensing.

### **6. Questions From the Public**

The Chair announced that as a public question had been received from Gamlingay Parish Council, agenda item 11, Making of Gamlingay Neighbourhood Plan, would be discussed after this agenda item.

Councillor David Jones from Cambourne Town Council expressed disappointment in a recent presentation by the South Cambridgeshire Investment Partnership (SCIP) on the proposed development of 260 homes on land at Cambourne Business Park where it had been made clear that SCIP were not proposing to provide a road connection between the Business Park and West Cambourne as part of their development. Councillor Jones asserted that road access was critical to integrate West Cambourne with the wider town and this

had been understood when the District Council determined MCA's outline planning application for West Cambourne, as the planning permission and subsequently approved Design Code secured the delivery of a spine road up to the boundary of the Business Park. The development of West Cambourne was only found to be acceptable on the basis that the opportunity would exist to secure an access with any future application for the land at the Business Park. The provision of this link road was also critical to provide safe access for around 2,000 children attending Cambourne Village College and Hardwick and Cambourne Primary Schools. The land required to deliver the link road was wholly within the control of the District Council but there was a cost attached to the works. Councillor Jones then asked the following question:

"Can Councillor Smith therefore please explain to the people of Cambourne why the integration of their town and the safety of around 2,000 of their children is now considered secondary to the wish of the Council to profit from its chosen role as a developer of 260 additional houses on a green space in the centre of our town?"

The Leader stated that the current proposals by SCIP sought to deliver cycle, pedestrian and bus access between the Business Park and Cambourne West. She explained that Policy SS/8 identified the need to address a number of access issues. This included "...vehicular access between the Business Park and Cambourne West" (Paragraph 12 (g)) and "bus prioritisation measures...including a bus link ... linking through to Great Cambourne by the Cambourne Business Park" (Paragraph 12 (h)).

The Leader explained that according to the current evidence, the traffic impact generated by the development of the SCIP did not require access for private vehicles to be available from Cambourne West. It was important to note that the Business Park site access road had not been adopted and opening up this link so that it formed one of three primary access points into Cambourne West would require physical works to rebuild and upgrade parts of the road. The transport effects of the development proposed by the SCIP does not require such an upgrade. The current proposals would enable the realisation of bus prioritisation measures listed in SS/8 without the need to upgrade the existing road. The cost of improving the road through the SCIP proposals would therefore need to be considered against the consequences for other infrastructure requirements set out for development of this type, such as the provision of high quality greenspaces, buildings with appropriate environmental performance and the need for infrastructure contributions towards education, community and health infrastructure. The Council's local plan policy also required the development to deliver affordable housing at levels up to 40%. The Council was committed to shifting away from private car use to more sustainable forms of transport and whilst it will be a matter for the SCIP whether they wish to argue for delivery of such a link to be prioritised over other infrastructure contributions, given that the development was unlikely to be able to fund all the policy objectives of the plan, the prioritisation of the respective policy objectives identified in the question and those other policy objectives across the Local Plan, will ultimately be a matter for the Planning Committee to balance in due course.

As a supplementary question, Councillor David Jones asked the Leader to confirm if the discount in the cost of the site allowed the link road to West Cambourne will SCIP show the level of profit from the site? The Leader explained that a written answer would be provided to this question and it would be included in the minutes.

Councillor Sam Martin, Chair of Gamlingay Parish Council, explained that the Gamlingay Neighbourhood Plan was the culmination of seven years' work and involved various the engagement of various stakeholders. Councillor Martin thanked Councillor officers and councillors for their support and asked whether Gamlingay Parish Council could offer some training to the area planning officers and councillors on the main characteristics and aspects of the plan.

Councillor Brian Milnes congratulated Gamlingay Parish Council on their Neighbourhood Plan and stated that the Council would welcome an opportunity for the Parish Council to provide a briefing on the ambitions of the Plan to local Members and the officers of the West Area planning team.

## **7. Petitions**

It was noted that no petitions had been received since the last Council meeting.

## **8. To Consider the Following Recommendation:**

### **8 (a) 2021/22 Provisional General Fund Revenue and Capital Outturn (Cabinet, 14 November 2022)**

Councillor John Williams introduced this report on the General Fund Revenue and Capital outturn position for the financial year 2021/22 with Reserve balances as at 31 March 2022, which proposed changes to the Capital Programme. He stated that the actual outturn for the General Fund was close to the predicted revised budget. The actual figures for the Capital Budget were different from the predicted budget as a number of projects had been delayed and so moved into the budget for 2022/23. He reminded Council that the report provided details of last year's accounts.

Councillor John Batchelor was pleased with the accuracy of the General Fund budget and hoped that this would be sustained for the 2022/23 budget.

The Chair asked why the funding allocation for the Vitrum Building had been £10,000 but the actual cost had been £118,000. Councillor John Williams promised a written answer to this question.

Councillor Heather Williams asked a number of questions that the Head of Finance then answered.

### **Overspend in the Planning service**

The Head of Finance explained that the overspend in the Planning service had been due to the hiring of agency staff as the Council had been unable to recruit

permanent staff.

### **Tenants on 270 Cambridge Science Park**

The Head of Finance explained that the Council had two tenants in place at 270 Cambridge Science Park and councillors could expect to be updated regarding current negotiations with a prospective tenant.

### **Air Quality Monitoring Equipment project**

The Head of Finance explained that the table on page 29 of the report should be amended as the Air Quality Monitoring Equipment project had not been completed on budget. £1,000 had been allocated but the project had not been completed.

### **Allocation of councillors' laptops**

The Head of Finance stated he believed that the laptops for councillors had been allocated in April 2022 and so did not appear in the 2021/22 accounts.

### **Delays to the greening of South Cambs Hall project**

The Head of Finance explained that delays to the greening of South Cambs Hall project had been due to the contractor, who had agreed to pay the costs of the delay.

### **Funding of the Investment Strategy**

The Head of Finance explained that the £450,000 allocated to the Investment Strategy had been carried forward to the 2022/23 accounts, as the project had not been completed.

### **Written answers to unanswered questions**

Councillor John Williams promised written answers to the following questions from Councillor Heather Williams:

- When would the parish maintained street lights project be completed?
- When would the Aerial Photography Refresh project be completed? Or would it be cancelled?
- Who was the officer responsible for commercial investments now that the Head of Economic Development and Commercial Investments officer had left?

Councillor John Williams proposed and Councillor John Batchelor seconded the recommendations in the report. A vote was taken and

Council unanimously

### **Agreed to**

- A)** Acknowledge the 2021/22 general fund revenue outturn position as summarised in Appendix A, the operational underspend of £0.490 million, and the shortfall after income from Taxation and Government Grants in the year of £0.747 million, and the explanations provided for the variances compared to the revised 2021/22 revenue budget;

- B)** Acknowledge the consequent increase in the General Fund as at 31 March 2022 of £2.955m to around £14.7m;
- C)** In relation to the Capital Programme:
  - (i)** Note the 2021/22 capital outturn of £32,420 million;
  - (ii)** Acknowledge the performance achieved in relation to the Capital Programme schemes substantially completed in 2021/2022, summarised in Appendix B.
  - (iii)** Approve the carry forwards of £3.344 million in relation to General Fund capital projects due mainly to slippage.

#### **9. Returning Officer's report of Councillors Elected**

The Chief Executive congratulated Councillor Tom Bygott and Councillor Natalie Warren-Green on their election for the ward of Longstanton.

Council **noted** the report.

#### **10. Political Proportionality**

The Democratic Services Manager presented this report, which sought the Council's approval of the review of political proportionality for the authority following a change of political group membership arising from the by election for the Longstanton ward. It was noted that the amendments had the support of both Group leaders.

The Chair proposed and the Vice-Chair seconded the recommendations in the report. A vote was taken and Council unanimously

#### **Agreed to**

- A)** Approve the allocation of seats on committees as set out at Table 2 in Appendix A; and
- B)** Note the nominations of the Political Group leaders to seats on the Audit and Corporate Governance Committee and Licensing Committee as set out in Appendix B.

#### **11. Making of Gamlingay Neighbourhood Plan**

This item was discussed after item 6, public questions.

Councillor Brian Milnes expressed his admiration for everyone involved in the production of the Gamlingay Neighbourhood Plan, which had taken seven years to develop. A referendum had been held on 10 November and 76.77% of those who had voted had supported it. If agreed, the Neighbourhood Plan would form part of the Local Development Plan.

Councillor Henry Batchelor supported the adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan. He explained that two of the parishes in his ward had produced Neighbourhood Plans and so he knew the work involved. He also acknowledged the benefit of Neighbourhood Plans to the Planning Committee when considering planning applications.

Councillor Heather Williams congratulated those involved in the production of Gamlingay's Neighbourhood Plan and welcomed the positive impact the Plan would have on Gamlingay and the surrounding area.

Councillor Brian Milnes proposed and Councillor Henry Batchelor seconded the recommendations in the report. A vote was taken and Council unanimously

**Agreed to**

- A) Note that the referendum for the Gamlingay Neighbourhood Plan took place on November 2022.
- B) 'Make' (adopt) the Gamlingay Neighbourhood Plan as it was a successful referendum. The made version of the plan is Appendix 1 of this report.

**12. Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel - Members' Allowances Scheme 2022/23**

The Head of Finance presented this report on the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel in respect of the Scheme of Members' Allowances 2022/23.

The Leader suggested that there should have been more engagement of councillors on this issue and recommended that more information was required for Council to make a decision on the Scheme of Members' Allowances for 2022/23. Councillor Brian Milnes agreed that additional work was required.

Councillor Heather Williams suggested that in the current economic climate Council should vote to reject the recommendations made by the Panel to increase allowances for 2022/23. Councillor Daniel Lentell agreed that it would be inappropriate for Council to agree an increase in Members' allowances at this time.

The Leader proposed that more information be sought from the Panel and extra work be carried out if necessary. Councillor Brian Milnes seconded this proposal.

A vote was taken and were cast as follows:

**In favour (27):**

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Paul Bearpark, Anna Bradnam, Ariel Cahn, Dr Martin Cahn, Stephen Drew, Libby Earle, Peter Fane, Corinne Garvie, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Sally Ann Hart, Geoff Harvey, Dr James Hobro, Carla Hofman, Helene Leeming, Dr John Loveluck, Peter McDonald, Brian

Milnes, Dr Lisa Redrup, Judith Rippeth, Peter Sandford, Bridget Smith, Dr Aidan Van de Weyer, Natalie Warren-Green and John Williams

**Against (8):**

Councillors Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Daniel Lentell, Bunty Waters, Dr Richard Williams and Heather Williams.

**Abstain (0)**

Council

**Agreed** to request that the Independent Remuneration Panel undertake additional work on its recommendations regarding the Members' Allowances Scheme 2022/23.

**13. Membership of Committees and Other Bodies**

The Democratic Services Manager presented this report on changes to the membership of committees and other bodies.

Councillor Henry Batchelor proposed and Councillor Bridget Smith seconded that Councillor Peter Fane be elected as Chair of Planning Committee, Councillor Geoff Harvey as Vice Chair and Councillor Sunita Hansraj be appointed as Substitute Member of the Adults and Health Committee. A vote was taken and Council unanimously

**Agreed** to endorse the following appointments:

- A)** The election of Councillor Peter Fane as Chair of the Planning Committee;
- B)** The election of Councillor Geoff Harvey as Vice Chair of the Planning Committee
- C)** The appointment of Councillor Sunita Hansraj as Substitute Member of the Adults and Health Committee to fill the vacancy arising from the resignation of Alex Malyon.

Council

**Noted** the following changes in the membership of Committees:

Audit and Corporate Governance Committee

The appointment of Councillor Jose Hales as the Liberal Democrat Group's 5th Substitute Member.

Climate and Environment Advisory Committee

The appointment of Councillor Natalie Warren-Green as the Liberal Democrat Group's 4th Substitute Member.

Employment and Staffing Committee

The appointment of Councillor Peter Sandford as the Liberal Democrat Group's



4th Substitute Member.

#### Grants Advisory Committee

A change in order of Substitute Member hierarchy so that the Liberal Democrat Group's Substitute Members are Councillor Peter Sandford 1st, Councillor Peter McDonald 2nd and Councillor Dr Martin Cahn 3rd.

#### Planning Committee

The appointment of Councillor Dr Lisa Redrup in place of Councillor Paul Bearpark as the Liberal Democrat Group's 3rd Substitute Member.

#### Scrutiny and Overview Committee

The appointment of Councillor Judith Rippeth and Councillor Tom Bygott in place of Councillor Sunita Hansraj and Councillor Heather Williams as ordinary Members of the Committee, and the appointment of Councillor Paul Bearpark in place of Councillor Peter Sandford as the Liberal Democrat Group's 2nd Substitute Member.

#### Cabinet

The Leader appointed Councillor Brian Milnes as Deputy Leader and Councillor Henry Batchelor to join the Cabinet as Lead Cabinet Member for Environment, Waste and Licensing.

#### Changes to Outside Bodies appointments

Council **noted** the following changes to appointments on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's executive committees made by the Leader:

Combined Authority Skills Committee: Councillor Natalie Warren-Green replaces Councillor Peter McDonald who is now appointed as substitute member.

Combined Authority Transport and Infrastructure Committee: Councillor Brian Milnes replaces Councillor Bridget Smith as substitute member.

Combined Authority Housing and Communities Committee: Councillor Peter Sandford replaces Councillor Bridget Smith as substitute member.

Combined Authority Employment Committee: Councillor John Williams replaces Councillor Judith Rippeth as substitute member.

## 14. **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority**

Councillor Bridget Smith explained that an Improvement Board had been established, the Combined Authority's senior management team had been restructured and £50,000 had been allocated to an independent climate change commission to identify what work could be carried out.

Councillor Heather Williams wished the Mayor a swift recovery and asked about the interim arrangements. Councillor Bridget Smith stated that the Deputy Mayor was Councillor Anna Smith, Leader of the City Council. She was ensuring that work continued and the governance review was implemented in the Mayor's

absence.

#### **15. Greater Cambridge Partnership**

Councillor Heather Williams reported that the minutes of the recent Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly were 60 pages long and she urged members to look at them to get an impression of the meeting.

Council **noted** the report.

#### **16. Ox-Cam Regional Partnership**

The Leader reported that the Ox-Cam Regional partnership was now focusing on the environment and the economy. Councillor Heather Williams stated that there was a lack of transparency regarding the Ox-Cam Regional partnership and asked if the minutes and agendas of the Partnership would become publicly available. The Leader agreed that the Partnership should be open and transparent but up until now the Government was in control of the project and had decided not to set up a website. In response to questioning the Leader assured Council that according to the Government, the Partnership's focus was on the environment and the economy and not additional housing.

Councillor Daniel Lentell suggested that Council should discuss what it wanted the Partnership to achieve and expressed concern that one person was making decisions on this matter on behalf of the District. The Leader explained that it was in the Council's interests to be involved in the Partnership, as funding will be secured to deliver environmental and economic schemes.

#### **17. Questions From Councillors**

##### **17 (a) From Cllr Dan Lentell**

In her reply to my question at the last Full Council meeting, the Deputy Leader referenced the government statistic underpinning the congestion charge proposal, and the inclusion of our hospitals at Addenbrooke's in particular, namely, the claim that Cambridge residents on low or no income are less likely to own, or have access to, a car.

While this claim may be correct for our densely-packed urban centre, is it also true for very rural parts of the South Cambridgeshire District such as my ward in Over & Willingham? And, as a professional schoolteacher, will the Deputy Leader show her working out by providing the data to justify her answer?"

Councillor Brian Milnes agreed to provide the detailed data, which he assured Council supported the contention that improved bus services would benefit those on low incomes the most. Councillor Daniel Lentell asked if this information was specific to South Cambridgeshire residents. Councillor Brian Milnes replied that the data was from nationally based statistics.

As his supplementary question, Councillor Daniel Lentell asked what impact the

congestion charge would have on lower income residents who were struggling to afford to run a car. Councillor Brian Milnes replied that the charge would fund affordable alternative transport.

**17 (b) From Cllr Heather Williams**

Is the Leader happy with the current levels of planning enforcement?

The Leader explained that the data for the year 1 October 2021 to 31 September 2022 indicated that 322 complaints were received on planning matters and 417 cases were closed. The Council also issued the following over the same period:

- Six Breach of Condition Notices.
- Eight Enforcement Notices.
- Two Listed Building Enforcement Notices.
- Two Section 215 Untidy Land Notices.
- One Tree Replacement Notice.
- One Temporary Stop Notice.
- One High Hedges Remedial Notice.
- Seven Planning Contravention Notices.

The Leader reported that with the support of our transformation team, the shared planning service had expanded the use of the Council's planning software to include planning compliance case management. This will allow more efficient case management as well as an improved online reporting process allowing complainants to report a complaint and upload photos and videos at any time. The advice on the Shared Planning Website had also been revised to provide additional information on the enforcement process. In November, the service presented a revised draft planning compliance policy – for consultation. The draft policy proposes priorities for the teams and sets out new standards for response times to enable members and our communities to track and see how the team is performing. Central to this was the successful appointment of a permanent and experienced compliance team manager who will start with the Council in the first week of January.

The Leader noted concerns about the planning enforcement function, however, the figures above indicated that the Shared Planning Service already takes more "formal" action than any other area of Cambridgeshire. The Leader reported that following the end of lockdown there was a growing momentum around development of the planning compliance service – which included some really positive signs that the service was listening to and responding to the feedback the Council was giving with a comprehensive approach to systems, staffing, performance and processes.

As her supplementary question Councillor Heather Williams asked how much the Council had paid in compensation for failing to enforce planning conditions. The Leader promised that this information would be provided in writing.

**17 (c) From Cllr Graham Cone**

How many complaints is the Leader aware of that have been marked complete

by mistake in the last four years?

The Leader replied that she was not aware of any complaints being “closed by mistake”, but no process was totally infallible and if this has happened the complainant only has to contact the Council and point this out and the complaint will be re-opened, and the investigation completed.

Councillor Graham Cone stated that he was aware of some complaints that had been marked as complete when they were still ongoing and members of the public had expressed concern that their right to refer their case to the Ombudsman had been removed. The Leader replied that a complainant was free to refer their case to the ombudsman if they were unhappy. A new web-based complaints system had been installed that would keep track of complaints.

**17 (d) From Cllr Sue Ellington**

How long is reasonable in the Leader’s view to have a complaint answered?

The Leader replied that for a first stage complaint it was reasonable for a complainant to expect a reply in 10 working days in most cases, but in more complex cases 20 working days was reasonable. For second stage complaints it was reasonable to expect a response with 20 working days with more in-depth investigations getting a response in 30 working days.

Councillor Sue Ellington stated that she was aware of a complaint from 2019 that had not been addressed. It was agreed that this specific complaint should be discussed outside the meeting.

**17 (e) From Cllr Dr Richard Williams**

Does the Leader accept that if it is this council that wants excessive house building then this council is responsible for resolving key issues like water supply?

The Leader explained that the housing levels identified in the First Proposals for the joint Greater Cambridge Local Plan were based on detailed modelling of evidence of the forecast economic growth in this area up to 2041 and the housing needed for those future employees. The Leader explained that for some time, both this Council and the City Council have been lobbying the water industry and Government in an effort to ensure that they take the necessary action to address our shared concerns for the environment caused by water abstraction in particular.

Councillor Dr Richard Williams suggested that the water resources were inadequate to support the proposed housing figures and as his supplementary question he asked whether these numbers should be revised. The Leader replied that the figures would be revised, as part of the properly agreed process that ensured that any changes were evidence based.

**17 (f) From Cllr Dr Shrobona Bhattacharya**

Since the Leader came to Cambourne Town Council in February 2019 to say the council was removing their support for the High Street nothing really seems to have moved on. Will the Leader confirm if there will ever be enough priority given to a High Street in Cambourne by this administration or will we have another 3 years of nothing?

The Leader explained that the redevelopment of the privately owned site in Cambourne High Street has been the subject of engagement between the Shared Planning Service, members of the Town Council and the landowner. Pre-application discussions with the owner of the land had taken place for a mixed retail and residential development. In response to concerns about development viability raised by the applicant and their team, the planning officers have advised that subject to justification, they are prepared to be flexible in respect of affordable housing requirements. The Joint Director of Planning had met with the Town Council and the applicant to work through design challenges associated with the sites shape and size.

The Leader stated that officers had recently contacted the agents for the applicants who confirmed that they were not seeking anything further from the Council at this time. In conclusion, she shared the hope that the High Street area of Cambourne would be developed.

Councillor Dr Shrobona Bhattacharya expressed her disappointment at the lack of progress and asked if the Council could do more to encourage the owners of the site to agree development. The Leader explained that the economic climate had become more challenging and the Council had been informed by the applicants that the authority's assistance was not required at this time.

**17 (g) From Cllr Tom Bygott**

In July 2021 the Lead cabinet member for Planning stated that 'The Council had developed an action plan which had been shared with Local Ward Councillors for comment and with the Parish Council. The Action plan sets out the measures that the Council proposes following the recommendations of HR Wallingford. Subject to the Parish Councils feedback on the action plan, the Council will then seek to progress with the measures outlined in that plan.' Where is it?

The Leader disagreed with the suggestion that there was no action plan, as the Council had developed and agreed a plan with the Parish Council. The measures in that plan were implemented or are underway. Ongoing investigations with Northstowe Town Council were continuing. A copy of the Action Plan was already available to view online on the Council's website, along with other reports and information on this matter.

As his supplementary question Councillor Tom Bygott asked whether the action plan would resolve the underlying problems. The Leader replied that the Council was working closely with both Longstanton Parish Council and Northstowe Town Council who were pleased with the progress being made.

## 18. Notices of Motion

### 18 (a) Standing in the name of Councillor Heather Williams

This council notes the concerns raised by many residents across South Cambridgeshire about the introduction of a 'Sustainable travel zone' that would charge people to enter the zone via motor vehicle. This council will formally respond to the Greater Cambridge Partnerships consultation relaying these concerns on behalf of the residents we serve. This council, as part of the consultation, will raise opposition to the introduction of said charge and cite the inclusion of Addenbrooke's and Royal Papworth Hospital as absolutely unacceptable.

Councillor Heather Williams stated that other councils were making representations as part of the consultation process and this authority needed to be clear on what its vision was. On behalf of the District's residents, she expressed her opposition to the proposed charge, in particular for those visiting the Addenbrookes site.

Councillor Graham Cone expressed his support for the motion. He had received a considerable number of responses from residents on this issue and the Council should represent these people. He declared an interest as he worked on the Addenbrookes site, but was not paid by the Hospital.

Councillor Brian Milnes explained that this authority was a voting member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board, which had decided to consult on the proposed sustainable travel zone. He stated that it would be pre-emptive of the Council to express a view on this matter before this consultation had concluded.

Councillor Sue Ellington suggested that many residents were unaware of the consultation process and did not know how to respond. She stated that the guided buses were often full and residents with heavy shopping found it difficult to use the bus service. The proposed charge would adversely affect tradespeople from the District who frequently visited Cambridge. It was unclear how blue badge holders, who could nominate two vehicles, could always be exempt from the charge.

Councillor Dr Richard Williams spoke in favour of the motion. He disagreed with the suggestion that the public consultation prevented the Council for expressing its view on the proposed charge. He explained that residents in places such as Heathfield had no alternative but to use a car to travel into Cambridge, as there was no bus service. He expressed concern that the leadership of the Greater Cambridge Partnership relied on officers to express its views and concluded that the Council had an obligation to represent its residents.

Councillor Mark Howell expressed concern about the cost for visitors to Addenbrookes Hospital, in particular those on low income who had a family

member on one of the wards.

Councillor Daniel Lentell stated that the proposed congestion charge was unjust as all residents would have to pay the same regardless of income. He suggested that people should not be charged for visiting Addenbrookes.

Councillor Heather Williams asserted that the proposed charge would impact more on those living in rural areas and those who had to visit loved ones in hospital.

Councillor Heather Williams proposed and Councillor Graham Cone seconded the motion. A vote was taken and cast as follows:

**In favour (8):**

Councillors Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Daniel Lentell, Bunty Waters, Dr Richard Williams and Heather Williams.

**Against (25):**

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Paul Bearpark, Anna Bradnam, Dr Martin Cahn, Stephen Drew, Peter Fane, Corinne Garvie, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Sally Ann Hart, Geoff Harvey, Dr James Hobro, Carla Hofman, Helene Leeming, Dr John Loveluck, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Dr Lisa Redrup, Judith Rippeth, Peter Sandford, Bridget Smith, Dr Aidan Van de Weyer, Natalie Warren-Green and John Williams

**Abstain (2):**

Councillors Ariel Cahn and Libby Earle

Council **Rejected** this Motion.

**18 (b) Standing in the name of Councillor Tom Bygott**

This council notes the lack of planning enforcement actually taken in the last 2 years and raises its concerns. We as a council wish to make clear that we will take enforcement action when breaches are made. We will instruct officers that it is this council's view that enforcement should be taken unless good grounds not to as opposed to the apparent current reverse ethos.

Councillor Tom Bygott asserted that planning enforcement was an essential part of the planning service and it was important that the Council takes swift action to rectify any breaches in order to ensure that planning law was followed. He implied that this was not happening and that breaches of planning law were not being properly investigated.

Councillor Henry Batchelor opposed the motion as each case of planning enforcement needed to be judged on its merits and any action needed to be justifiable and enforceable. He informed Council that the compliance team would be fully staffed in January and so would have the capacity to respond to the demand on the service.

Councillor Sue Ellington stated that it was important that the Council enforced its planning decisions. She expressed concern regarding the increase in fly tipping.

Councillor Jose Hales suggested that those supporting the motion were being critical of officers, who worked evenings and weekends and he wanted to thank them for their hard work and commitment. Councillor Heather Williams assured Council that officers were not being criticised and that councillors were responsible for giving direction to the planning team and ensuring that they had the resources to carry this out. The purpose of the motion was to highlight that currently there were too many cases to enforce.

Councillor Stephen Drew stated that he would be voting against the motion, which he saw as unnecessary. He added that officers had ensured compliance with planning law in his ward.

Councillor Dr Martin Cahn explained that planning enforcement was a complex issue and the officers responsible for this work needed to be supported. The Council had found it difficult to recruit staff to the planning service, which had put pressure on existing staff. Councillor Daniel Lentell praised Councillor Dr Martin Cahn for his comment, but lamented the political nature of the debate and suggested that those opposed to the motion should have proposed an amendment.

Councillor Dr Richard Williams spoke in support of the motion. He asserted that the compliance team were under resourced and it was possible to be critical of the Council without being critical of officers.

Councillor Tom Bygott stated that if the Council left a problem unaddressed it would get worse. He explained that councillors were responsible for setting the policy of the authority and this could be done without criticising officers. He hoped that the budget agreed in February would provide adequate resources to planning enforcement.

Councillor Tom Bygott proposed and Councillor Dr Richard Williams seconded the motion. A vote was taken and were cast as follows:

**In favour (8):**

Councillors Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Daniel Lentell, Bunty Waters, Dr Richard Williams and Heather Williams.

**Against (27):**

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Paul Bearpark, Anna Bradnam, Ariel Cahn, Dr Martin Cahn, Stephen Drew, Libby Earle, Peter Fane, Corinne Garvie, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Sally Ann Hart, Geoff Harvey, Dr James Hobro, Carla Hofman, Helene Leeming, Dr John Loveluck, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Dr Lisa Redrup, Judith Rippeth, Peter Sandford, Bridget Smith, Dr Aidan Van de Weyer, Natalie Warren-Green and John Williams

**Abstain (0)**



Council **rejected** this Motion.

**18 (c) Standing in the name of Councillor Graham Cone**

1. This council accepts that there is no operational need for the water treatment plant to be relocated to the Honey Hill site between Horningsea and Fen Ditton, the relocation allows houses to be built on the current site via the Housing Infrastructure Fund.

2. This council does not believe that the relocation of the water treatment plant to the Honey Hill site should be deemed acceptable.

3. This council will clearly distinguish where the proposed relocation is situated within the Local Plan documentation going forward.

4. The council will make clear how many dwellings could be allocated without relocation of the water treatment plant. These measures would ensure full transparency in all future documents so residents can accurately ascertain the emerging Local Plan's impact to the green belt.

Councillor Graham Cone stated that the process for the relocation of the water treatment plan had not been open or transparent. This Council had not given a preference but the relocation could result in 8,000 fewer homes in the Local Plan.

Councillor Heather Williams explained that the relocation of the treatment plant was linked to the Local Plan and the purpose of this motion was to ensure that the Council gave a view on this issue.

Councillor Brian Milnes explained that the location of the treatment plant was beyond the remit of this authority. He was therefore not going to support the motion.

Councillor Carla Hoffman stated that it was too late for the Council to influence this decision, which was the responsibility of the Government.

Councillor John Williams stated this matter was discussed at a Planning Portfolio Holder meeting under the previous administration. He had opposed the move to the Honey Hill site but it had been supported by the administration, the Conservative controlled County Council and the Conservative Mayor. It was now preferable for the Council to work with Anglia Water to get a development that was suitable for the District.

Councillor Dr Richard Williams spoke in favour of the motion. He stated that the Council was the local planning authority and was responsible for housing in the District. He therefore disagreed with the suggestion that the Council could not influence the process to the benefit of its residents.

Councillor Graham Cone explained that housing cannot be built on the current site without the relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Plant and the purpose of this motion was to try and get this to happen.

Councillor Graham Cone proposed and Councillor Heather Williams seconded the motion. A vote was taken and were cast as follows:

**In favour (9):**

Councillors Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Carla Hofman, Mark Howell, Daniel Lentell, Bunty Waters, Dr Richard Williams and Heather Williams.

**Against (25):**

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Paul Bearpark, Anna Bradnam, Dr Martin Cahn, Stephen Drew, Libby Earle, Peter Fane, Corinne Garvie, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Sally Ann Hart, Geoff Harvey, Dr James Hobro, Helene Leeming, Dr John Loveluck, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Dr Lisa Redrup, Judith Rippeth, Peter Sandford, Bridget Smith, Dr Aidan Van de Weyer, Natalie Warren-Green and John Williams.

**Abstain (1):**

Councillor Ariel Cahn.

Council **Rejected** this Motion.

**19. Chair's Engagements**

Council noted the Chair's Engagements as laid out in the agenda.

**20. Northstowe Interim Community Facilities**

Councillor Bill Handley introduced this item on the delivery of a community building for the new town of Northstowe. He explained that the Council needed to be flexible to respond to a rapidly changing situation.

Councillor Heather Williams thanked the administration for managing to get this report ready in time for this Council meeting, as she was opposed to any further delay to the provision of community facilities at Northstowe. She reminded Council that the Conservative Group had previously supported the recommendation proposed in the report and she hoped that the administration would listen to their practical solutions in the future. She also agreed with the decision to have the discussion in open session, noting that Council's previous debate on this matter had been in closed session.

The Service Manager – Acquisitions and Development explained that the changes in the previous costs was partly due to a change in the market but mostly due to the fact that the proposed facility was much larger.

The Leader expressed her support for the recommendations in the report, stating that she wanted to avoid any further delays. She had asked officers to ensure that the size of the facility was larger than originally planned.

Local Members, Councillor Natalie Warren-Green and Councillor Tom Bygott, both confirmed the support of local residents and Northstowe Town Council for

the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Bill Handley proposed and the Leader seconded the recommendations in the report. A vote was taken and Council unanimously

**Agreed** to

- A)** To purchase/rent a modular building for the interim community facility and delegate to the Chief Executive Officer negotiation over the final contractual price (estimated cost in Table 1 of the exempt appendix).
- B)** An annual revenue budget for budget years 2023-2026 to cover the net costs of running the interim facility (estimated cost in Table 1 of the exempt appendix).
- C)** To place the interim facility on Council owned land at Northstowe (either Parcel 2 or Parcel 6), depending on the advice received through the Planning pre-application process.

---

**The Meeting ended at 5.30 p.m.**

---